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Abstract

Dynamic networking is a key factor for successful transnational organizations. The transcultural shift is a critical process that can enable cultural hybridization so as to inspire consensual identity and learning aptitude amongst worldwide members. The Global Learning Organization (GLO) model is re-conceptualized to bring about this cultural shift. E-learning seems an appropriate tool to generate effective transcultural communication for both culture and learning perspectives under the GLO model. A qualitative case study using document analysis and interviews is conducted to understand how transcultural communication is generated via e-learning under the GLO model in two fields. Findings reveal that firstly, trust is a core element in generating transcultural communication and the combination of face to face and e-learning can enable trust to be activated and developed. Secondly, the way to build trust varies depending on task characteristics: the detail-oriented tasks require more intense face to face communication than the concept-focused tasks. This study illustrates that design of various mixed learning pattern with strategies to build trust through the affective dimension will be key for the successful GLO.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Brief History and Background

Globalization is our reality in a highly interconnected world (Cullen, 2002, pp. 3-7; Millar & Salt, 2007, pp. 41-42). The driving force from globalization creates both opportunities and threats. The higher level of global integration and coordination are indispensable for organizations’ cross-border operations. The globalization of the 21st century is enabling all agents to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than ever before fostered by global information and communication (as cited in Tolbert, McLean & Myers, 2002, p. 464).

Globalization, which started at the end of the twentieth century, created a unified world marketplace with powerful countervailing forces (Bousseba, 2012, p. 481). To realize most of the potential economic benefits coming from global coordination, the national structures of many industries underwent major transformation (Bartlett, Ghoshal, & Beamish, 2008, pp. 88-89). Globalization is a landmark that required international organizations to change the strategic motivations of transnational organizations: global scanning and learning capability in its worldwide network of operations became critical (Bartlett et al., 2008, pp. 6, 88-89; Cullen, 2002, pp. 197, 277).

The management style of organizations that perform cross border activities along this modernized trend may be characterized as two major movements: the international management style of the 60s and 70’s and the multinational management style in vogue since the 80’s. Both management styles were directed toward the transition to transnational organizations (Bartlett et al., 2008, ch.1).
The Development of Three Types of Cross-Border Organizations

**International organizations.** The international organizations’ strategies in the 60s and 70’s can be characterized as strong control on local markets by home-headquarters, limited adaptation to local culture and concentration on home market benefits (Cullen, 2002, p. 197). These strategies concentrate on a worldwide transfer of home country innovations and centralized core competencies, in other words, the center develops knowledge and transfers it to overseas units (Cullen, 2002, p. 339).

The main issue of these international strategies lies in the lack of consideration of local responsiveness due to insufficient understanding of local markets and unilateral knowledge transfer by headquarters (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, p. 95; Orbe & Drummond, 2011, pp. 1690-1692).

**Multinational organizations.** With respect to the focus of the previous management style, the strategies of multinational organizations in the 80s and 90’s can be characterized as an overemphasis on local responsiveness, which led organizations to adopt a market policy of total differentiation through modification of products, strategies and management practices country by country, in order to use local market knowledge, and to hire local managers who made decisions independently (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, p. 11).

The main issue of multinational organizations came from conflicting interests between local offices and the head office; this required finding a balance between their different needs and necessitates intensive negotiations (Cullen, 2002, p. 278). As the tension between local and global represents domination by one party, a global-local consensus dilemma is accentuated in a more significant way (Bartlett et al., 2008, p. 456).

**Transnational organizations.** The increasing volatility, unpredictability, and paradoxical forces in the international environment of the closing decades of the twentieth
century necessitated worldwide companies to adopt a transnational strategic mentality. This can be characterized as neither centralized in the parent company nor decentralized in each subsidiary. As Bartlett et al. (2008) describes it, “the integrated resources and the activities in an interdependent network of worldwide operations are dispersed but specialized, to achieve efficiency and flexibility local-global simultaneously” (p. 13). In other words, distributed resources in a network become a flexible and robust knowledge base.

**Emergent issues of multinational organizations.** Globalization intensified the issues of the global-local dilemma as a contingent challenge against cooperation among cross-border organizations (Troster & Knippenberg, 2012, p. 597). The global environment experienced much more complex demands and became driven by the search for global efficiency, local responsiveness, and simultaneous worldwide innovation (Bartlett et al., 2008, pp. 90, 96). The strategy of decentralization and differentiation lost its efficiency because of constantly emerging new events; stable values and conditions became less reliable because local settings such as technology, consumer values, political regulations, and local cultures changed constantly in an unpredictable manner. For this reason, instead of global local distinction, knowledge should be contextualized between global vision and local action as collective wisdom (as cited in Tuzumer, 2010, p. 53). This tacit knowledge\(^1\) can deal with diverse events that constantly evolve over time in volatility and paradoxical forces. Hence, sharing diverse resources through flexible and interdependent networking became an important notion of a flexible management style (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, pp. 102-103).

\(^{1}\) It refers to a sort of constructed knowledge, which is useful for specific contexts (Tuzumer, 2010, p. 53).
Two crucial shifts can be detected in this situation: first, from independence to interdependence to implement a coordinated global strategy (Bartlett et al., 2008, pp. 90-91) and, second, from a long term cycle strategy to a short term innovation and learning strategy through networking (p. 96). In this sense, the complex and unpredictable situations arising from the globalization process forced organizations to focus on three objectives: efficiency, flexibility and the capacity to learn (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, pp. 50-51, 88-89).

The emergence of transnational organizations. The balance between maintaining the core heritage of the organization and cultural sensitivity vis-à-vis local cultures became a key factor in order to survive in the global marketplace. This balance is realized by sharing a consensual identity and the capability to learn in multi-dimensions (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, pp. 90-91). During networking, all working members in transnational organizations encounter different perspectives and recognize their limitations. They learn how things can be done in different ways through continuous adjustment to stay in tune with the environment (Rademakers, 2014, pp. 10-21). With this objective in mind, the networking system builds interdependent coordination of distributed and specialized resources that are located according to the most beneficial position for a specific activity (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, pp. 99-100). The figures below illustrate two structures: a multinational structure as a multi-level drop down system and a transnational structure as a form of net.
The most promising way to build global efficiency is through a worldwide infrastructure of distributed and specialized assets. The capability to learn throughout the

---

2 The source: www.clipart.me from the public domain.
3 The source: www.pixabay.com from the public domain
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global operations becomes a part of the company’s shared knowledge base and provides input to future strategies; bring local strategy under global vision as global coordination produces knowledge for 21st century (Bartlett et al., 2008, pp. 99-100).

At the same time, thinking in a global perspective and acting appropriately according to local contexts became necessary elements to construct transnational organizations’ culture (Terence, 1995, p. 61; Cullen, 2002, p. 23; Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, pp. 90-94, 112; Shimoni, 2011, pp. 155-156). This kind of worldview, based on contextualization as a form of third culture across state boundaries, enabled the development of networking in a non-hierarchical structure. National culture, which easily produces rival or power relationship, became less meaningful during this process.

As a result, the tension between headquarters and local units can be reduced by reciprocal and equal contribution in a horizontal communication structure, through the construction of a consensual identity based on negotiated sense through hybridization of perspectives among members (Terence, 1995, p. 331; Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, p.111; Shimoni, 2011, pp. 159-160). As the contextualization process requires the mutual contribution of geographically dispersed members, it seems easier to share the basic assumptions that characterize them as a unique entity (Terence, 1995, pp. 330-331). In other words, global and local interdependent networking allows all members to adopt a core global value with certain parts of periphery practice as local actions, which are modified by the elements of local culture. The European Union model is one such example: the specific features of each country are equally recognized under the core value of Europeans.

Because this transnational structure optimizes competitiveness, local responsiveness, and the collaborative learning system through the various specializations of each unit, it seems quite positive. However, the main challenges of transnational organizations lie in the
difficulty of coordinating activities across national borders. A strong tendency toward
fragmentation is a weakness of transnational structures.

The Challenges of Transnational Organizations

**In terms of culture: fragmentation of identity.** Working members of different
cultures need to develop a consensual identity with shared meaning, which allows keeping
their own identities to align with others’ values and simultaneous attachment to multiple
cultural homes (as cited in Orbe & Drummond, 2011, p.1692). The challenge for
transnational management due to fragmentation of identity is related to cross-cultural
diversity management: the convergence of core identity and the incorporation of local
identities (Shimoni, 2011, p. 156). As shared meaning can exist based on trust, mutual
respect, and social cohesion across borders, culture in transnational organizations seems to be
re-conceptualized so as to achieve a consensual identity among members of different
backgrounds (Shimoni, 2011, pp.159-160). Given that it is a real challenge to change the
mindset and worldview of people, the networking system should serve as a global link to
develop a common vision coherent with the company’s core value (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991,

**In terms of learning: fragmentation of expertise.** Interdependence through a
networked learning system in transnational organizations can maintain the viability and
efficiency of each unit (Cullen, 2002, pp.279-281). It can produce contextualized knowledge
through sharing a global vision and bringing local actions. It can reduce tension caused by
contradictory points of view between global and local perspectives (Boussebaa, Morgan, &
Sturdy, 2012, p. 466; Terence, 1995, pp.72-75). As constant collaboration through learning is
a critical key for success, the transnational structural dilemma such as fragmentation between
units, dispersed resources, and complexity in the exploitation of learning capacity should be
managed to produce an integral network of free flowing ideas and innovations (Bartlett et al., 2008, p. 457).

**The problematic observed in transnational organizations.** Transnational management and strategy promote diversity based on multi-dimensional interdependence as a positive notion (Moore, 2005, p. 29). For this purpose, networking is critical (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, pp. 99-100). However, collaborative networking is a challenging process due to fragmentation of members’ diverse identities. This situation can cause incoherence and ambiguity during networking (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, pp. 224-225). To resolve this dilemma, transnational organizations must need two objectives. First, it is essential to have an inclusive culture so as to construct a consensual identity among members from different cultural backgrounds (Tolbert et al., 2002, pp. 465-466; Moore, 2005, pp. 34-35). This consensus will motivate members to learn and collaborate with each other through networking. Second, it is critical to have the proper notion of learning to build this culture (Tolbert et al., 2002, p. 465). A shared meaning can be best developed with an appropriate concept of culture and learning activities (Palaiologou, 2003, p. 77; Onwumechili, Nwosu, Jackson, & James-Hughes, 2003, p. 52).

Hence, new culture and learning are inter-related in a synergic relationship. On the one hand, organizational culture plays a critical role in generating learning capacity and, on the other hand, learning activities play a critical role in building this culture (Rademakers, 2014, pp. 74-75). In the next chapter, the structure and characteristics of transnational organizations will be analyzed with more details in order to identify this new culture and learning.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

In the previous chapter, a transnational strategy was presented as a newly emerging characteristic of international organizations. A transnational strategy requires a fluid worldwide networking system based on the collaboration of working members (Bartlett et al., 2008, p.251; Cullen, 2002, pp. 279-281; Terence, 1995, p. 73). Fragmentation in culture and learning therefore presents a challenge (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, pp. 224-225). Consequently, it is necessary to identify an appropriate culture and communication system that create a consensual identity and a learning capacity that responds to the characteristics of a transnational strategy (Tolbert et al., 2002, p. 465; Moore, 2005, pp. 33-34). The relevant literature will allow us to understand this specific context.

Transnational Organizations

Characteristics

Definitions. Transnational organizations can be described as structures that orchestrate co-ordination of work within a matrix of individual workforces around the world that share a common vision and understanding of corporate strategy (Bousseba et al., 2012, p.466; Morawska, 2011, p.1031).

The structure of transnational organizations. The transnational structure has two main characteristics. First, it refers to distributed and interdependent capabilities in a non-hierarchical structure. The specialized knowledge of each unit is viewed as a resource for the benefit of the total organization. Each unit assumes responsibility for cooperation and involvement without central authority (Bartlett et al., 2008, pp.341-345). Cullen (2002) describes this structure as a net, which allows for the advantage of local specializations and the circulation of resources to become the global source of knowledge (pp. 279-281). This
structure allows for a form of learning because differentiated contributions by all units are integrated in worldwide operations to become a common knowledge base in which working members collaborate to achieve collective objectives (Schockley-Zalabak, 2012, pp. 191-192). Second, it refers to a flexible integrative management process, which facilitates the integration of diverse perspectives into the activities of organizations (Bartlett et al., 2008, pp. 342-343). In other words, the microstructures allow greater flexibility so as to respond efficiently in complex and uncertain situations (Bartlett et al., 2008, pp. 344-345).

The Management and Strategy: goals and examples. Transnational management and strategy are combined to achieve three goals: first, global efficiency emphasizes value-chain activities (Cullen, 2002, p. 195); second, flexibility allows for the ability to manage risks and opportunities and to integrate the different roles and responsibilities of local units when unpredictable situations happen (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, pp. 96-97); finally, worldwide learning capacity enables the sharing of resources (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, pp. 96, 102-103). In this way, strategic alliances are widely used in transnational management. A strategic alliance decision is made when each participant has capital resources to contribute equally to the relationship and when each partner benefits the company objective (Cullen, 2002, pp. 213-216).

Organizations such as Nestlé, IKEA, Benetton, and FrieslandCampina use transnational networking to achieve three goals through reversible knowledge construction, which allows jointly developed knowledge in standardized and flexibly replicated forms to be shared worldwide through non-hierarchical two-way communication (Rademakers, 2014, pp.129-130; Jonsson & Foss, 2011, p.1092). The figure below explains this dynamic:
Figure 3. Transnational Strategy: Reversible Knowledge Construction (From https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Unstructured_peer-to-peer_network_diagram.png & https://pixabay.com/fr/syst%C3%A8me-r%C3%A9seau-actualit%C3%A9s-connexion-1527685/)

It is noteworthy that transnational organizations focus on two domains of activity; first, they create a set of principles and values as a global concept based on mutual respect for working members. For example, IKEA foundations created an easily identifiable third culture through the value of “you’ll be able to contribute to the development of others” to unify people in the organization (Jonsson & Foss, 2011, pp. 1093). This alignment of values between individual and organizational levels can be easily developed through various tasks (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, pp. 275-280; Bartlett et al., 2008, pp. 350-358; Rademakers, 2014, p.3). Second, in the production domain, the main corporation encourages innovation through reversible knowledge flow networking (i.e. IKEA group’s The idea concept, The concept in practice) (Jonsson & Foss, 2011, pp. 1081-1082).

**Advantages and opportunities.** One of the most remarkable advantages of transnational organizations lies in developing locally leveraged and globally linked innovation (Bartlett et al., 2008, pp. 456-457). Shockley-Zalabak (2012) argues that transnational organizations are superior in information sharing, worker flexibility, quality improvement and overall employee job satisfaction (p. 192). Opportunities come from the non-hierarchical structure; integrated global and local operations can reduce tension (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, p. 106). As a result, local voices are more easily included and sharing responsibility among working members allows for negotiation not by power relationships but by context. As certainty about knowledge becomes less evident, contradictory perspectives can be developed through respect for different disciplines (Adomsent, 2013, p. 11). Sharing responsibility for solving complex problems among all members is more promising and reassuring.

IKEA is a good example for arguing the advantage of knowledge construction; the standardized format as basic instruction (Idea concept) is developed and shared among worldwide working members and flexible replication (concept in Practice) captures local markets. Both are hybrid knowledge developed through networking (Jonsson & Foss, 2011, pp. 1091-1092). This approach also consolidates social cohesion to create consensual identity; non-state 3rd culture across state boundaries allows for reciprocal and equal contribution based on shared responsibility.

**Challenges and threats.** The weakness of transnational organizations lies in three factors. First, cooperation can be easily fragmented due to the weak ties resulting from geographic distance and dispersed resources. Second, intensive interdependence can undermine flexibility. Third, the development of learning capacity can be highly complex (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1991, p. 106). These factors can transform organizations into anarchic or
combating networks through non-productive conflicts (pp. 224, 251). This raises the question of how working members from different cultural backgrounds agree on a core vision and at the same time reflect periphery practice.

The challenges of collaborative networking require the development of a consensual identity that enables the sharing of contextualized and negotiated knowledge through learning (Boussebaa et al., 2012, p. 466). For this objective, instead of the previous notion of cultural competency based on adaptation theory (Nardon & Steers, 2008, p. 47), a new identity based on trust should be built through network learning systems. Each individual shares responsibility within the organization, thus sharing the same vision of the group (Bartlett & Goshal, 1991, pp. 106, 111). Therefore, a strong corporate culture and the empowering of learning are interrelated and needed to reduce fragmentation. The following table shows the challenging part of transnational organizations’ strategy in terms of culture and learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Competition and lack of collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create 3rd culture as consensual identity with shared meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empower learners to contribute creative assets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Notion of Culture and Learning in Transnational Organizations

The importance of culture in organizations. Organizational culture can be defined as a common system of shared meanings acquired by a sense making process through everyday life activities (Palaiologou, 2003, p. 76). Shockley-Zalabak (2012) suggests that organizational culture reflects how realities create organizational events (p. 49). In other words, contexts are the main keys to understanding the culture of a group. As 21st century
globalization has changed the contexts of organizations, transnational organizations should seek balance between uniformity (central value of an organization) and diversity (the periphery value) (Terence, 1995, pp. 163-164).

**National cultural dimensions: applications and limitations.** A national culture represents the culture of the people within the political boundaries of the nation-state; theorists such as Hofstede (1980) and Hall (1959) have concentrated on establishing broad classifications of value orientation in different national cultures (Cullen, 2002, pp. 48-49). This has provided for a generalization and prejudice about national culture and the people of a country based on statistical aggregates rather than the interaction among individuals from different countries (Terence, 1995, pp.1-2).

This scope definitely limits the complex cultural phenomena in transnational organizations. Batonda and Perry (2003) argue that a culture based on generalization cannot survive a long term relationship in a globalized world (p. 1568). A transnational organization needs a new concept of cultural competence and flexibility within global co-ordination in order to respond to issues. As the current body of knowledge is limited within geographical and conceptual parochialism, a review of overgeneralization is required (Terence, 1995, p. 25).

A new culture should be based on emphasizing interdependence within the organization’s network (Moore, 2005, p. 32). Intercultural knowledge, which is principally learned by memorization, categorization, and anecdotal treatments through filtering points of views, is no longer valid in reaction to paradoxical contexts and the complexities of opportunities and threats (Terence, 1995, pp. 2, 222-223). The new culture consists of recognizing value differences and being open in order to learn different perspectives; it allows for the acquisition of an integrated view by learners (Holt & Seki, 2012, p. 49). This
means that diversity becomes a toolkit that can be used depending on situations (Moore, 2005, p.9); this can build highly flexible learning capacity.

**Description of transnational organizations’ new culture.** As an information and communication technology (ICT) platform allows for overcoming barriers of geographical distances and time differences, the globalization of the 21st century is characterized as a communication era (Liu, 2007, p. 75). People of diverse cultural backgrounds can evolve into a global workforce through this new communication tool that is closely related to the new culture of transnational organizations. As this shift brought rapidly changing organizational activities in terms of interaction and the way information is processed, culture should be adapted to support an ongoing learning process. As there are no overarching global principles for transnational organizations’ culture and communication, it is necessary to develop a new culture that enables global collaborations through a networking system (Shockley-Zalabak, 2012, pp. 60-61).

New culture needs to incorporate both local and global cultures in a complex and ever-changing system in which people can see themselves connected to the world. The characteristics of the new culture can be defined as the hybridization of various multifaceted patterns through an interdependent network and interconnected relationships among working members (Moore, 2005, pp. 4-5, 8-9, 29-32). Shimoni (2011) argues for a hybrid culture in a virtual third space, which reflects a global vision and local operations based on negotiating a set of values and practices under specific contexts. Hence, the new culture must have a dynamic of always becoming something else as third culture (p. 155). It is an outcome of glocalisation, which means dynamic negotiations between the global and the local on an equal status (Palaiologou, 2003, p. 78).
This new culture plays a critical role for transnational organizations. First, it enables geographically dispersed working members to attain group cohesion and to develop a shared identity. Second, it allows for the construction of transformative and hybrid knowledge by dialogic communication through networking (Adomsent, 2013, p. 17). Finally, as events increasingly happen on short notice, the new culture becomes a *toolkit and repertoire*, which allows for various perspectives and world views in differently angled positions (Moore, 2005, p. 9; Slotte & Tynjala, 2005, pp. 8-9).

New culture gives challenges to be built in transnational organizations. First, it is difficult to find balance and a congruent combination between central and periphery values so as to achieve harmony on the cultural plane (Terence, 1995, p. 171). Second, it is not easy to find a way of communicating that engages various activities in order to construct a consensual identity. Finally, it takes time to establish a proper structure for the networking learning system, which gradually builds both the new culture and consensual identity of members simultaneously.

**Collaborative learning.** As new culture is needed, a new way of learning is also required for knowledge construction. As various ICT platforms enable hybridization of knowledge in virtual space, the way different learning takes place changes from the previous pattern of knowledge transfer to one of collaborative learning. Under the constructivists’ view, knowledge construction occurs through the combination between an individual mental universe and socially negotiated meaning. Collaborative learning empowers individual learners to define problems for themselves and to investigate socially (Henri & Lundgren-Cayrol, 2001, pp. 19-26). This process produces knowledge in standardized and multiple forms (pp. 95-101). Both ways represent hybrid knowledge. Reversible knowledge construction is allowed through constant contextualization of new meanings (p. 132).
A Multitude of Concepts for Transnational Organizations’ Culture

The notion of a new way of learning is quite clear, but there are various emerging concepts related to the new culture for transnational organizations. Some terms and notions are explored below:

**Transnationalism.** Transnationalism can be defined as the cross-border transactions and exchanges between a set of frequent activities through transnational space (Mau, 2010, p.17; Takle, 2012, pp. 176-180). It alters traditional forms of nationalism and creates a transnational mindset, which supports *non-state actors* (as cited in Takle, 2012, pp. 180-181). Transnationalism is closely related to the digital media network, which contains multiple cultural inputs and enables a connection with others in a transnational circuit (Lam, 2006, pp. 219-221). As it attempts to dissolve the national cultural division, it supports networking to maximize knowledge production through collaboration such as grass root activists on the web (Orbe & Drummond, 2102, p. 1706).

**Cosmopolitanism.** Cosmopolitanism is similar to transnationalism but it implies a more ethical and religious stance. Rejecting the myth of race or nation, it supports openness and genuine interest towards others (Clifford, 1994, p. 308). It values hybridization of perspectives and heterogeneous identities (Appiah, 2006; Nussbaum, 2002; Beck, 2000; Fathali, 2012). With respect to the plausibility for transnational organizations’ new culture, cosmopolitanism can easily generate consensual identity based on compassion, respect for human lives, and encouragement for partnership with others (Kendall, Woodward, Skribis, & Palgrave, 2009, p.4; Appiah, 2006, ch. 4, 9). However, there is a limit to its conceptualization in everyday life contexts due to its highly abstract characteristic.

**Global mindset.** The global mindset reflects glocalization: *think globally, act locally* is the ultimate objective that transnational organizations want to bring into their work culture...
TRANSCULTURAL COMMUNICATION VIA E-LEARNING

(Tolbert et al., 2002, p. 465). It allows working members to interact successfully with people from diverse backgrounds and to negotiate meanings through effective communication, a fundamental prerequisite to building knowledge together and implementing experiences in the different contexts (Nardon & Steers, 2008, pp. 49-50). Through a global mindset, workers can develop insights into issues pertaining to world problems and conflicts (Ahamer, Kumpfmuller, & Hohenwarter, 2011, p. 22).

Transcultur. Baraldi (2006) defines transculture as “a sensibility to all cultural forms in self leading to harmonious polyphony” (p. 61). Ramirez describes the process of transculture as “les interactions et les échanges individuels transforment l’individu d’avoir une perspective globale dans la pluralité” (as cited in Wilson, 2012, p. 265). Onwumechili et al. (2003) define transculture through individual characteristics: “being capable of preserving when confronted with prolonged identity stress and adjustment from one culture to the next…and they have multiple homes and a sense of comfort in them” (p. 52). Transculture is the fusion between self and others based on openness and selectiveness (Baumann, 2004, para 1).

One of the predominant characteristics of transculture lies in hybridization, which includes two core elements: multiplicity and a constantly changing state. First, multiplicity refers to maintaining one’s own culture while at the same time participating through learning and socializing with others; it is not based on a distinction between them and us (Holt & Seki, 2012, p. 34). While multiculturalism was criticized owing to its reluctant acceptance of cultural diversity (i.e. frustration), transculture became a center of study because it refers to a transformation made through contacts with other cultural aspects than one’s own, through a desire to improve oneself (Wilson, 2012, pp. 269-270). Second, a constantly transforming state is described as a form of glocalization and new form of global identification, which is
socially constructed through networking, collaborating across distance, race, class, and gender based on common interests and a collective identity. New meanings are constantly created during communicative practices through new technology and learning in digital networked spaces (Lam, 2006, pp. 227-229).

Transcultural communication is a combination of many cultural elements through cultural practices in everyday life. Orbe & Drummond (2012) call it a mono-cultural identity (i.e. Asianolatinoamerican); meaning that all cultures constitute one entity. This form of hybridization shows openness in cultural integration, enabled by learning and sharing different cultures through communication (p. 1706).

**The observation of notions.** Common ground exists among these four notions: transnationalism, cosmopolitanism, global mindset, and transculture. All of them rely on constant contact with cross-border activities as a global exchange of relationships, based on cultural openness between local and global levels. However, the degree of abstraction indicates that transculture is the most concrete and narrow notion among them.

In relationship with new ways of communication after globalization, transculture has important implications. As a new culture is generated through cross-cultural communication, it enables people to foster a better understanding of global relations and acknowledgement of different people beyond the national state (Mau, 2010, p. 95). As transculturalism derives from the everyday positive experience of transnationalization, it is an outcome of how individuals negotiate meanings and how individuals achieve it through appropriate communication in real settings (Onwumechili et al., 2003, p. 52).
Transcultural Communication

To inspire transculture and collaborative learning in everyday working context as the form of dialogue and negotiation of meaning in real settings through interaction and feedback among working members, proper communication is needed.

Baraldi (2006) defines transcultural communication as a new pattern of intercultural communication in a form of *fusion* (p. 63). Its prominent characteristic lies in mixed-coding, based on unpredictable hybridization among contradictory cultural forms through non-hierarchical communication (Baraldi, 2006, p.60). This means that transcultural communication is particularly important because it allows for bridging the concept and practice of transculturalism in order to produce the essential elements of transnational organization: it refers to a consensual identity based on a fusion between the values of the self and those of others (Baraldi, 2006, p. 63) and a learning capacity based on collaborative learning that reflects individual knowledge negotiated with others (Henri & Lundgren-Cayrol, 2001, p. 14).

The theoretical role of transcultural communication for building transculture and collaborative learning

*Creation of a third space.* Transcultural communication enables the creation of a third space where hybridization and sense making happen. Terence (1995) describes this space as one where interactions among the different cultural members encourage each member to contribute, while maintaining one’s own cultural elements and letting organizational practices make them unique (p. 330). In this logic, Shimoni (2011) describes hybridization as the process of continual re-hybridization by a narrative form of transcultural communication, which produces new sense in a third space. The hybridization process in this third space is an ongoing project and it continues to evolve through transformation into other forms (pp. 156-
For example, the term, ‘Asianlatinoamerican’ identifies a combination of various cultures, integrated into the complex entity. Contradictions and hybridizations between assimilation and resistance are mutually reflected in this personality, which represents the process the third space envisages when negotiating cultural identity (Orbe & Drummond, 2012, pp. 1962-1963). In other words, multiple identities become an individual’s resources.

Creating dialogue for negotiation of the sense. Negotiation comes from the desire to enrich the relationship and to construct trust among members. It is a sense giving process, which may allow the reconstruction of an identity that makes all parties feel comfortable (Clark & Geppert, 2011, p.411; Onwumechili et al., 2003, p. 54; Shimoni, 2011, p.156).

Negotiation is more likely to happen under the form of dialogue. The transcultural form of communication will open dialogue and conversations in a critical mind. Dialogue allows members to become familiar with newness given that it does not seek the end of agreement, not persuading, but making newness in a gradual way (Appiah, 2007, ch. 4; Baraldi, 2006, p. 63). In other words, transcultural communication through dialogue brings about a reflection on one’s own identity to bring it in alignment with that of others. The internal level of negotiation of the sense can lead to a respect for individual uniqueness while, at the same time, conjoining with others (Holt & Seki, 2012, p. 34).

The process of construction of new knowledge. Whiteworth (2007) argues that broadening knowledge is inevitable. It allows creativity to be orchestrated through a multiplicity of perspectives and without overlooking other forms of knowledge (pp. 214-215). According to Adomsent (2013), knowledge becomes a coproduction during the learning process. There is no solely absolute knowledge in content and form; knowledge is considered raw material that may be combined, mixed, used, and manipulated by different users beyond their immediate knowledge: therefore, knowledge is hybrid (p. 17). People are seen not as
recipients of knowledge but as possessors of knowledge who generate dynamic and reciprocal interpretations based on the strong belief that diversity is positive (Adomsent, 2013, p. 21).

This notion of constructed knowledge is critical for transnational organizations because it is related to networking among different actors (Achtenhagen & Johannisson, 2013, pp.25-26). As knowledge is obtained through a constant process of dialogic collaboration, it may be called co-intentional learning, where the participants jointly develop understanding. As meanings and values are negotiated during knowledge construction, it becomes a process of cultural practice (Meethan, 2003, p.16). Therefore, new knowledge forms produced by participants’ dialogic communication and interactions may become meaningful for members in order to facilitate cultural hybridization. Transcultural communication based on conversation and dialogue may generate empathy and curiosity among members from diverse cultures and it allows people to gradually become accustomed to each other (Rogerson-Revell, 2003, p.166). In this context, transcultural communication aims at integrating knowledge through the negotiation of meanings in intertwining networks.

Knowledge constructed by geographically and culturally dispersed members should be circulated through proper communication tools (Adomsent, 2013, p. 18). According to Adomsent (2013), in the 21st century, technology enables a non-competitive spirit of learning through a negotiation process. People from different work cultures become positively interdependent by means of communication technology to accomplish joint tasks and they enter into a dialogue to negotiate the complexity and ambivalence of problematic issues (pp. 17-19). Through ICT platforms, communication technology enables transcultural communicative acts in a third space as the main catalyst for reflexive creativity and constructed knowledge (Achtenhagen & Johannisson, 2013, p.3). Transcultural
communication may play an interdisciplinary function that offers the best support for the transformation of knowledge. Slini, Giama, & Papadopoulou (2016) argue that transcultural communication as trans-disciplinary communication integrates the capability of different actors in order to produce during the learning process the most desirable outcome as strategic knowledge (p. 6). It is a fundamental predisposition for new hybrid knowledge production (Adomsent, 2013, pp. 18-21).

The process towards a consensual identity. In a transnational organization, it is necessary to establish a shared identity to prevent fragmentation. As social relations are multifaceted, each individual’s ‘self-accomplishment and self-development’ are supported as latent values (Terence, 1995, p. 73). The resistance of a local culture can make consensual sense making particularly difficult to obtain.

Boussebaa et al. (2012) point out that the contribution of voice from each local unit can be a solution for consensual identity (pp. 473-476). Glocalization, or global concerns increasingly becoming part of the everyday local experiences and vice-versa, seems to mobilize the mental motivation to create openness, social cohesion, and a sense of belonging among members. The hybrid identity achieved through consensual sense making can be built by the narrative realities of the third space (Takle, 2012, p. 188; Terence, 1995, pp. 323-324). The negotiation process will be easier because the spirit of partnership can inspire mutual respect and reciprocal trust (Clark & Geppert, 2011, p. 405). This consensual identity in transnational organizations can be formed by transcultural communication because it becomes a daily horizontal way of communication, dependent upon multiple and constant interconnections and social experiences across international borders (as cited in Baia, 1999, pp. 93-96). Transcultural communication can mobilize members through an exchange of diverse issues, the creation of sense sharing about the reality, and the construction of
practices through relevant events and projects. Therefore, consensual identity may be created by transcultural communicative activities, where personal values can be recognized via empathy, dialogue, participation, and learning (Baraldi, 2006, pp. 64-65).

**Challenges of transcultural communication.** As transcultural communication involves networking of a learning system to build transculture and learning capacity through mobilizing mental motivation in a spirit of partnership, one critical question must be addressed: what are the conditions for choosing an appropriate tool to generate transcultural communication in every day working experiences through events and projects?

**A tool for multidisciplinary projects encompassing great divergence.** Divergence arising from geographical, economic, technological, educational, social, and political distances increases the complexity of multidisciplinary learning in a transnational organization. As the learning environment is complex and needs to include all working members, an online communication platform is an effective tool to generate transcultural communication. However, there are challenging aspects such as building social cohesion through a cold medium, a requirement for a high degree of autonomy by the participants, limitations of pedagogical design, online power relationships, and a digital divide (Rogerson-Revell, 2003; Bunt-Kokhuis, 2013; Wilder, Pixy Ferris, & An, 2010; Wilhelm, 2010; Slini et al., 2014; Collins, Weber, & Zambran, 2014). These limitations of online communication are real and it is necessary to accommodate them, for example, by providing effective facilitator, easy tools to access online resources, and a supportive virtual climate to motivate each individual learner (Henri & Lundgren-Cayrol, 2001, pp. 95-101).

**A tool for managing multi-cultures & languages.** Transcultural communication can break down the resistance of people who hold preconceived traditional notions such as one’s own perceptions, beliefs, values, biases and misconceptions about things (Nardon & Steers,
2008, p. 48). For this reason, Baraldi (2006) emphasizes that the mindfulness of cultural diversity should be created progressively through a tool that generate *dialogues with appreciation*. According to Baraldi (2006), this allows for plausible communicative conditions for participants; people can have a self-reflexive attitude through active listening and perception checking (pp. 66-67). A tool to coordinate persisting diversities through dialogue is a critical issue for consideration.

**A tool for dealing with theoretical and practical framework.** Slotte and Tynjala (2005) states that the objectives of promoting transcultural communication lie in increasing holistic learning competencies such as interaction skills and flexibility for continuous change (pp. 192-193). In order to generate such positive outcomes through transcultural communication, the concept of transculture should be properly introduced as a theoretical framework that can reduce ambiguity.

**The role of e-learning in the transcultural communication challenge.** According to Baraldi (2006) and Henri & Lundgren-Cayrol (2001), transcultural communication facilitates dialogic conversations to produce a comfortable third culture and enables knowledge to be hybridized through individual interpretations and dynamic interactions with others. This is reconstructed every day, making sense of realities. For this objective, e-learning needs to be focused as a tool for generating transcultural communication in both culture and learning perspectives

**The relationship between intercultural and transcultural.** Understanding intercultural and transcultural dynamics is essential to reduce the ambiguity of these two concepts. This will allow for a clear characterization of the role of e-learning in transcultural communication. Papadopoulos, Tilki, & Ayling (2008) explains the characteristic of being *intercultural* as “a status of communicating with people of other cultures: being in interaction
with people from foreign cultures concerning their specific concepts in perception, thinking, feeling, and acting” (p. 4). The positive or negative experiences will influence people’s determination to continue learning otherness. Similarly, Baumann’s study (2004) clarifies how a transcultural trait is related to an intercultural one: when intercultural situations happen, three reactions take place: reculturation, transculturation, and deculturation.

According to Baumann (2004), transculturation produces other forms of fusion. He defines transculture thus: “between the two rigid attitudes of rejection and complete openness toward the other is the selective or flexible position that leads to a cultural connection or blending of A and B, of the own and the other” (para.1). Through the following figure, he indicates well the distinction between intercultural and transcultural levels and different cultural dynamics.
Figure 4. Intercultural and Transcultural Dynamics (From Trans Revista Transcultural de Musica by Baumann, M. P., 2004 http://www.sibetrans.com/trans/articulo/192/the-charango-as-transcultural-icon-of-andean-music)\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{5} The source: www.creativecommons.org CC BY-NC-ND 2.5 ES
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Therefore, according to Baumann (2004), the transcultural aspect is one of the different outcomes of intercultural reactions; it is a self-determined hybridization and a visibly emerging consequence of the 21st century globalization process.

**E-learning: definition and characteristics from the intercultural context.** The role of e-learning in previous studies of intercultural context may provide some insight on the way it can be adopted for generating transcultural communication. E-learning may be defined as the “art of converting the brainware of the teacher into a courseware” (Alraddadi, Alraddadi, & Alotaibi, 2011, p. 116) under a positivist view. However, under a constructivist view, e-learning is considered a beneficial tool to increase cultural awareness, reduce prejudice and enhance cross-cultural collaboration through customization of local characteristics (Bunt-Kokhuis, 2013; Collins et al., 2014; Rogerson-Revell, 2003; Slini et al., 2014).

**Assumed advantage of e-learning for transcultural communication.** Previous studies of intercultural context provide three major assumptions to predict the possibility of transcultural communication generated by e-learning in cultural perspective. First, e-learning provides the platform for non-hierarchical communication, which allows for a sense making process in a reciprocal relationship by online learners (Sorensen, 2007; Verbaan, 2008; Wilder et al., 2010). Second, e-learning can offer effective opportunities for better understanding of otherness. This is about creating openness and genuine curiosity towards others via the space of dialogic collaboration. A successful process will allow for the gradual internalization of cultural competency (Wilder et al., 2010; Ruiz-Molina & Cuadrado-Garcia, 2008; Audras & Chanier, 2008; Durampart, 2007; Wilhelm, 2010; Jeunesse, 2009). Finally, e-learning offers flexibility for exchanging fluid feedback as virtual interaction. Communication through synchronous and asynchronous modes will produce dialectical sense making through collaboration and will lead to familiarization with other thoughts and ideas.
through reflection (Sorensen, 2007; Verbaan, 2008; Lam, 2006). E-learning is empowering, but also liberating: each participant will be entitled to creatively define for themselves the problems that require investigation (Whiteworth, 2007, p. 216). A culture of hybridization is built by learning activities through feedback under contingent situations.

In a learning perspective, the device of e-learning is emphasized under the constructivists’ view; they argue that e-learning via ICT platforms facilitates collaborative learning among geographically dispersed learners. In other words, the device of e-learning allows autonomous knowledge producers (Henri & Lundgren-Cayrol, 2001, pp.18, 32-34). The figure below illustrates how collaborative knowledge production happens between an individual and others via e-learning:
Predicted challenge of e-learning for transcultural communication. Previous studies indicate three criteria that present a challenge in e-learning for transcultural communication.
First, the lack of non-verbal expressions may intensify misunderstanding and potential conflicts among people from different cultures (Liu, 2007, p. 51). Second, the foreign language barrier, the digital divide and appropriate interpretation of cyber language can occur (Palaiologou, 2003, p. 81). Finally, ignorance, indifference, low motivation, negative perception of national identity, and resistance can decrease active learning (Jeunesse, 2009, pp. 63-65). To minimize these challenges, a conceptual framework of transculture and collaborative learning can be conveyed by e-learning under a context that emphasizes two perspectives; this might reduce the complexities of cultural issues (Palaiologou, p. 82). It is plausible to assume that different cultural ingredients may play positively in transcultural communication if e-learning is adequately designed to produce selective transformation through the multiple negotiations of different meanings.

**E-learning under the Global Learning Organization (GLO) model.** As previous studies suggest that e-learning can generate transcultural communication in cultural and learning perspectives, it is necessary to have proper design to implement this notion of e-learning within an organizational context for specific tasks. The *Global Learning Organization* (GLO) model can be adopted to promote transcultural communication theoretically and practically. GLO aims at achieving a cultural shift that supports learning diversity in alignment with the core spirit of the organization’s priority (Tolbert et al. 2002, pp. 465-466). It is necessary to discuss the GLO model in more details to analyze the possibility of reframed e-learning as a unique tool to generate transcultural communication.

**Chapter 3**

**Conceptual Framework**

The existing literature recounts the crucial importance of the creation of transculture brought about by transcultural communication for transnational organizations. As cultural
change is a very challenging task, the Global Learning Organization (GLO) model was conceived by Tolbert et al. (2012) to generate transcultural communication in order to encourage learning diversity. Previous studies view e-learning as having great potential for GLO. In this regard, the present chapter will examine the theoretical basis of the Learning Organization, its reconceptualization to the global level (GLO), and the significance of implementing e-learning into the GLO model. Finally, a research question will be formulated at the end of the chapter.

GLO: A Model for a Globally Inclusive Worldview

GLO: the reconceptualization of the learning organization. The concept of a learning organization was presented by Peter Senge (1990). He defines the learning organization as “an organization that is continually expanding its capacity to create its future” (Senge, 2006, p. 69). The very first requirement for creating a learning organization is awareness that an organization is composed of different people, who lead in different ways. A learning organization enables working members to participate in a cultural shift from the traditional authoritarian workplace to one where human potential to adapt to new situations is recognized. Learning organization transforms mindset, engendering “personal growth, respect, and tolerance for difference and for a sustainable world” (Montgomery, 2014, p. 198).

Based on these notions of a learning organization, Tolbert et al. (2002) focused on a global perspective: the GLO model aims to build a geocentric mindset and positive diversity-related behavior to learn in collaboration in order to marshal world resources for creativity (p. 464). This entails a need to change the corporate worldview from an ethnocentric to a globally inclusive one. Given that it is difficult to re-orient the minds of employees towards global issues, it became essential to create a new value system under the GLO model, which allows
transnational organizations to coordinate resources in real settings (Tolbert et al., 2002, pp. 465-466). A mind shift (Senge 1990, p. 37), which enables all working members to see themselves at the center of the world, is the core objective under GLO. The comparison between worldviews is summarized as follows (Tolbert et al., 2002, p. 464):

- Ethnocentric:
  a) Center of business is at home.
  b) Different perspective is tolerated.
  c) Golden rule: treat others as I would like to be treated.

- Globally inclusive:
  a) Center of business is throughout the world.
  b) Different perspectives are sought by multiple ways of communication.
  c) Philosophy: treat others as they would like to be treated.

**The principal characteristics of GLO**

**The re-conceptualized GLO model.** A learning organization exhibits five disciplines as core elements: first, personal mastery, which refers to becoming a lifelong learner; second, a mental model to align to world changes; third, a shared vision among employees that has the power to bind an organization together; four, team learning that enables members to learn with a goal in mind; the fundamental basis of the learning organization derives from the fifth element, “system thinking”, which supports the ability to see the big picture, neither as a cause-effect nor as a snapshot (Senge, 2006, pp. 15-16, 69).

The re-conceptualized GLO model based on these disciplines may allow autonomous learners to contextualize knowledge reflecting the self in harmony with others. For this objective, the GLO model should offer well-orchestrated learning activities through specific organizational tasks. The GLO model, therefore deals with three dimensions: the cognitive
dimension for conveying the concept, the skill dimension for generating dialogic collaborations, and the affective dimension for enabling gradual cultural familiarization. The ADIE model in Figure 6, which illustrates the general steps is a concrete form of the GLO model (Tolbert et al., 2002, pp. 467-468). As is evident, this general and conceptual process should be associated with each organizational project. The GLO model is challenging because all employees must tap into their inner resources and hope that they can build their own community with distributed assets based on a collective core concept.

**Figure 6**: Organizational Development for Creating the GLO (From Creating the global learning organization by Tolbert, A. S., McLean, G. N., & Myers, R. C., 2002, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26, p. 468. Copyright 2002 by Elsevier. Reproduced with permission.)

Meyer (2014) argues that the continuous strategic alignment in terms of value and knowledge between market, business, organization and individual, which can be obtained
through a continuous learning process under GLO model (pp. 10-24), helps organizations to implement a new business system consistent with transformational learning, which bridges the gap between knowing and doing (Rademakers, 2014, pp. 25-35). Figure 7 shows how each organizational level aligns with the others in a GLO model focused on a learning perspective.

*Figure 7:* Forms of Continuous Learning (From Strategy development for continuous learning by R. Meyer in M. F. Rademakers (Eds.), 2014, *Corporate Universities*, p. 20. Copyright 2014 by Taylor & Francis Group. Reproduced with permission.)
The role of GLO in transnational organizations. The cultural change initiated by the GLO model will allow transnational organizations to overcome fragmented and dispersed forces through well-defined e-learning activities, which may generate transcultural communication by enabling members from different backgrounds to have a shared identity and learning capacity (Edmundson, 2007, pp. 44-45, 49-50). The following diagram proposes why and how e-learning via the GLO model can bring about a cultural change in transnational organizations.

**Increased transnational activities due to globalization**

**Transnational organizations need constant networking through learning.**

Challenge: fragmentation of knowledge and working members’ shared identity

**Diagnostic: consensual identity and collaborative learning are needed**

Need for shift in organizational culture, learning, and communication

**GLO objective: shift in cultural and learning perspectives**

‘Worldview from ethnocentric to globally inclusive’ and ‘learning capacity from transferring knowledge to collaborative knowledge’

Transcultural communication enables global network learning and consensual identity.

**Generate transcultural communication via e-learning in three dimensions: cognitive, skill, and affective.**
Workers can build transnational competency, learning aptitude, transnational identity, and transnational trust via GLO model.

Outcome: The GLO model creates a globally inclusive culture and a global learning network

Some examples: Mars, Deloitte, and IKEA. The GLO model has been adopted by a number of organizations wishing to produce a cultural shift in worldview and learning. Their concern was same: empowering individual workforces to obtain global efficiency.

The GLO model adopted by Mars shows how a company can reshape its business through globally unified learning strategies. Mars developed a global alignment that provided unified resources via online technologies and ensured equal access, commitment, and social interaction. This process brought strong consensual identity for standardization in the production field. Self-paced e-learning through virtual classes combining instructor-led classroom training were successfully used during GLO adoption (Rademakers, 2014, pp. 54-66).

Deloitte, spread over 153 countries, with a vision of transculture and collaborative learning, aimed at anticipating future trends. For Deloitte, it is crucial to collect input from all members. The networking under the GLO model, which strengthens the online learning system, makes it possible to respond to the needs of each unit through participation in surveys, working sessions, and project teams so as to form new content from the e-library (Rademakers, 2014, pp. 74-75). With Deloitte globally as a slogan, they introduced web-
based training, webinars, web-apps, e-books, podcasts, learning videos, games, and simulations. This provided them with on-demand learning and created a collaborative virtual experience in real time so that participants felt connected to each other (Rademakers, 2014, pp. 68-71).

IKEA conducted e-learning under the GLO model as one of most successful transnational organizations in terms of reversible knowledge construction, which means the combination of centralization and decentralization of resources to produce a basic format at the global level and to allow diverse replications in smooth local implementation. This collaborative networking breaks down all barriers across borders and builds an open and trusting working climate (Jonsson & Foss, 2011, pp. 1091-1093).

**The GLO and E-learning**

E-learning under the GLO model can help individuals improve in a number of cultural settings and can develop flexibility in individual members so as to maximize their personal coping mechanisms and share organizational realities through the new culture (Shockley-Zalabak, 2012, pp. 371-373). Reframing e-learning under the GLO model is a significant process.

**The conceptualization of e-learning under GLO.** Sharples, Taylor, & Vavolua (2007) explain that e-learning generates virtual conversation and dialogue, which enables people to negotiate differences more easily and understand each other’s experiences. Online dialogue allows people to gradually become accustomed to each other, forming transiently stable interpretations of the world (p. 226).

Under both perspectives of transculture and collaborative learning, e-learning is seen as *co-intentional learning*: learners jointly develop understanding through dialogue (Sharples et al., 2007, p. 226). Under the constructivist view, this is a sense making process in creating
multiple meanings and interpretations by multiple actors. As transcultural communication refers to mixing codes, e-learning involves a continuous conversation with the external world to seek out new ideas.

Therefore, e-learning under GLO can be conceptualized as communication patterns through everyday activities by exchanging cultural aspects and collaborative network learning, which can be described as all the processes to help understanding and to encourage collaboration aimed at creating hybrid knowledge.

This conceptualization of e-learning is quite a different aspect of transferring knowledge from previous cases in which e-learning is mainly used for delivery of job-related instructions through instructor-led training (Welsh, Wanberg, Brown, & Simmering, 2003, pp. 246-248). For example, the successful short video clips of Nokia as a form of e-learning (Welsh et al., 2003, p. 248) did not aim at construction of knowledge via two-way communication flow based on a transcultural worldview and collaborative learning style.

**Aspects of e-learning under GLO**

**Advantages.** There are several arguments concerning the advantages of e-learning.

First, Collins et al. (2014) describes the advantages of e-learning for business corporations as delivery of multiple perspectives and great feedbacks via multiple channels (pp. 514-516).

Second, e-learning can make data more reliable as a result of multi-criteria analysis; this may strengthen theoretical knowledge so that learners can perceive the inter-relatedness of people (Slini et al., 2014, pp. 8-9; Takle, 2012, p. 175). Third, the advantages of e-learning in terms of increased personal motivation will allow participation in joint activities in the network and will facilitate international projects through a reduced ethnocentrism (Slotte &
A digital learning system develops mental openness so that people can form a globally communal mindset.

**Challenges.** In the GLO model, the challenges of e-learning can be seen in situations such as insufficiently contextualized cultural input, the complexity of developing cultural competency owing to difficulty in clearly interpreting cultural elements, and infrequent face to face meetings and weak social cohesion (Alradaddi et al., 2011; Bunt-Kokhuis, 2013; Holt & Seki, 2012; Rogerson-Revell, 2003; Slini et al., 2014; Slotte & Tynjala, 2005).

**The significance of e-learning for GLO.** E-learning can satisfy two perspectives under the GLO model and its implementation via three dimensions may produce outcomes as qualified transcultural elements.

**Significant implications of networking for the learning perspective.** Transcultural communication generated by e-learning under the GLO model can prevent fragmentation of knowledge. Holt & Seki (2012) argue that global resources can be achieved by social learning through technologies that bind together people aiming for interconnectedness (p. 33). The construction of knowledge through e-learning can occur through a wide range of authentic updatable inputs and task oriented every day context bound communicative activities under specific tasks.

**Significant implication in building consensual identity for the cultural perspective.** Transcultural communication generated by e-learning under the GLO model can prevent fragmentation of identities. E-learning can be offered to develop negotiation skills through self-reflection, dialogic conversation, reciprocal observation, equal distribution of voice, and concrete interactive experiences in order to produce new cultural concepts and rules for testing them in real settings (Nardon & Steers, 2008, p.52). E-learning is empowering because it allows people to see social situations as a way to creatively change the parameters.
of a system (Whiteworth, 2007, pp. 214-216). E-learning, which allows individual learners to participate in real world projects, can convey a sense of inclusion and shared vision, not based on national or race boundaries but rather on understanding human commonalities, mutual respect, sensitivity to otherness, genuine curiosity, and global awareness (Liu, 2007, pp. 44-45).

**Aspects of transcultural communication generated by e-learning under the GLO model.** E-learning is conceptualized as a tool to generate transcultural communication under the GLO model. Lopez (2008) describes the intervention of e-learning under the GLO model as having three dimensions: first, a cognitive goal enables people to construct conceptual understanding; second, a skill goal\(^6\) allows people to develop various skills via performing mixing codes; finally, an affective goal produces a sense of respect and trust through making themselves accustomed to otherness via cultural familiarization. Transcultural communication generated by e-learning through three dimensions will create an attitude of openness and genuine curiosity towards others (pp. 45-48). In other words, the GLO model reframes e-learning to promote the value of hybridity, which is plausible for a transnational networking system. Each of these dimensions will be explained below:

**Cognitive: conveying the notion of transculture.** The concept of transculture needs to be promoted through a theoretical framework. This allows members to reduce the ambiguity of the concept. Tolbert et al. (2002) suggest that understanding the need for cultural change can be perceived through a cognitive framework using e-learning, which can provide employees with an opportunity to internalize the theory in order to facilitate an attitudinal

\(^6\) In the ADIE (Analyze, Develop, Implement, Evaluate) model, it refers to the behavioral dimension (Tolbert et al., 2002,p. 468).
change (p. 465). Concepts conveyed through e-learning will allow working members to practice in real situations through interaction with others so as to correct habits of mind and attitude, to reduce existing prejudice about other cultures, and to increase cultural sensibility as a cultural competency (Lopez, 2008, p. 39).

**Skill: the space of dialogic collaboration.** Shimoni (2011) points out that contingent situations will create various hybridizations during e-learning (p. 160). Baraldi (2006) argues for the power of dialogue: a form of equal distribution of voice, empathy, and sensitivity to the needs of others. This form of transcultural communication creates a condition of openness, the negotiation of meanings, and the joint creation of new cultural symbols (pp. 61-62). Dialogue in the skill dimension through e-learning leads to collaborative knowledge building. In order to generate dialogic collaboration, e-learning should be designed so as to produce knowledge sharing, interaction, and discussion as a horizontal way of communication (Sorensen, 2007, p. 164). Collaborative learning is facilitated by e-learning; it makes thinking modifiable through the learners’ participation (Miyaken, 2007, p. 249). In other words, an e-learning system easily empowers individual learners to become self-sustainable to construct knowledge for themselves and to share with others.

**Affective**

*The emergence of a socialization process.* E-learning will activate social relationships among members, which increase the motivation of learners (Ruiz-Molina & Cuadrado-Garcia, 2008, p. 20). Wilder et al. (2010) remark that contextualized experiences through e-learning enable members to get accustomed to other’s thoughts and ideas through reflection and feedback and to work together on targeted projects (p. 31).

*The consolidation of a globally communal mindset.* Virtual identity appraisal through open social networks facilitates interaction and engagement in community activities so as to
create social cohesion and cultural familiarization (Bunt-Kokhuis, 2013, p. 51). E-learning facilitates transcultural openness and a sense of belonging based on empathy and community building, through various technological tools such as video conferencing, Skype, and discussion forums, which can build trust and an affinity for sharing human commonalities.

**The transcultural elements built under GLO.** GLO expects some transcultural elements as positive outcomes via e-learning: transnational competency, learning capacity, transcultural identity, and transnational trust. Each of these will be explained below:

**Transnational competency.** Transnational competency is a set of human attributes that is broader than the narrowly defined skills and abilities of the past because people must deal with unexpected events using this competency in task situations (Engle, Mendenhall, Powers, & Stedham, 2001, pp. 347-348). There are three aspects:

First, it refers to flexibility. When relationships are nonlinear and uncertain, it is necessary to develop capacity in using the resources of the network in each situation (Koehn & Rosenau, 2010, p. 24). The non-evaluative characteristics of transcultural communication allow for the preservation of diversity regarding conflict as a new form of expression and as a social process (Baraldi, 2006, pp. 66-67). Second, it means communication skills: transcultural communication creates dialectical meaning for each member through storytelling and narrative dialogues that infuse passion into everyday activities (Schockley-Zalabak, 2012 p. 50). Finally, it implies cultural competency. It is the ability to bridge disciplines and transform specialized knowledge into integrated practice (Koehn & Rosenau, 2010, p. 41) through engaging useful dialogue in different cultural contexts (Hawkins & Cummings, 2002, p.8).

**Learning capacity and constructed knowledge.** According to Senge (2006), empowering learners in organizations should begin with the alignment of the different
degrees of personal power (p. 217). As transcultural communication plays a role in developing learning perspectives and values rather than learning facts, e-learning under the GLO model can promote this lifelong learning capacity (Alraddadi et al., 2011, p. 119). The process of alignment is preceded by dialogue that deals with current realities.

In this regard, Senge (2006) emphasizes that “virtual world is a constructed representation of the real world. The essence of a virtual world is freedom” (p. 241). Learners can rehearse the real performance and replay the same action to find a way of dealing with different viewpoints through virtual learning (Liu, 2007, p. 53).

Meanwhile, Liu (2007) argues that e-learning is a great venue to develop social capital as a new information-sharing database through a sustainable learning community on a worldwide scale. She defines social capital as “the collective power and resources to improve society and individuals” (P. 53) and argues that social resources facilitate information exchange, knowledge sharing, and knowledge construction through continuous interaction, which is built on trust and maintained through shared understanding (p. 53).

**Transcultural identity.** Transcultural identity is a post national identity, which means that it has little relationship to national origin and instead, a sense of national identity going hand in hand with a supranational and global feeling of belonging (cited in Mau, 2010, p. 117). The tension between local and global can be negotiated through communicative experiences under the transcultural worldview (Mau, 2010, p. 115; Orbe & Drummond, 2011, p. 1690). Featherstone, Broadhurst, and Holt (2012) points out that transcultural identity makes up the fabric of everyday life in new forms of time, space and sociability (p. 4). Transcultural identity melts down the barrier between national and supranational levels, so it forms an expanded nationalism (Mau, 2010, p. 117). Transcultural identity in a shared vision can allow people to see that they can shape their future together (Senge, 2006, pp. 211-215).
Transnational trust. Mau (2010) argues that trust is a moral infrastructure that integrates members so they can share an identity (p. 114). Transcultural communication creates a feeling of mutual sympathy and commitment as the basis of transnational trust during virtual interactions between strangers (pp.109-111). It is defined, first, as a global perspective conveyed in a theoretical framework through which e-learning creates initial trust. Then, the next stage of transcultural communication can reinforce transnational trust through socialization; it has a feedback effect (pp. 109-110). Palaiologou (2003) argues that consolidated trust can be built through interaction during e-learning activities, which will improve global awareness as transnational qualities (p. 82).

Summary of the implications of e-learning through GLO. In short, e-learning reframed and conceptualized under GLO model can generate transcultural communication in order to inspire transculture and collaborative learning for all working members who deal with specific working tasks and who share diverse resources to produce knowledge.

Research Question

Summary of the research problem. Both international and multinational organizations have tried to find the best knowledge through either a centralized or decentralized strategy. Over time, these two types of organizations have evolved into transnational structures and management characterized as networking systems. The globalization at the end of the 20th century made this structural evolution necessary. Fixed knowledge is mainly based on an effect-causal relationship, however, knowledge should not be fixed. Knowledge should be constructed based on everyday activities in a society and not

---

7 This is the summary of the problematic of the study; related references are already provided through two chapters of literature and conceptual framework.
on national boundaries, but on a global perspective. As contextualization is indispensable, a notion of culture should also be newly focused. Volatile and unpredictable events around the world mean that cross-cultural working members can no longer count on previous cultural competency, which is mainly based on national and ethnic cultural differences.

Each unit within a transnational organization contributes to the whole system with a specialization. Collaboration between these units provides the flexibility, efficiency and capacity to learn in order to deal with changes and crisis. Therefore, a transnational system allows for free access to information data, so as to share and to construct collaborative knowledge. However, it is necessary to create an organizational consensual identity in order to manage the fragmentation and dispersion. Consensual identity in transnational organizations creates trust across borders so as to produce the solid unification required in order to be flexible in the face of opportunities and potential problems through the networking of various units. This shared vision may come from openness, genuine interest in understanding and learning otherness, and conviction that diverse opinions are better than limited perspectives. Hence, this new culture, which enables members to share a consensual identity, is also crucial to enable working members to collaborate in a horizontal networking learning system.

The GLO model is introduced to bring about a cultural and learning shift. It introduces a new notion of hybrid culture and collaborative learning enabled by transcultural communication. E-learning conceptualized under the GLO model may generate transcultural communication through cognitive, skill and affective dimensions, which empower individual workforces to develop together a project with the same objective. It facilitates interaction between working members who interact with each other in a virtual space and obtain
knowledge of other cultures in a progressive and constant way so that members gradually get accustomed to other perspectives.

**Research question.** ‘How does e-learning under GLO generate transcultural communication among transnational organizations’ working members?’

The principal objective of this study lies in first, finding out how transculture and transcultural communication are characterized under the GLO model and second, exploring how e-learning through the GLO model contributes to building transculture through transcultural communication.

**Chapter 4**

**Methodology**

In previous chapters, e-learning was described as a potential means for creating consensual identity and learning capacity for transnational organizations, more specifically, through the essentials of transcultural communication in a cultural change process (Whiteworth, 2007, pp. 214-216). The literature and conceptual framework suggest four key factors to be studied. These provide the basis for conceiving the thesis as a whole (Farquhar, 2012, pp. 36-37).

- Transculture is a new identity and culture for transnational organizations.
- Transcultural communication develops consensual identity and learning capacity.
- E-learning under the GLO model generates transcultural communication for two perspectives: culture and learning
- Elements of transcultural communication include transnational competency, learning aptitude, transcultural identity, and transnational trust.
As this thesis focuses on observing how transcultural communication is generated through e-learning conceptualized under the GLO model, it can be classified under the study of theory confirming and building. In this regard, qualitative research has been determined to be the best method to carry out the study given that understanding and making sense of social events are the main objective, rather than establishing linear causal links (Chevrier & Hansen, 2014, p. 26). It reveals the processes and the perspective actually involved in situations (Bryman & Burgess, 1994, ch.11).

Research Design

Qualitative case study. Yin (1994) states that “a case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context” (p. 13). A case study may be used when it allows a researcher to gain a deep understanding through in-depth information about a phenomenon. A case study of an organization allows the researcher to gain particular understanding or insight and find meaning in relation to many other aspects of the participants’ lives (Farquhar, 2012, p. 6). As GLO aims for a cultural change, a qualitative case study will allow the researcher to explore the meanings of transculture and transcultural communication and to understand how these processes happen through e-learning and how the outcome affects transnational working environments.

A single-case embedded study. Considering the objective of this study, an embedded single-case study (Yin, 2003, p. 53) is conducted with the Play Game Group\(^8\). There are four criteria for choosing the Play Game Group: the first element is the transnational structure, the

---

\(^8\) The real name of the company has been modified; the source for the background is from Play Game Group official website and two documents selected for case study: P.G. et al. (2014) and H.J. (2012).
TRANSCULTURAL COMMUNICATION VIA E-LEARNING

which is characterized by non-hierarchical networking for reversible knowledge construction. The second and third elements refer to transculture, which promotes a geocentric worldview as a non-state third culture and collaborative learning, which requires many individuals’ collaboration to construct knowledge. The last critical element consists of the real experience of e-learning under the GLO model used for specific working tasks. In addition, the main activities of the Play Game Group in the production and education fields promote playful learning, which enhances creativity through a constructive mind, hence, this case provides a strong rationale for the study being characterized as exploration and theory building. In fact, the Play Game Group shares similarities with the IKEA group in terms of organizational structure such as different activities in business corporate and humanitarian foundations, a pro-diversity culture, and real experience of e-learning under the GLO model. Both of them especially targeted open knowledge flow between headquarters and local sites through centralized and decentralized dynamics.

Facing unavoidable worldwide convergence and networking drives since 2008, the Play Game Group opened four factories on three continents. Accordingly, the company’s traditional beliefs on the benefits of learning for their organization have expanded through the adoption of the GLO model, which promotes learning through networking and constructing knowledge in a globalization context in order to revitalize the company for long term development and to align the value of learning to a 21st century globalized world. GLO enables a change in culture for working members for the group worldwide.

Collaborating with the internal research team, the Play Game Group’s internal preparation for conceptualization of cultural change under GLO has been ongoing since 2008. The Play Game Foundations re-conceptualized the notion of learning under GLO’s globally inclusive worldview. This remains as the core learning value of the organization but
it was also used to adopt the GLO model to deal with specific tasks with working members. As the Play Game Group operates mainly in two different fields, production and education, the Play Game Foundation\(^9\) is dedicated to developing the conceptual basis and to developing overseas education programs and quality of learning. The adoption of the GLO model in production and education is a strategy of the Play Game Group to attain a worldwide consensus on their core value, so as to create a common identity and learning capacity among working members. The table below shows the organizational structure in two domains of different activities.

### Table 2: The organizational structure in two domains of the Play Game Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play game group</th>
<th>Play game foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Offering flexibly replicated training program for local educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Research for developing a global concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Promoting quality of learning via global dialogue and humanitarian campaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this context, this study explores the circumstances and conditions of transcultural communication where e-learning has been implemented via the GLO model by the Play Game Group in two different fields of activity. This will allow for the collection of more evidence about the evolution of GLO adoption. The first unit derives from a pilot project in overseas production plants in order to standardize job instructions. The second unit represents the Play Game Foundation’s expansion of the GLO model through the C project in partnership with local educators in China. Two units of analysis in an embedded single-case

\(^9\) The real name has been modified.
study allowed the researcher to find out how transcultural communication is generated through e-learning under the GLO model. More details are described below.

**Unit of analysis 1: The Play Game Group and the TXX method on production sites.**

In 2010, the Play Game Group decided to focus on standardization of production, based on standardized job training and consensual job instructions with diverse factory working members, who have different cultural backgrounds. The adoption of GLO by the Play Game Group meant recognizing the limitation of the previous culture that headquarters know best and transcending differences in cultures and attitudes. Collaborative learning through equal voice, autonomy, and creativity of working members from different countries brought hybrid standardized knowledge and flexible self-sustainability (P.G. et al., 2014, p. 30)\(^{10}\).

The GLO pilot project on production sites in 2010 allowed the Play Game Group to have confidence in their strategic plain, entitled *Play Game Group's way: speaking the same language*. They decided to develop the model in order to induce a culture of learning through their other activities by making connections across different nations. Hence, the GLO model has been applied to the education field under the core value of learning and playing, thus aiming for creativity.

**Unit of analysis 2: The Play Game Foundation and the C program\(^{11}\) in China.** This unit illustrates the concrete dynamics of GLO implantation through the Play Game Foundation in the education field. H. J. \(^{12}(2012)\), who worked for the C program conducted

---

\(^{10}\) The real name of author has been modified due to confidentiality; original text is available on demand.

\(^{11}\) The real name of program has been modified.

\(^{12}\) The real name of author has been modified due to confidentiality; original text is available on demand.
by the Play Game Foundation in a local school in China, describes two directions of the Play Game Foundations: first, to focus on the task of flexibly replicating training instructions of a global pedagogical concept for local educators in China and second, to focus on participating in the exchanging of dialogues with globally active local partners. Concerning the first direction, the C program of the Play Game Foundations consists in redefining a global pedagogical concept with local educators in China by integrating local culture. This project produced hybridized training instructions on how to use company toy products for playful learning in local educational settings. Another direction consists in promoting the quality of learning via conference, a donation program, and a campaign. This direction allows total freedom to transform an abstract core idea into local practice (pp. 5-7).

Data Collection

In order to provide accurate responses to the research question, two qualitative data collection techniques are used: document analysis and in-depth interviews. The use of two methods allows for extrapolation from different viewpoints. These methods allow the researcher to become an active agent in the construction of knowledge (Farquhar, 2012, p. 19). For this reason, it is necessary to gather first-hand information from document analysis concerning the two units: relevant documents about GLO adoption on production sites (2010) and the Play Game Foundation’s C project in China (2012). Both are based on the conceptual preparation for GLO since 2008. This review of documents is followed by corroboration with interviewees having professional experiences in the GLO project and who have an understanding of the company’s unique context.

Document analysis. Yin (2003) argues that the use of documents can augment evidence in terms of making inferences and verifying and corroborating information (p. 82). However, it is important to apply a critical view when interpreting the contexts of evidence to
avoid overreliance on documents (Yin, 2003, p. 87). When all evidence produces a consistent picture, the researcher can tell how particular events actually occurred (Farquhar, 2012, p. 79).

**Justification of the method and objective.** First, the document analysis provides inferences with respect to the research question. The documents selected are relevant sources in terms of publication time to find out how the procedures of the GLO model in the Play Game Group evolved with different objectives and approaches. As these are limited information sources considering the vast activities orchestrated by the Play Game Group, there is always a risk of bias. But information can be corroborated and complemented with data obtained from in-depth interviews.

Second, the document analysis allows for the creation of inductive categories of coding frames. The literature provided the principal deductive categories. Document analysis of the Play Game Group’s Learning Report (G. et al., 2011) and Playing Report (E. et al., 2010) enabled the identification of inductive sub-categories. Two documents were published by the Play Game Learning Institute and are accessible on their website. About 200 pages of complete research reports about the vision of learning and playing show how the culture of learning and playing has been shaped under the GLO model. After combining deductive and inductive principal and sub-categories, the complete coding frame (Appendix 1 and 2) was developed and this coding frame was used for analysing the other documents selected as well as the interview transcripts.

13 The titles of the reports and the names of the authors have been modified due to confidentiality.
**Sampling strategy and size.** Purposive and convenient sampling is used for selecting documents. Online research provided materials on GLO adoption through the TXX training methods on production sites, the report about the C project in China, and the Play Game Foundation’ online publications between 2010 and 2012. These documents provided initial insight into how transcultural communication through e-learning under GLO has been supported. As e-learning under GLO is not explicitly explained in the documents, an assumption was sometimes made that given e-learning examples could indirectly indicate platforms of e-learning under GLO. It was also assumed that e-learning for the C program in China must be applied in the same way in other countries because details of e-learning are verified by the local partner of the C program in Africa. The sample size for documents followed the saturation point rule: if a small sample is organically generated, the saturation point justifies the quality of the data when it stops revealing new elements (Deacon, Pickering, Golding, & Murdock, 2007 ch.3). As this study does not aim to build up a large number of cases to make broader inferences, the saturation point was reached quite quickly and it indicated that a sufficient size of documents had been reached when the progress and responsibility reports of the Play Game Group showed the same arguments as in previously analyzed documents.

**Selection of relevant documents.** Four documents were selected: First, two reports, the Play Report (E. et al., 2010) and the Learning Report (G. et al., 2011), elaborated by the Play Game Learning Institute in collaboration with academic experts, explore the benefits of play to learning. They explore how playing is important for learning and the role of supportive social relationships in the 21st century learning context. As the conceptual basis of GLO, the reports show how the GLO model was adopted for implementation in the activities of the Play Game Group.
Second, the book, written by P.G (2014) explains the detailed working procedures in effect during the pilot project on production sites: how e-learning was used, how various training phases proceeded, and how the GLO objective was reached on overseas production sites. This book provides primary information, which was verified through interviews with two TXX Institute trainers, who were engaged in the adoption of GLO by the Play Game Group.

Third, the report by H. J. (2012) enabled the researcher to analyze how GLO proceeded on the ground under the strategy of the Play Game Group’s expansion of GLO through educational activities. It describes details of how the C project of the Play Game Foundation achieved consensus on the training program with local practitioners in China and how the Play Game Foundation promoted the core value of learning and play. This document was written as a thesis, which can be considered formal on-site research.

**In-depth interviews.** Mason (2002) argues that an in-depth interview offers a descriptive account of social events experienced by the individuals involved (ch.11). In this study, in-depth interviews reveal the professional experience and feelings of informants in relation to their participation in the GLO project at different stages: the information obtained from interviewees provides an understanding of how GLO was initiated and how different cultures interacted during the communication process in the field, which may reveal the relationship between e-learning and transcultural communication in a different manner from that revealed by documents. A semi-structured in-depth interview would serve two purposes:

---

14 The name of the author has been modified
15 The name of the author had been modified
independently probing the process of cultural change and corroborating the main inferences drawn from the documents.

**Procedure and sampling**

*First steps in finding informants.* The respondents were identified based on online research on their relationship with the Play Game Group’s GLO project. For the embedded case of unit 1, the target population was narrowed to the TXX Institute and working members of the Play Game Group who participated in the 2010 pilot project. As P.G.’s book (2014) provided primary sources for the GLO process with the TXX method, two voluntary participants of the TXX Institute were significant sources for finding out and corroborating additional details. Following initial inquiry emails and telephone calls to explain the objective of the study, TXX Institute trainers voluntarily agreed to participate in Skype interviews. For the embedded case of unit 2, it was not possible to find any participants who had worked in China under the Play Game Foundation’s C program. As an alternative, local partners who had worked with the Play Game Foundation’s education programs were contacted by e-mail. Finally, two participants voluntary accepted to participate in Skype interviews: one was involved in the C program in Africa and the other was a local partner with the Play Game Foundation’s objective of improving the quality of learning conditions in South America. Both informants were highly relevant to the embedded case of unit 2 concerning GLO development in the education field.

**Sampling**

*a. Strategy.* For the embedded case of unit 1, purposive and snowball sampling were used. The trainer at the TXX Institute, who had been initially contacted, had a high level of understanding about GLO process dynamics in transnational organizations and the other
trainer, who had been contacted through referral by one of his colleagues, had a professional
point of view and experience with GLO adoption by the Play Game Group in 2010.

For the embedded case of unit 2, purposive convenience sampling was used. The Play
Game Foundation’s overseas partners were selected based on their relationship in partnership
or networking collaboration. Instead of China, the representative of the C program in Africa
volunteered to participate in an interview as did a global dialogue partner in South America,
who participated in the 2016 Play Game idea conference and replied to the email inquiry.
Online research enabled access to two local informants.

b. Size. The sample size does not focus on numbers but on informants’ relevant
experience about the phenomenon until the saturation point is reached. All participants were
identified with particular attention to their playing different roles in different fields around
adoption of the GLO process by the Play Game Group. A total of four people were
interviewed; they participated anonymously and no identifying information was attributed to
the responses of these informants.

c. Justification of participants for the two units. The participants can be described
in terms of their role in relationship with GLO and the Play Game Group:

- Interviewee A: a TXX institute trainer who consults for transnational organizations’
adoption of the GLO process;
- Interviewee B: a TXX institute trainer who participated in GLO in the Play Game
  Group project on production sites;
- Interviewee C: a local trainer in the C program sponsored by the Play Game
  Foundation in Africa; and
Interviewee D: a local trainer of the A Foundation, a global dialogue partner with the Play Game Foundation in South America.

**Procedure for Skype interviews.** The four people who agreed to be interviewed were informed by electronic letter of the purpose of the study\(^{16}\). As soon as they confirmed their agreement to participate, the date of interview was scheduled based on the availability of the participant and the researcher. As almost all informants were located in different countries, only Skype interviews were used. A consent form had been sent electronically to each interviewee 48 hours before the interview. It had been read, signed and returned by e-mail in an attached file before the interview date. Interviews followed the steps included in an interview protocol submitted to and approved by the ethical board of the University of Ottawa.\(^{17}\)

**Mode, interview guide, duration, recording and transcripts.** A Skype interview is different from a face to face interview in terms of the absence of physical co-location. This can be beneficial to avoid traveling long distances for a physical meeting. It allows both parties to remain in a more convenient and familiar environment and to have a feeling of physical presence through observation of some non-verbal cues in the visual image on the screen. However, there is a risk of low quality in the interview due to less flow, conversational disorder, and the additional concentration required to build rapport (Kazmer & Xie, 2008, p. 265).

---

\(^{16}\) See appendix 3
\(^{17}\) See appendix 4
The questions are open response style in order that respondents may articulate the answers in their own terms. The interview guidelines\textsuperscript{18} are constructed mainly by deductive categories based on a conceptual framework. However, in order to put people at ease and encourage their being comfortable during online interaction, the questions in the interview guide were asked in sensitive and creative ways. Considering the characteristics of a cold medium, the length of the question is sometimes shortened and paraphrased using key words to favour easy understanding.

Each interview was conducted at different dates and times in consideration of the time differences between Ottawa and the cities where participants resided. The interviews usually took around 40 minutes. When an interview is conducted by Skype, permission to record the interview is requested to ensure accurate transcription. If participants agree, verbal recordings are done for later transcript. As participants voluntarily agreed to be interviewed so as to contribute to the quality of my study, Skype interviews supported by good Internet connection proceeded without specific difficulty. Both the interviewer and the interviewees were able to build good rapport. All participants were quite interested in the subject and they were stimulated by the questions to deliver enthusiastic answers.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

Deacon et al. (2007) suggest the following procedure for data analysis. First, there should be a clear and analytic coding pattern. Second, there should be a cross-check of relevant information confirming the research objective. Finally, themes and categories should be developed through coding to construct an interpretative framework. In this logic, coding is

\textsuperscript{18} See appendix 5
an essential process for data analysis. Coding involved two processes: first, identifying and classifying units in the texts that describe categories connected to the phenomenon and, second, interpreting the data to give it meaning (as cited in Farquhar, 2012, p. 108).

**Coding frame with mixed categories for analysis.** The first role of coding refers to an indexing function, which is seen as a key process to organize and reduce copious data; it can help a researcher to obtain a first impression of what is in the collected material in order to prepare for a more in-depth conceptual analysis (Schreier, 2012, p. 38). For this step, deductive categories are initially used: they are developed from the conceptual framework (concept-driven). New concepts as inductive categories drawn from the Play Report and the Learning report as well as from the interviews (data driven) are identified and added to the deductive categories in order to complete the final coding frame for analysis. The coding frame allows for breaking down the text so as to group together items under the same category (Farquhar, 2012, pp. 92-93).

The coding frame of this study contains four principal categories and 17 subcategories. The four principal categories are as follows:

- Definition of transculture
- Characteristics of transcultural communication
- Characteristics of e-learning under the GLO model
- Elements of transcultural communication under the GLO model

To ensure consistency (reliability) and mutually exclusive categories, it is essential to define how the categories are distinguished from each other. Qualitative content analysis (QCA) is applied to analyze the collected data because the social meaning of transculture is not always obvious and it needs interpretation of latent meaning. All documents and
transcripts analyzed followed an intra-coder reliability rule by which the researcher repeats the coding procedure on each document to ensure the coding frame is constructed in a mutually exclusive way. The analysis of each document and transcript is compiled as a summary and a comparison done with the literature to interpret and discuss results.

**Coding frame with mixed categories for interpretation.** The second step involves an explanation and exploration to create links between data and concepts. As coding becomes an interpretive device, it is possible to identify how well the data open up new meanings. This enables the discovery of new aspects and ways to render the collected material meaningful (Schreier, 2012, p. 39). The process of interpretation should be conducted by trying to answer the research question: how e-learning generates transcultural communication among working members.

**Interpretation of results and findings.** A researcher should observe data to see if any patterns emerge and if evidence from different sources converges towards similar conclusions (Gagnon, 2010, p. 76). In order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge, the results of the data describe in chronological way how GLO evolved from its conceptual stage, through a pilot stage in production, and finally to a developmental stage in the education field. In this regard, it is important to take time to reread several times data obtained through the two data collection techniques, to re-examine them and to allow the configuration of the facts and the interconnections to take shape and for an overall picture to emerge.

**Interpretation for discussion.** In order to begin the discussion, all gathered data are coded, analyzed, summarized, and compared with the literature to establish meaningful relations between data during the GLO process. Empirical data from interviews and theoretically idealized data from document analysis are compared to the concepts from the
literature in order to offer an in-depth analysis of the current phenomenon. The links between existing concepts and the case study data create theoretical explanations that facilitate building relationships between transcultural communication and e-learning under the GLO model. The process of interpretation unveils a variety of patterns in the data, allowing explorations, reflections and perspectives pertaining to the findings of two units. Finally, the discussion will be narrowed: the confirmation of existing theory and construction of new theory with new facts obtained from the case study.

**Ethical Clearance**

Ethical clearance to conduct this research was granted by the University of Ottawa’s Ethics Board on March 22, 2016. The participants who were relevant to the study were contacted between March 25 and April 8, 2016. Interviews were conducted between April 11 and 25, 2016. As previously described in the sampling strategy, no identifying information was attributed to the responses of the informants in the research and the answers provided by the interviewee were used only for this study and were not shared with a third party.

**Limitations of the Methodology**

The limitations of the methodology are due to the issue of access to the organization. First, for in-depth interviews, it was not possible to include informants who work in the Play Game Group or its foundation. Information obtained from local partners reflect an indirect but quite relevant reality. Second, internal documents, which may show how and what sorts of e-learning are used to generate transcultural communication during the GLO process, were not accessible. Only open publications available through online sources were collected; these documents can give biased information.
Summary of Chapter

This chapter has described how the study to investigate transcultural communication generated by e-learning was conducted. It included two stages of GLO: the Play Game Group’s initial adoption of GLO in the production field in 2010 and its expanded strategy to implement GLO in the education field through the C program in China in 2012. The following chapter evaluates and analyzes the findings gathered from this study through qualitative analysis in order to answer the research question. In this way, it will be possible to understand how transcultural communication through e-learning orchestrated by the GLO model demonstrates the creation of a new hybrid identity and the construction of a learning capacity to create constructed knowledge.

Chapter 5

Results and Findings

This study was conducted to explore how e-learning generates transcultural communication among transnational organizations’ working members. In order to answer the question, it is necessary to understand how four categories evolved: how transculture is defined; the characteristics of transcultural communication; the characteristics of e-learning according to the three dimensions under the GLO model; and the transcultural elements of GLO.

This chapter will present an analysis in three parts according to how GLO developed in the Play Game Group. The first part is the preparation stage to develop the conceptual basis for the adoption of GLO. The second part is the embedded case unit 1, the stage of the pilot

19 See Appendix 1 and 2: the coding scheme table includes all the principal categories and subcategories with more details for in-depth definitions.
project in the production field. Finally, the third part is embedded case unit 2, the developmental stage of the GLO model in the education field. Two units of analysis in an embedded single-case study will show how the four categories evolved and help to understand how the GLO model, aiming to create transculture, proceeded in the Play Game Group through the transcultural communication generated by e-learning.

**Adoption of the GLO Model in the Play Game Group Starting in 2008: the Preparation Stage for the Conceptual Basis of the GLO Model**

**Brief context (2008-2011).** During GLO adoption to revitalize sustainable development between 2008 and 2011, the Play Game Group experienced an easy process in becoming a global learning organization because the spirit of learning played a significant role in integrating the GLO model into their business strategy. During this process, the conceptual basis prepared by the Play Game Foundations for a new organizational culture and learning shows how the GLO model was established to perform concrete tasks via e-learning within working members. In order to strengthen the organization, diversity became the parameter that reflected society’s variety in culture and learning. This value also aligns from the individual worker level through the organization to the exterior environment. The four categories explored under the GLO model in the preparation stage are described below:

**The definition of transculture.** According to the Play Game Group’s Learning report, transculture is mainly defined through the following principal categories and subcategories. The table 3 shows this:
**Table 3: The definition of transculture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal category</th>
<th>Subcategory(^\text{20})</th>
<th>Representative statement from the Learning report (2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation</td>
<td><strong>Self-determination</strong>, self-efficacy</td>
<td>The individual is viewed as an active agent toward growth with intrinsic motivation based on his own self-beliefs (pp.16, 20, 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td><strong>Rhizomic and dynamic form</strong>, consensual identity</td>
<td>Learning through stretching and exploring means to share a common goal based on balancing core and periphery values (pp. 65, 56, 108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third culture</td>
<td>Culture of play</td>
<td>It refers to a set of free and creative experimentation through multiple cultural backgrounds (pp. 16-17, 54-55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory culture</td>
<td><strong>Culture of learning</strong></td>
<td>It refers to the experience of producing knowledge through sharing meaning with others and mutual attention (pp. 40, 103-104, 111)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Learning report, transculture is particularly expressed as a hybrid that derives from dynamic forms to build consensus among multiple identities. Transculture tends to keep its self-determined value as generated by a playful state of mind and a belief in one’s own ability. Transculture can be formed by playing, which generates creativity, and participatory learning, which permits sharing different perspectives among peers.

\(^{20}\) Bold indicates stronger emphasis is placed on this subcategory
Characteristics of transcultural communication. The Learning report characterizes transcultural communication mainly through the following principal and subcategories. The table 4 shows this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Representative statement from the Learning report (2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interacting process</td>
<td>Construction of meaning</td>
<td>It refers to socially constructed sense through active individual interpretation via dynamic interaction with peers (pp. 25, 40, 65, 78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybridization process in 3rd space</td>
<td>Embodiment</td>
<td>Learners manipulate artifacts and dialogues in various forms of fusion and merge cultural practices to produce a comfortable third culture through sense making (pp. 10, 47, 60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Learning report, transcultural communication happens during the interacting process, which allows for the development of ideas and practices through engagement, participation, exploration, and experimentation. Transcultural communication can develop through the formation of an online hybridization process in the third space: embodiment is an act of mixing codes to build new culture and tends to manipulate, share, and negotiate sense in a constantly unfinished state.

Characteristics of e-learning under GLO. The Learning report and the Playing report describe e-learning under GLO mainly through the following principal and subcategories. The table 5 shows this:
## Table 5: Characteristics of e-learning under GLO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal category</th>
<th>Sub category</th>
<th>Representative statement from the Learning report (2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICT platform</td>
<td>Capacity to connect, <strong>informal learning</strong></td>
<td>Multimodal communication&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt; offers inspiring extra-curricular learning settings to individuals, who are inspired and can pull down their own networks (pp. 64-68, 76-77).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Strengthening notion, distributed cognition&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Learning via a two-way flow relationship between individuals and hybrid environments forms distributed cognition and conveys the notion of transculture (pp. 56-58, 107-109).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Virtual interaction</td>
<td>Enthusiastic participation for problem solving in multiple situations develops flexibility through manipulating metaphorical models (pp. 67, 92-96).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Socialization and familiarization</td>
<td>Cultural acquaintance, empathy, and trust can be gradually internalized through story-telling and through social talk with the informal support group; multimodal portal devices are used (pp. 45-47, 64-68).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E-learning through an ICT platform involves synchronous and asynchronous multimodal performative stages. Informal e-learning enhances personal motivation. An open learning system<sup>23</sup> reinforces the concept of transculture through virtual sharing. It enables dialogic conversations through a process of negotiation of sense to enhance skill dimension. E-learning enables socialization among working members, who can perceive support and trust each other.

---

<sup>21</sup> Synchronous and asynchronous multimodal forms of representation such as imagery, sound, video, speech as well as writing (Learning Report, 2011, p. 90)

<sup>22</sup> This notion is based on the theory of distributed cognition by Hutchins (1995)

<sup>23</sup> This definition by the Play Game Group refers to learning through the environment and the context.
The characteristics of the transcultural elements of GLO. The Learning report and the Playing report describe the mainly transcultural elements of GLO through the following categories. The table 6 shows this:

**Table 6: The characteristics of the transcultural elements of GLO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal category</th>
<th>Sub category</th>
<th>Representative statement from the Learning report (2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transnational competency</td>
<td>Communicator, creative leader</td>
<td>It refers to the ability to express the self and to incorporate others’ values to address potential knowledge (pp. 94, 99, 107).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning capacity and constructed knowledge</td>
<td>Reflective learner</td>
<td>It refers to the mind of the learner, who stretches reality for self-realization through connecting, exploring and transforming to produce systemic creativity (pp. 69, 88-89, 94-95).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcultural identity</td>
<td>Transcultural mind matrix Innovative minded person</td>
<td>It refers to a resourceful person, who expands mental capacity by epistemological curiosity to see the world as a hackable platform (pp. 98-99, 109, 111-112).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transcultural elements under GLO emphasize transnational competency such as creative leadership, which incorporates both individual and collective value. Learning capacity is one of the most important elements sought by the GLO model. The reflective learner model\(^{24}\) shows a systemic relationship between the connecting, exploring, and transforming stages during the learning process. Transcultural identity implies a playful and epistemologically curious mind matrix. An innovative mind refers to a mind that sees the world as a hackable platform.

\(^{24}\) Appendix 8 provides additional explanation of the reflective learner model.
Embedded Case Unit 1

**Brief context of unit 1.** As of 2010, the Play Game Group recognized that the value and culture of the company were not easy to transmit to various local partners. As the production level became more complex due to diversity issues, it was necessary to standardize instructions for producing toys in a consensual format. The group needed to unify diverse perspectives of people. The expansion of production overseas required development of the workforce, which entailed consideration of the local culture. It was necessary to transcend differences in cultures and attitudes and to represent what is fundamental to all people from any society. Through this experience, the Play Game Group learned how GLO could change the ethnocentric culture and the group started to try to construct knowledge through collaboration and transcultural creativity.

**Comparison between document and interviews**

**The definition of transculture.** According to the document and two interviewees, transculture is defined under three principal categories: self-affirmation, hybrid, and participatory learning culture. These aspects are described in order as follows:

The only way to get the heart of people and mind was to get them involved and give them some responsibility in setting the goals in connection with standardization. (P.G. et al., 2014, p. 193)

Consensual identity is obtained by standardization, in other words, speaking the same language… Once you have that common language, cultural change occurs as

25 For unit 1, the document refers to P.G. et al. (2014), whose name has been modified and the two interviewees are referred to as A (personal communication, April 11, 2016) and C (personal communication, April 21, 2016).
each one can speak with the same power of voice in hybrid culture as equal status; they can decide how to do the job in autonomy within this consensually hybrid third culture. (Interviewee C)

To make global and local mindset, we had to change the mindset from not invented here, to a more global mindset of “the more we share, the more we get” and “copy with pride”. (P.G. et al., 2014, p. 21)

**The characteristics of transcultural communication.** According to the document and the interviewees, transcultural communication happens during interaction such as the feedback and hybridization process in the third space under the form of glocalization\(^{26}\). In particular, it happens under a state of open-mindedness that comes from having equal voice, mutual respect and engaging in cooptation. In this regard, a new argument came from the interview data: mutual trust is the core element that activates initial transcultural communication. More specifically, face to face communication is a pre-requisite condition to generating the *minimum trust*\(^{27}\) required for starting a dialogue. When initial trust is established, it can develop the process of building consensual identity through active collaboration and an interacting process. Interviewees reflect this point of view as follows:

To get trust was not easy because factories are like isolated kingdoms; those people running local plants resist the direction to collaborate. (Interviewee C)

If my mind opens more and more, I can really see; my perception can be corrected; more correct perception and reality come. (Interviewee A)

---

\(^{26}\) Global concerns are increasingly becoming part of the everyday local experiences and vice-versa (Takle, 2012, p. 188).

\(^{27}\) A foundational degree of trust to the establishment of social relationships (Mau, 2010, p. 110).
The characteristics of e-learning under GLO. According to data from the document and interviews, e-learning is predominantly characterized by the ICT platform’s capacity to connect. E-learning is particularly useful to connect geographically dispersed working members through multimodal communication platforms; it facilitates networking on tasks in a cost and time effective way. An interviewee says the following:

It makes a big difference; it makes understanding more as a person. We can see people as a human being; I can see my sameness. We feel commonality. (Interviewee A)

Overall, according to data from document and interview participants, e-learning turned out to be very effective. Under the cognitive dimension, it conveyed the notion of global culture, providing insight in situational work by creating cultural profiles to bridge gaps. Under the skill dimension, synchronous communication allowed for immediate follow-up and for developing job instructions. E-learning in the affective dimension also played a role in socialization: the learning portal generated curiosity, virtual support, and cooperation among the global apprentice community. Online appraisal encouraged the enhancement of cultural awareness through communication with strangers. These descriptions are reflected in document and interview data as follows:

Having a cultural introduction made constructive dialogue between the different site members; this inspired members’ interest. (P.G. et al., 2014, p. 72)

I know you as more person via technology; as image, it is like replacement of face to face in everyday basis; it enables us to work on the relationship and trust. I understand you much more as a person to make desire to collaborate for common cause. If you ask me something, I will listen because “YOU” ask. Working even technical issue is in relationship and trust. (Interviewee A)
TRANSCULTURAL COMMUNICATION VIA E-LEARNING

However, it was imperative to have face to face meetings at the initial stage for developing the affective dimension because e-learning cannot create minimum trust independently. And when e-learning was limited to handling some parts of the skill dimension, face to face learning had to intervene. This limitation of e-learning emerged from the interview data: participants A and C indicate that e-learning is a weak tool for constant follow-up because distance creates a fragile tie. In addition, some tasks require the mutual presence of members in order to obtain consensus. This view is expressed as follows:

  Contacting me via technology from a long distance is a low priority. The person is burdened by responsibility and tasks of the site. Regular basis face to face meeting helps e-learning under GLO. (Interviewee A)

  E-learning cannot replace the dynamic of face to face relationship. Social cohesion is possible once it has been established by face to face meeting. (Interviewee C)

The characteristics of transcultural elements under GLO. Data from the document and interviews indicate that transcultural elements are characterized as first, transnational competency, in which a collaborative communicator possesses effective cross-cultural communicative skills and a sense of praxis, or the mindset to use very realistic dialogue during brainstorming and to recognize the value of collaboration. This is reflected as follows:

  Today, it is very down to earth and realistic concerning dialogue around competencies development. (P.G. et al., 2014, P. 93)

  Second, learning capacity is represented by the reflective mind of the learner. This is characterized as being confident, curious, flexible, and responsible for others. As a result, standardized instruction through collaboration and consensus based on experiential learning
on site allowed for sustained production at the local site as high as at the global level. This view is expressed as follows:

To make sure everyone gives consensus for GLO, the objective is described as a global footprint in the present and in the future. GLO ensures the local site is sustainable and improves knowledge and skills for global need. GLO is an enabler to support a set-up strategy: speed, adaptability, coherence, flexibility and scalability. (P.G. et al., 2014, p. 172)

Third, transcultural identity refers to first, a transcultural mind matrix, which refers to the flexibility to different options and second, having an innovative mind, which refers to the courage to abandon old routines. Finally, transnational trust in terms of solidarity through a sense of belonging is considered a very important factor to achieve successful GLO.

Interview data corroborated document data with specific emphasis. This element is reflected as follows:

We are all connected, not an island; once people understand a cultural group of people as a person with the same objective, we listen through dialogue. (Interviewee A)

All positive outcomes of GLO are possible on the point of mutual respect. The big barrier in cross cultural business is respecting others, not only holding ours, which is human condition in our everyday life, in fact. (Interviewee C)
Summary of embedded case unit 1. Under the context of adopting GLO on the production site, four categories, which are the basis for conceiving the thesis as a whole, can be understood and summarized as follows:

Transculture is defined through three concentrated concepts and that are in a procedural relationship: initial self-determined motivation enables participatory learning to build a hybrid consensual identity among working members. The very beginning of the shift to transculture starts from working members’ recognition that no one is perfect; the more we learn together, the more we progress.

Transcultural communication is characterized through three categories, which describe how transcultural communication happens. First, a feeling of initial trust should happen mutually; face to face contact is a pre-condition for generating transcultural communication. This is followed by an interacting process to form a consensual identity through feedback and constructing meaning. This happens during the contextualization process through virtual space. The steps in the development of transcultural communication are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Face to Face meeting</th>
<th>Step 2: Mutual trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Process of forming consensual identity via active collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: Interacting process such as construction of meaning through feedback and leadership: contextualization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 The four categories refer to transculture, transcultural communication, e-learning, and transcultural elements.
29 The synthesis table of embedded case unit 1 is in Appendix 6.
All findings concerning e-learning are obtained from a mixed pattern between e-learning and face to face learning. The result of e-learning in the cognitive and skill dimensions were clearly successful. This resulted from initial and regular face to face learning interventions, which are most effective in GLO. Meanwhile, even with face to face communication interventions, the affective dimension is not predictable because many factors influence the development of e-learning. The limitations of e-learning are deeply related to a mixed pattern.

The prominent transcultural element lies in the qualities of the reflective learner, who has communicative competency, a sense of praxis, and a transcultural and innovative mind. Transnational trust seems a very important element for the long term objective of GLO. It seems to develop from individual trust, which activates initial transcultural communication.

**Embedded Case Unit 2**

**Brief context of unit 2.** Following the pilot study in the production field, the Play Game Group wanted to expand the model in order to induce a culture of learning through their global activities in the education field. First, starting in 2012, the Play Game Foundation established education training programs in China and South Africa; more precisely, redefining a global concept and integrating local culture with local educators to produce training instructions in local educational settings (H. J., 2012, pp. 5-7). Second, promoting playful learning and exchanging dialogues with active local partners allowed the core idea to be transformed into local practice. Embedded case unit 2 will illustrate how the Play Game Group re-conceptualized the core philosophy of learning through playing under the GLO

---

30 The author is identified with initials only to keep the company name confidential; the original text is available on demand.
worldview, by enabling global access in education from two directions: Four categories are developed in unit 2.

**Comparison between documents and interviews**

**Definition of transculture.** According to data collected from document and interviews\(^\text{31}\), transculture is defined as a more abstract notion of self-affirmation: the individual’s empowerment and feeling of mastery. The following citations illustrate this tendency:

The common objective of learning is fun; playing is a feeling of mastery for each individual. (H.J., 2012, p. 17)

The sense of identity, own unique thing; I respect the way they (children) play and explore. (Interviewee D)

Interview data show that hybrid consensual identity develops from the contextualization between multiple global and local identities. According to participants:

It is definitely a collaborative process; this can’t be done in isolation. How can we take 1st world resources to help people form 3rd world; this is pretty much we are looking for. (Interviewee B)

That is the matter of sense of identity. That’s why we do not see any conflicting view between core value of Play Game Group and local foundation; the value in my country. (Interviewee D)

---

\(^{31}\) For unit 2, the document refers to H.J. (2012), whose name has been modified and the two interviewees are referred to as B (personal communication, April 18, 2016) and D (personal communication, April 25, 2016).
A participatory culture, which inspires people to recognize their unique identities, is emphasized in experiential learning. Document data emphasize the culture of learning and interview data support youth-self generated culture. These are reflected in the following descriptions:

Participative member constructs meaningful learning by active participation. (H.J., 2012, p. 16)

Children develop skills and concepts of development via art of playing together; with nature and open materials. (Interviewee D)

Characteristics of transcultural communication. According to data from document and interviews, transcultural communication is defined by three categories depending on different task characteristics:

First, the interaction process is strongly emphasized through stimulated interactions between local instructors and Play Game Foundation facilitators. Face to face meetings stimulate conversation. As the construction of meaning is also a strong characteristic of the interaction process, cultural dissonance had to be overcome: the local guide, who facilitated understanding cross-cultural interpretations, was an efficient solution. The following is found in the document:

Instead of forming a step-by-step recipe for teaching, the phases demonstrate the necessity for the teacher to reflect on practice to ensure relevance and an appropriate level. (Document: H.J., 2012, p. 36)

Second, the hybridization process in a third space such as glocalization was effected by entering into a dialogue with worldwide partners to find a solution for improving the global education system and it does not necessitate initial face to face meeting. This is reflected by one participant as follows:
No need to be in each place, we can talk what we want to do and we can get to know the things. (Interviewee D)

Finally, an attitude of openness is crucial for building consensual identity. Document and interview data both clearly emphasize that minimum trust should be obtained from an initial physical meeting for training local instructors. Holding regular face to face meetings is important to consolidate trust. Mutual trust is a pre-requisite to generate transcultural communication as a starting point to create an attitude of openness. Individual trust can develop commitment and long term engagement in sharing a problem. Then, active collaboration, such as brainstorming with an equal voice, enriches transcultural communication. The process of building consensual identity lies in agreeing on the core value of learning and playing instead of focusing on details of the same procedures. These characteristics of transcultural communication are reflected as follows:

Open-minded talk means to identify problems without feeling shame regardless of cultural difference. We don’t talk about white or black people. We talk about issues in front of everybody (as human beings). Culture is a challenging aspect of any issue and (open) communication is vital. Open-minded talk comes from mutual trust through human contact in face to face. Globalization comes only with a system; it does not come with an idea. It is a form without content. Globalization needs the hybrid content in that system; Contextualization in global scale, not small scale for small place, makes things work easier. (Interviewee B)

The characteristics of e-learning under GLO. Document and interview data show that e-learning is characterized in all principal categories.

The ICT platform encourages playful informal learning through multimodal communication. One interviewee expresses his experience arguing as follows:
Modern technology enables a lot of people to be trained at the same time over a live platform such as Skype, conference calls, and webinars, which allow live questions and are simultaneously broadcast in nine countries; we do not need to travel for it. The demonstration can be done via Skype and so is easily understood. Discussion via technology platforms can be shared efficiently. (Interviewee B)

In the cognitive dimension, it conveys transcultural concepts of learning through exchanging relevant articles, an outline of the project, and reflective reviews. As talking has an equivalent value to doing in the education field, discussions using multimodal communication can generate new ideas and virtual sharing. This is reflected in the document as follows:

Practical experience includes practitioners’ own way of using materials during practices and they are invited to capture success and frustration during work through journals, blog, emails and other synchronic communication tools. (H.J., 2012, p. 41)

Under the skill dimension, it plays an effective role in terms of exchanging different sorts of experiences, such as successful and frustrating experiences during the C program. Interview data support that online dialogic conversation can break down cultural barriers through synchronous communication. This is described as follows:

Discussion via technologic platforms can be shared efficiently. Short and long videos also can teach local practitioners how to do without understanding verbal language. It breaks down some part of language barriers via visual materials; non-verbal communication works. (Interviewee B)

However, some content cannot replace experiential learning. Therefore, the effectiveness of hands-on learning through a mixed pattern in skill dimension is reconfirmed. Following is the comment in the document:
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Face to face and hands on experiences are distinctly different from just teaching concepts. E-learning only cannot generate embodied process and continuous flow of human feeling and experiencing. (H.J., 2012, p. 37)

The mixed pattern can be developed in a predictable way in the affective dimension overall for both directions because mutual trust is easily obtainable. But the pattern varies depending on the task characteristic. If the activity is related to a highly concept-focused task such as a global dialogue partnership, e-learning under GLO can develop a global communal mind; there is little need for socialization among members and initial face to face contact is not necessary. This is revealed by interview data as follows:

Not much about socializing in our activities… We are in process for developing e-learning which enables conversation via Skype, exchange articles about humanitarian activities and impacts. (Interviewee D)

If the activity is to train local instructors, socialization among members is more focused and an initial face to face meeting is a pre-requisite. This is found in document and interview data as follows:

It is important to experience people at least once to meet physically for making sure (relationship). E-learning is not ideal that you can do all the time as initial training. (Interviewee B)

Next, to reflect on the nature of interactions between teaching practitioners and the foundation, I draw on similar cases … on liberating versus instrumental intent when it comes to education for the future. (H.J., 2012, p. 14)

The limitations of e-learning in terms of weak ties due to distance, lack of experiential learning, and the digital divide in terms of web connections are revealed in the interview data. The viewpoints concerning the effectiveness of mixed patterns are expressed as follows:
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Experience and message obtained by face to face meeting cannot be lost in distance. People go back with memories in order to act and share information with people in distance by more constant manner… E-learning as following up and supplementary training can be more efficient to have new ideas. (Interviewee B)

We believe the capacity of e-learning and potential so we teach our teachers how use computer and navigate through internet (overcoming digital divide issue); this will allow all professionals to work each other. (Interviewee D)

**Characteristics of the transcultural elements of GLO.** Document and interview data indicate that the transcultural elements of GLO can be noted under two principal categories: first, transnational competency as collaborative communicator and, second, transnational trust as solidarity, embracing others in community based trust and as a global responsibility, engaging with a playful world to improve the quality of learning through continuous dialogue.

Due to the different characteristics of tasks even in the same field, the document data from the program of training local instructors puts more emphasis on the transcultural elements of an individual, such as creative leadership and a transcultural mind matrix, or being flexible so as to reflect various cultural elements. For a global dialogue partnership, interview data indicate that the collective value is more focused, such as constructed knowledge as social capital. These characteristics of transcultural elements for individual and collective values are expressed as follows:

Individual learning aptitude is needed to have continuous improvement and relevance to provide an environment encouraging to engage with the world in playful ways. (H.J., 2012, p. 46)
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We try to communicate how we can give impact to communities through training; developing e-learning tools can improve the quality of solutions. We believe that dialogues through different communities around the world, which develop educational programs, change the condition of the vulnerable places in order to offer the quality of life and learning. (Interviewee D)

**Summary of embedded case unit 2**32. Under the context of adopting GLO in the education field, four categories can be understood and summarized as follow:

Transculture is defined as an abstract notion of playing and learning; this allows for flexible options in terms of reflecting the periphery’s local values while simultaneously promoting the core global concept and easily obtaining consensus among working members. This definition also implies that various activities and people can be involved in different ways for tasks in the education field.

The characteristics of transcultural communication lie primarily in mutual trust, which induces an open mind and activates transcultural communication. For training local instructors, an initial face to face meeting is indispensable and, when this stage is successful, transcultural communication may bring highly synergic feedback and leadership. In this sense, e-learning is very positively developed in cognitive and skill dimensions due to a mixed pattern of e-learning and face to face learning. In the affective dimension, even if it is not easy to determine clear mixed patterns and e-learning requires face to face meeting in most tasks to create social cohesion, the development of e-learning seems predictable when

32 Appendix 7 contains a synthesis of unit 2.
minimum trust is established. The limitations of e-learning provided an explanation of why face to face intervention is necessary.

The transcultural elements of GLO focus on learning capacity and constructed knowledge. Different nuances of individual or collective elements can be observed due to the different characteristics of tasks in the field.

Comparison of the Development of the GLO Model through Preparation Stage and Two Units

The following comparison is made based on findings provided by data from two units compared to the conceptual basis of the GLO model.

Comparison between preparation stage and unit 1. Following a comparison between the preparation stage and unit 1, the following aspects under the four categories can be observed. Transculture is defined as a concentrated notion of hybrid consensus. Transcultural communication starts only from strong mutual trust. E-learning under GLO can be effective due to the intervention of face to face learning except for the affective dimension, in which it is difficult to predict the development of e-learning. The limitations of e-learning detected justify a mixed pattern. Transnational trust in terms of solidarity through a sense of belonging became very significant.

Comparison between preparation stage and unit 2. Following a comparison between the preparation stage and unit 2, the following aspects under the four categories are observed. Transculture is defined as an abstract notion of free play and learning, which are basic notions in the creation of hybrid consensus and a third culture. Transcultural communication starts from minimum trust and feedback consolidates it through an interaction process. E-learning under GLO can be used effectively in combination with face to face learning. Especially for the cognitive dimension, e-learning can be used independently
without initial face to face intervention. The mixed pattern for the affective dimension can be
determined depending on task characteristics, which vary in degree, intensity and stage when
face to face learning intervention is necessary. However, a positive development of e-learning
is predictable in the education field. The limitations of e-learning are detected under the same
logic as in unit 1. Transnational trust is highly emphasized for a long term relationship
focusing on community values rather than on individual ones.

**Comparison between unit 1 and unit 2.** In a comparison of the two fields of
production (unit 1) and education (unit 2), transculture is conceptualized in different ways: a
crude sense (i.e. standardization of job instruction based on consensus) and an abstract
sense (i.e. promoting multiple solutions based on consensus of learning through playing).
Because the two fields need different aspects of transculture to form consensual identity; the
former emphasizes details and the latter focuses on concept.

Concerning transcultural communication, both unit 1 and 2 emphasize an attitude of
openness as primary characteristics of transcultural communication. In relationship with this,
a mixed pattern of e-learning and face to face learning under GLO seems necessary in all
dimensions. E-learning is used efficiently for both unit 1 and 2 in the cognitive and skill
dimensions of GLO. For the production site, the skill dimension is exploited very effectively
and for the education field, the cognitive dimension is particularly appropriate. In the
affective dimension, initial face to face contact is necessary to develop the socialization
dimension among members. However, a global dialogue partnership does not require initial
face to face intervention, as socialization seems less significant. The development of e-
learning in the affective dimension is unpredictable for the production field while developing
this dimension seems clearer in the education field; this predictability level seems correlated
with the requirement for the intense effort required to generate mutual trust. The limitations
of e-learning are corroborated through the two units justifying the intervention of face to face learning.

The common predominant transcultural elements under GLO consist in being a good communicator as a reflective learner, who keeps on consolidating transnational trust. The production field emphasizes more individual capacity and solidarity through a sense of belonging, while the education field focuses more on collective power and global responsibility.

**Synthesis of a Single Embedded Case Study: The Play Game Group**

The following descriptions are based on interpretations by observing latent meaning from the emerging relationship of previously presented findings. Direct quotations are used to support each point of view, which comes mainly from observations.

**Transculture and transcultural communication under GLO**

*Major findings in transculture through the two units.* The Play Game Group defines transculture as a hybrid consensual identity, in other words, a shared meaning of mixed codes with multiple identities. In the production field, it is more difficult to develop a hybrid consensual identity as a unified form due to the characteristics of the task, in which there is a strong need for standardization of concrete details. In the education field, focusing on an abstract concept makes it easier to develop a hybrid consensual identity in multiple forms among working members because it is not necessary to standardize details of the task. In the production field, the slogan of a hybrid consensual identity is expressed as *Play game way, not head quarter’s way*, which values consensually constructed knowledge. In the education field, the slogan of *Learning through playing* allows a hybrid consensual identity to improve the education system in the world. These two tendencies are described as follows:
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We have more transparent and clear standards. Clear roles and responsibilities are developed. Safety and quality are improved. (P.G. et al., 2014, p. 93)

When we talk about playing and learning, of course, we have different references such as landscapes and customs; they are different between countries, but conceptually, we can come together and we can support exploratory play as a core value.

(Interviewee D)

**Major findings in transcultural communication through the two units.** Transcultural communication does not happen in a simple way. The results reveal that there is a path to generate transcultural communication. First of all, mutual trust seems to be one of the most critical elements in activating transcultural communication. Findings from both the production and education (concerning the C program) fields indicate that minimum mutual trust can happen only through an initial face to face meeting, which seems a pre-requisite condition. Physical co-presence allows for the exchange of mutual respect through verbal and non-verbal expressions and for a feeling of genuine curiosity toward each other, which create a mentally favourable disposition at the initial stage. This is particularly significant when it comes to recognizing that nobody is perfect and that even the person who invented the thing does not know everything. One interviewee expresses this viewpoint as follows:

Consensus can happen only after recognizing that we cannot know everything. In the beginning, people from headquarter wanted to teach everybody to do the same way, expecting that all will follow their way. But they saw that others had different experiences at same stage and they shared their different knowledge; then consensus worked. (Interviewee C)

However, the way to build trust is determined by task characteristics. As tasks in the production field are more detail-oriented, there is a stronger need for mutual trust than in the
education field, in which tasks are more concept-driven. Especially for a global dialogue partnership, it is quite easy to establish minimum trust via an abstract form of trust under the notion of learning and playing. Therefore, the intervention of face to face meetings can be minimized. Meanwhile, glocalization should be noted as a typical outcome of transcultural communication during the hybridization process in the third space. It signifies “contextualization, which creates content into the globalization system in order to work globally”\(^{33}\).

**E-learning and transcultural elements under GLO**

*Major findings in e-learning under GLO through the two units.* E-learning is developed through a synergic relationship with face to face learning; this mixed pattern produced successful operations for the cognitive and skill dimensions in the GLO model and its potential in the future is predicted. The affective dimension looks more complex in describing clearly the development of e-learning through a mixed pattern due to trust building issues. Various factors seem to influence the affective dimension of detail-driven tasks such as standardization of the production field: the activity objective in a specific context, team dynamics, the culture of members, available resources and task characteristics. As complexity and potential are equally high, this dimension requires more study. Even if the limitations of e-learning are an unavoidable reality in major situations, the potentially independent e-learning without intense face to face communication in the highly concept-focused task of the education field seems quite evident in predicting the development of the affective dimension. An interviewee points this out:

\[\text{----------------------------------------}\]

\(^{33}\) Paraphrased from the comments of interviewee C.
We have 28 centers all over the country, having 1000 educators. More and more using e-learning this year for community and network makes us think about developing it more in terms of open and strong system, which allows all professionals and teachers work for us. We do believe the capacity of e-learning and potential. (Interviewee D)

**Major findings in transcultural elements under GLO through two units.** The Play Game Group constantly emphasized learning capacity starting from the preparation stage: they represented the GLO model through a reflective learner model\(^{34}\). The reflective learner model stresses co-creativity while the GLO model emphasizes a hybrid culture. However, both models support coordinated multiplicity in one entity. As both models aim to create a consensual identity, standardization through learning in the production field and playful learning in the education field are focused upon.

Another finding in transnational trust is noteworthy: As mutual trust was discovered to be a core element to activate transcultural communication, developing individual mutual trust can lead to forming transnational trust to create solidarity and global responsibility. The different levels of transnational trust are determined by task characteristics. For example, the production field focuses on solidarity through a sense of belonging and the education field emphasizes global responsibility. Transnational trust is particularly important for collaboration through a long term relationship among geographically distant working members.

\(^{34}\) Appendix 8 presents this model in more details.
How Transcultural Communication is Generated in the Play Game Group through E-learning under the GLO Model

The aim of this study lies in understanding how transcultural communication happens through e-learning under the GLO model. With objectively observed results and an interpreted synthesis, it is possible to answer the research question in this section. Learning in the Play Game Group is a process to build transculture through transcultural communication. As learners are geographically dispersed, face to face learning is limited and e-learning becomes an indispensable tool to generate transcultural communication. Initially, transcultural communication was considered to be easy to manipulate through the simple process of e-learning. However, in reality, it turned out to be more complex to obtain meaningful transcultural communication; it needed to be situated in a proper setting such as a mixed learning structure under the GLO model. In a certain sense, a mixed pattern constructed under the GLO model as transculture is rooted in constructivism: face to face learning intervenes to develop e-learning and e-learning accommodates and supplements face to face learning. We can discuss this process with more procedural details as follows.

Theoretical model of the transcultural communication process generated by e-learning. The reflective learner model shows how transcultural communication happens during three activities of learning (connect, explore, transform) through four dimensions (individual, experiential, relational, and contextual). This flow, illustrated in Figure 6, represents the transcultural communication generated by e-learning. During this process, co-creativity will allow easy access to consensus in society. As transcultural communication serves as a tool in the process of creativity, it requires a medium that enables learners to have a mental disposition toward this flow. Theoretically speaking, transcultural communication can be generated through an ICT platform of e-learning quite easily as suggested in the
following figure.

**Figure 8**: Flow of transcultural communication generated by e-learning (From Learning Report, G. et al., 2011, p. 92)

The process of generating transcultural communication

**In relationship with trust.** Contrary to the theoretical model of transcultural communication developed by the Play Game Group, in reality, the process of generating transcultural communication did not manifest itself as was hypothesized. More complex factors are at play outside transcultural communication and e-learning. As already mentioned, the initial intervention of face to face communication enables minimum mutual trust and e-learning offers a flexible setting in which to generate greater transcultural communication as a facilitator.

35 The source allows to use materials such as public domain. As the company name is modified due to anonymity, the site name can be provided upon request.
E-learning can offer numerous benefits for enriching dialogue. Dialogic conversations through e-learning are different from face to face discussion and negotiation; they allow for listening to others, for curiosity to know more about others, for a disposition to understand the situation, to contribute and to help. Dialogic conversation via e-learning tends to make members interact to easily build consensus. This is more likely to happen in activities characterized as concept-driven such as global dialogue partnership. When task characteristics prioritize concept rather than details, e-learning through GLO can easily generate transcultural communication due to less difficulty in obtaining mutual trust and consensus. If members share the global meaning of core value, periphery value can be adapted according to local contexts.

In relationship with three dimensions of GLO. Based on the emerging relationship from data described previously, a mixed pattern of face to face and e-learning produces a synergic relationship that generates transcultural communication. First, in the cognitive dimension, minimum face to face intervention is required. E-learning is particularly beneficial because it can provide conceptual ideas before starting the project and it can enhance interaction through feedback and leadership to strengthen the internalization of concepts after a physical meeting. Second, in the skill dimension, more face to face intervention is required. For example, tasks on the production site necessitate close interaction through negotiating standardization. Therefore, the skill dimension can be developed through a dynamically mixed pattern of e-learning and face to face learning. Finally, in the affective dimension, initial face to face communication is required as a pre-requisite condition for the majority of tasks in order to obtain minimum mutual trust. However, a mixed pattern is not easy to achieve. More study will be required on this aspect.
The relationship between mixed pattern and task characteristics. As e-learning and face to face learning are interdependent, the degree of face to face intervention varies depending on task characteristics, which are influenced by the following factors: concept or detail-driven task, the level of influence of individual egos (strong or weak) during the collaboration, the level of difficulty in obtaining mutual trust (high or low), and the level of difficulty in reaching consensual identity. This list is not exhaustive.

For example, the data show that on the production site, task characteristics are more detail-driven; individual ego is strong; and the level of difficulty to obtain mutual trust and consensual identity is high. As a result, more intensive face to face intervention is required to combine e-learning under the GLO model. In the education field, task characteristics are more concept-driven; individual ego is less strong; the difficulty to obtain consensus and mutual trust is low. As a result, less intensive face to face intervention is required to combine e-learning under the GLO model. Initial face to face intervention is necessary for production and education training programs to generate minimum trust. Following procedures in the cognitive and skill dimensions can be achieved with e-learning.

With respect to the affective dimension under GLO, if task characteristics are detail-driven, e-learning can be used in a supplementary function, such as maintaining socialization among individual members after face to face meetings, and its development is still unpredictable. When tasks are concept-driven, e-learning can minimize face to face intervention. Its development in subsequent stages is also predictable. This implies that concept-driven tasks allow for more flexible working procedures among members and mutual trust is easier to obtain. For example, e-learning can be independently promoted to generate transcultural communication among global dialogue partners with neither initial face to face intervention nor intense face to face meetings because the affective dimension through e-
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Learning focuses on a globally communal mind, not socialization at the individual level. The following tables illustrate these relationships:

**Table 7:** Relationship between mixed patterns and task characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task characteristics</th>
<th>Highly detail focused task</th>
<th>Mixed task (detail and concept)</th>
<th>Highly concept focused task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production: instruction standardization</td>
<td>Education: training local instructors</td>
<td>Education: global dialogue partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of detail-focused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego of individual worker</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in obtaining consensual identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in obtaining mutual trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8:** Mixed patterns in the affective dimension and task characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed pattern: face to face and e-learning</th>
<th>Highly detail focused task</th>
<th>Mixed task (detail and concept)</th>
<th>Highly concept focused task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production: instruction standardization</td>
<td>Education: training local instructors</td>
<td>Education: global dialogue partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of e-learning in the affective dimension</td>
<td>Not predictable</td>
<td>Predictable</td>
<td>Evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face intervention in the affective dimension</td>
<td><strong>Indispensable at initial stage</strong></td>
<td>Not necessary at initial stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-learning without face to face learning</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Transcultural communication in activating and maintaining trust depending on task characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial stage</th>
<th>Developing stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detail-oriented tasks:</strong> indispensable</td>
<td><strong>Detail-oriented tasks:</strong> Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face</td>
<td>face to face and e-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual trust <em>activates</em> transcultural communication</td>
<td>Mutual trust <em>maintains</em> transcultural communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept-focused tasks: possibly by e-learning via cognitive dimension</td>
<td>Concept-focused tasks: Mainly e-learning via three dimensions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of task characteristics, it should be noted that e-learning cannot be totally independent even if it can enhance meaningful transcultural communication. Regular face to face meetings consolidate a relationship of trust in order that transcultural communication may continue. In sum, both e-learning and face to face learning if they work in solo to generate transcultural communication cannot avoid imperfect situations: limited experiential learning through e-learning may disrupt mutual trust. Factors such as distance and the digital divide may negatively affect the process of interaction in feedback and constructing meaning. Face to face learning is restricted due to geographical distance and it will not accelerate to produce the hybridization process. Therefore, all dimensions of GLO can be developed by a combination of face to face learning and e-learning to produce contextualization in scale, that is, glocalization. In the following chapter, it will be necessary to compare this result with previous theories.
Chapter 6

Discussion

In the previous chapter, the analysis of the findings and results seems to provide an explanation about the relationship and the path of synergy between transcultural communication, e-learning and the role of face to face communication. In this chapter, the results of previous studies are compared with the results of the Play Game Group case study. Existing theories are confirmed and redefined with new elements emerging. The comparison observed is as follows:

Definition of Transculture

In the theoretical framework, transculture was defined with two characteristics: first, maintaining one’s own culture while at the same time participating through learning with others: self-affirmation (Holt & Seki, 2012; Kendall et al., 2009; Onwumechili et al., 2003; Wilson, 2012). Second, hybridization, which means constantly transforming into something else in multiple and non-specific form: hybrid (Appiah, 2006; Beck, 2000; Beebe, 2008; Fathali, 2012; Karim, 2011; Lam, 2006; Moore, 2005; Orbe & Drummond, 2012; Suderman, 2007). These characteristics are reflected in a hybrid consensual identity, which is formed by the many perspectives of working members. Previous studies argue that this is:

A fusion: being capable of preserving when confronted with prolonged identity stress and adjustment from one culture to the next. (Onwumechili et al., 2003, p. 52)

A desire to immerse oneself in different cultures through learning from others seeking new knowledge. (Kendall et al., 2009, ch. 5)

These two characteristics, self-affirmation and hybrid, are confirmed in the case study. First, the importance of self is emphasized through all the activities of the Play Game Group.
Transculture is defined as self-affirmation that emphasizes the individual intrinsic motivation of one’s own value and feeling of mastery. It is described as:

Individuals are today engaged in a reflexive project of the self, and such powerful self-concepts as pride and self-esteem are based on confidence in the integrity and value of the narrative of self-identity. (Learning report, 2011, p. 40)

Second, hybridization is also a core element of transculture. In the production field, the hybrid consensual identity is expressed in a concrete way through speaking the same language based on a consensually constructed global team spirit. In the field of education, the hybrid consensual identity is expressed in an abstract way under a core value of learning through playing. The two types of hybridity are described as:

The vision of strength through diversity is expressed as core of what became a standard view of global expansion. (P.G.et al., 2014, p.8)

The personal experience of an educator regarding expectations from others and his own was contextualized during the interview with a special interest in the consequences of 21st century challenges. Cultural conversion, exchanges and interdependence were of specific interest. (H.J., 2012, p. 26)

Meanwhile, the meaning of a third culture is transformed into a culture of playing in the education field, by arguing that playing enhances learning capacity. This way of promoting free play as a third culture easily leads to a consensus on developing various periphery values simultaneously.

A newly emerging category in the case study can be referred to as participatory culture. The Play Game Group bridged the learning culture to create a shared understanding and connected feeling with peers. The experience of developing things with others enhances long term learning capacity as culture. Under this view, learners as knowledge producers inspire
one another to overcome limited knowledge. This view is emphasized through all the activities of the organization. The following statements represent this view:

> The participatory culture encourages connections to other learners, to share and build capacity for content creation and remixing, so it enhances a culture of learning.

(Learning report, 2011, pp. 44-45, 91-93)

> “The more we share, the more we get” created a strong culture within the team and really boosted the interaction between members; knowledge sharing happened.

(P.G. et al., 2014, p. 73)

**Characteristics of Transcultural Communication**

Transcultural communication is defined as a form of communication that facilitates mixing codes (Baraldi, 2006, p. 65). This represents two components. First, it happens during the construct of meanings via dialogic conversations through an interacting process. Second, as Shimoni (2011) argues, the negotiation of senses during the hybridization of local practices allows for other positions between local operations and global core values (pp. 156-159). This form of communication stimulates contradictory cultural reality through contextualization. Transcultural communication is characterized also as attitude of openness; it consists in the process of building trust via multiple communicative activities such as reconstruction of identity during the integration process (Shimoni, 2011, p.156; Clark & Geppert, 2011, p.411). This form of communication enables the individual to collaborate. The gradual familiarization process facilitates the building of a shared meaning based on openness.

> These characteristics of transcultural communication are found in the case study. First, the attitude of openness is expressed by exchanging conflicting views, breaking down
resistance, and showing enthusiasm for understanding local culture through brainstorming. This view is reflected by:

The sense that trusted others will back them up and enables them to respond with more vigor, flexibility, and constructive actions. (Learning report, 2011, p. 46)

It is definitely a collaborative process; this can’t be done in isolation. How can we take first world resources to help people form the third world; this is pretty much what we are looking for. The global side comes with skills and a mindset and the local side needs that power. (Interviewee B)

Second, interaction and the hybridization process make transcultural communication visible. In both the production and the education fields, transcultural communication is expressed as the operation of local culture in the vision of diversity and entering into a dialogue to find common language. Some statements show this dynamic:

The more abstract possibilities of virtual communities feed into concrete and physical environments as a way to engage with ideas, creating a social relationship between the digital objects and physical space. (Learning report, 2011, p.47)

Developing common terminology allows sharing knowledge and new ideas from local to global to become much easier and more effective. (P.G. et al., 2014, p. 71)

Meanwhile, a specific pattern is discovered concerning an attitude of openness. The process to generate transcultural communication is not as simple as predicted by the literature. Mutual trust in the existing theory is considered a moral infrastructure for integrating members so they can share an identity and it may happen under the abstract form

abstract form
of trust\textsuperscript{36} through e-learning (Mau, 2010, p. 114). The case of the Play Game Group revises this view more precisely: the very beginning of transcultural communication lies in mutual trust. For highly detail-oriented tasks and mixed task (detail and concept), trust is initially built by face to face communication, which activates \textit{minimum mutual trust}\textsuperscript{37}. However, e-learning can create an \textit{abstract form of trust}\textsuperscript{38} for highly concept-focused tasks. The following descriptions point out the importance of face to face communication for trust:

Human relations start from open communication; a lot of efforts have been done under the belief of Play Game Group: creating mutual respect by visiting other countries. (Interviewee C)

Face to face interview reveals important aspects of local practitioners’ conditions, frustrations, motivation and understandings, which otherwise would be unknown to the \textit{C} program trainers and it cannot be considered either before or during trainings. (H.J., 2012, p. 28)

In addition, the emerging notion of feedback characterizes transcultural communication in the case study. Feedback encourages dialogic teaching and learning; it is empowering and inspiring at the same time. When mutual trust is successfully built, transcultural communication may bring highly synergic feedback and leadership interactions. The critical role of feedback is emphasized in this way:

\textsuperscript{36} It does not require direct personal interaction but can be applied to many different social situations (as cited in Mau, 2010, p. 109).

\textsuperscript{37} A foundational degree of trust to the establishment of social relationships (Mau, 2010, p. 110).

\textsuperscript{38} The basis of transnational trust generated by virtual communication (Mau, 2010, p. 109)
Dialogic teaching emphasizes generating genuine discussion and argumentation, rather than the transmission of knowledge. (Learning report, 2011, p. 95)

Making sure that everyone had their say and received genuine understanding and appreciation, we were able to create an effective dialogue. Facilitating the development of important steps: not giving instruction, but helping them find themselves. (P.G. et al., 2014, p. 21)

**Characteristics of E-learning**

In the literature review, the characteristics of e-learning are described as a tool which connects geographically dispersed and culturally different working members in order to achieve a common objective (Bunt-Kokhuis, 2013; Collins et al., 2014; Rogerson-Revell, 2003; Slini et al., 2014; Wilder et al., 2010; Wilhelm, 2010). The data showed that e-learning under GLO plays a three-dimensional role: cognitive, skill, and affective. It conveys concepts and enhances skills through everyday conversation, which builds a trust relationship and inspires a desire to continue to collaborate. Transcultural communication generated by e-learning can condition people’s mind to be less judgmental about other cultures. The positive side of e-learning under GLO is expressed in previous studies such as:

Collins et al. (2014) describes remarkable advantages of e-learning for business corporations as multiple perspectives, great feedbacks, and replay of course materials via multiple channels. (pp. 514-516)

Social cohesion among members are shown under the form of empathy and support community via social networks. (Ruiz-Molina & Cuadrado-Garcia, 2008; Kokhuis, 2013)

All the characteristics of e-learning under GLO are recognized through the case study. The capacity to connect through a multimodal ICT platform in a cost-time effective way is an...
outstanding advantage of e-learning. It accommodates the weakness of face to face learning. For example:

Traditional institutions and places become extended by new contexts for learning.
The emergence of experience-based and collaborative forms of learning introduced through digital and mobile platforms provide a more informal, organized, contextualized approach and the content can be distributed and connected in multiple ways. (Learning report, 2011, p. 64)

The data revealed that e-learning also shows its effectiveness in cognitive, skill, and affective dimensions: it can offer a theoretical framework of transculture based on a global perspective and it is fortified through day to day communicative activities on shared projects. E-learning offers a third space where multi-criteria analysis enables the integration and customization of traditional cultural values into transcultural settings. E-learning can enable members to become familiarized with each other through feedback and feelings of proximity built by the online support group.

However, a specific pattern was discovered in this study for successful e-learning implementation under the GLO model. This is related to limitations of e-learning, which are not precisely mentioned in previous studies. E-learning can be efficient when it is mixed with face to face hands-on learning. The pattern of combining two learning methods varies depending on the difficulty of creating mutual trust and consensus among working members.

For cognitive and skill dimensions, e-learning is developed through a synergic relationship with face to face learning to bring about a successful result. Concerning the affective dimension, a mixed method shows more complexity in ensuring the development of e-learning when a task requires a high level of trust and consensus. As various factors seem to influence the affective dimension; more study will be required to find out how e-learning
can be developed in a more predictable way. One interviewee points out one of the
limitations of e-learning, which lacks real experience:

E-learning cannot replace the dynamic of face to face learning. The handicap of e-
learning lies in delivering only knowing side; if I understand the content, it does not
mean that I can do it (in real situation). Cultural change comes from changing
people’s habits. Real experience of each individual should come as insight and
inspiration into mind to change his old habits. (Interviewee C)

Characteristics of Transcultural Elements

Through previous studies, four transcultural elements under the GLO model are
conceptualized: first, transnational competency which refers to the ability to cope with the
rapidly changing global environment; second, lifelong learning capacity, which produces
social capital as a common resource (as cited in Liu, 2007, p. 53); third, transcultural identity,
which refers to the transcultural worldview (Mau, 2010, p. 115; Orbe & Drummond, 2011, p.
1690); and, finally, transnational trust, which reinforces transnational solidarity and global

These four elements can be traced in the case study. First, transnational competency as
the capacity to pursue harmonious communication is equally emphasized through all stages,
as the previous theory mentions:

Transnational competency refers to analytic, creative, communicative and functional
skills in order to address a potential knowledge. (Hawkins & Cummings, 2000; Koehn
& Rosenau, 2010)

Second, a learning capacity for constructed knowledge as a new information database
through dialogically-reflexive communication is a core value under the GLO model. This
viewpoint is found in the previous study and in the case study:
Learning aptitude will promote social capital as common resources and facilitates knowledge sharing through continuous interactions. (as cited in Liu, 2007, p. 53)

Local sites now are ready to build up their learning organization by the training and skills…Without GLO, we cannot maintain the future development of workforces in a structured way. (P.G. et al., 2014, p. 97)

Third, transcultural identity focuses on a resourceful person, who makes up the fabric of all social activities as a toolkit and who is attached to multiple cultural homes (as cited in Mau, 2010, p. 115). Epistemological curiosity as transcultural identity is promoted in both the production and the education fields:

The state of mind of transcultural identity is described as openness to novelty, alertness to distinction, sensitivity to different contexts, awareness of multiple perspectives, and orientation in the present. (Learning report, 2011, p. 98)

Fourth, transnational trust is strongly emphasized in the theoretical framework; it refers to a sense of solidarity and social ties among geographically dispersed members (Mau, 2010, p. 111). Two levels of transnational trust are expressed as follows:

Feeling of mutual sympathy towards others may happen via online spaces, which foster supportive conversations. It is challenging to create a design of supportive spaces, which are characterized by trust and shared goals. (Learning report, 2011, p. 61)

It is needed to have continuous improvement and relevance to provide an environment encouraging to engage with world in playful ways. (H.J., 2012, p. 46)

---

39 Driven by the desire to understand the world; different from spontaneous curiosity (cited in the Learning Report, 2011, p. 99)
Some new patterns were found in the case study: first, learning capacity and constructed knowledge are transplanted in a reflective learner model. This emphasizes individual empowerment and creativity as individual competencies under the GLO model.

Newly emphasized transcultural elements in the Play Game Group are as follows:

Reflective learner’s journey means connecting individual interests, experimenting with strategies, and monitoring this in an external context (Learning report, 2011, pp. 88-89).

*Put a ding in the universe*, as Apple founder Steve Jobs put it. This hacker ethics enables learners to see the physical world as a hackable platform. (Learning report, 2011, pp. 110-112)

Second, the notion of transnational trust is redefined in the case study because it turned out that an abstract form of trust cannot be easily generated in the affective dimension through e-learning under the GLO model. The individual feeling of trust seems to develop transnational trust via the affective dimension of e-learning under GLO. The following table explains how two patterns under this relationship develop transnational trust through e-learning depending on the characteristics of the task. And some interviewees recognize the patterns described below:

**Table 10: Different patterns of developing transnational trust**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern 1: Details driven tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong>: Initial face to face communication is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong>: E-learning under GLO reinforces trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong>: Individual socialization via the affective dimension may solidify through a sense of belonging.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Pattern 2: Core concept-focused tasks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Step 1</strong></th>
<th>Initial face to face communication is not always necessary; an abstract form of trust generated by e-learning is possible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td>E-learning under GLO allows trust to be maintained, but face to face intervention is still required to consolidate trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td>The globally communal mind of individuals in the affective dimension may become a global responsibility; individual socialization becomes less significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning together experience really happens when there are face to face brainstorming and authentic discussion then they realize that others also have experience that we did not have; once we can break down the pride, it opens up people’s mind. (Interviewee C)

Play game foundations has strong advocacy for learning exploration and learning through playing. They organize worldwide conferences and summits to bring people to generate meaningful talk and conversations with recent research. We think about different people, who do not have resources; we should think the global issue like our poor neighborhoods. (Interviewee D)

In short, the findings show that transcultural communication can happen when mutual trust is present. A mixed pattern under the GLO model can build trust in different ways depending on task characteristics. In other words, for detail-oriented tasks, intense face to face communication intervention is necessary and for concept-focused tasks, independent e-learning with minimized face to face learning is possible. Finally, the ambiguity in the affective dimension for detail-driven tasks suggests that an in-depth study should be
conducted to better understand this aspect in order to find strategies that may make the development of the affective dimension more predictable.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

Transnational organizations require a new culture that inspires worldwide working members with a globally inclusive world view. Among several emerging concepts, transculture is identified as the most appropriate notion due to its concrete way of mixing codes, which include many different cultural backgrounds in harmony in order to bring consensual identity and learning aptitude for transnational organizations. This cultural shift can be brought about through transcultural communicative activities through a real world situation in which working members can generate feedback and interactions to produce constructed knowledge and to acquire a transcultural mind matrix in their attitudes and behaviors. To provide a practical solution to reach this objective, the GLO model is adopted. It will enable globally and culturally dispersed working members to work together through three dimensions: cognitive, skill and affective. As the GLO model involves global collaboration, e-learning is considered an effective tool that can develop three dimensions of the model so as to bring cultural shift. Therefore, the objective of this study has focused on exploring how e-learning under the GLO model generates transcultural communication among transnational working members. The qualitative single case study was conducted with two embedded cases in the Play Game Group: one unit was selected from production field and the other unit was chosen from the education field. The findings obtained through documents and in-depth interviews were analyzed under the prism of four aspects: how to position transculture, how to practice transcultural communication, the role of e-learning under GLO, and the expected transcultural outcomes.
Summary

Conclusion. Transculture in this case study is defined as a hybrid entity derived from multiple perspectives and obtained by consensus through participatory learning. It can be called hybrid consensual identity. The positioning of transculture can vary: concretely described (i.e. standardizing job instruction by consensus) or abstractly visualized (i.e. free play for enhancing quality of learning); it depends on the characteristics of tasks, which are details driven or concepts focused.

Regardless of task characteristics, transcultural communication begins only when mutual trust exists among working members. According to the findings, a precondition of transcultural communication lies in mental openness by trust among working members. Physical meeting enables to deliver effectively members’ mutual respect, genuine curiosity, and recognition that face to face learning is indispensable for certain situations. Especially, when people realize that they need the knowledge of others to solve the problem of contextualization in scale to survive in globalized world, mutual trust happens naturally. Once that minimum trust is activated, a mixed pattern of face to face and e-learning can generate transcultural communication over a full range.

Under the principle of mixed pattern, e-learning can generate transcultural communication in three dimensions of GLO. Concerning cognitive and skill dimensions, a mixed pattern can successfully generate transcultural communication through the complementary relationship of two different ways of learning. Even if the stage and intensity of face to face intervention are influenced by many factors, the difficulty of creating mutual

40 This means the way of entry beyond cultural differences; it can be accepted by consensus of all; the term is mentioned by the interviewee B.
trust and consensus is a main determinant in the formation of various mixed patterns. For this reason, affective dimension such as socialization and globally communal minds show more complexity to ensure the development of e-learning. Various factors, such as individual culture, team dynamic, leadership style, available resources and context, seem to influence a mixed pattern in the affective dimension. More study is required to find out how e-learning can be developed in a predictable way and what sort of strategies can provide solutions for this dimension.

Transcultural elements built through transcultural communication are described in the reflective learner model, developed by the Play Game Group to transplant the GLO model in their specific context. The model suggests a profile of a future learner, whose transnational competency, learning aptitude, and transcultural identity are evidence of the cultural change initiated by GLO. For the solid and long term development of GLO, transnational trust is a crucial element that can be developed in the direction of solidarity at the interpersonal level or global responsibility at the ethical level.

In short, this study reveals that e-learning under GLO can generate transcultural communication with a specific mixed pattern between face to face communication and e-learning. In other words, transcultural communication happens when individual trust is shared among members. It entails an initial face to face meeting for the majority of projects. E-learning can provide the settings of dialogic collaboration to develop better transcultural communication. Concerning trust, the affective dimension via e-learning shows more complexity in determining the mixed pattern and it seems to bridge individual and transnational levels of trust, under the influence of task characteristics. Clarification in a future study could determine an appropriate field for the use of e-learning with minimized face to face intervention.
Implication of findings. One of the most important findings in this case study lies in uncovering the mixed pattern of learning that generates transcultural communication. The implication of the findings lies in two aspects: first, it emphasizes the importance of face to face learning and the limitation of e-learning for building individual levels of trust to activate and maintain transcultural communication. Second, this element of trust is built in different ways depending on task characteristics. Therefore, this finding can revise previous theory, which suggests that an abstract form of trust can be generated through online communication (Mau, 2010, p. 109). The abstract form of trust mentioned in a previous study is probably applicable to highly conceptual consensus-driven tasks (i.e. global dialogue partners). The type of trust that these activities require can minimize physical meeting. Overall, the findings can provide insight for transnational organizations for designing various mixed learning patterns with strategies for developing trust, keeping in mind that the more detail-driven tasks are, the more intense face to face learning is needed.

Limitation of Research: Methodology and Validity

There are limitations in this study: first, the term transculture is not a familiar notion; as transculture is not literally pronounced through any unit, the definition is not explicitly given and the meaning remains still ambiguous. For this study, the characteristics of transculture described in previous studies are used to identify transculture and transcultural communication through the analysis of documents and interviews. There is a critical need to promote the term to share its meaning in society. Secondly, data collection techniques can be considered; the study seems to require also finding out how e-learning generates transcultural communications in a virtual context among different generations of working members. The discourse analysis with online conversations or online participatory observation could allow enhancement of the validity of the study. As virtual collaboration and interaction have
different aspects, depending on the generation of users, this variety of data collection can produce quite different aspects of transcultural communication compared to the result of this study.

**Future Research**

As findings show that the mixed pattern under the GLO model can vary, depending on the element of trust determined by task characteristics, there should be more thorough investigation about many influencing factors in terms of trust building. Clearer strategic solutions for a mixed pattern can illustrate how to mobilize individual trust to generate transcultural communication, how to develop the affective dimension under the GLO model in a more predictable way, and how to bridge individual and transnational levels of trust. This discovery will bring various designs of mixed pattern, which can suggest e-learning with minimized face to face intervention. Knowing that the element of trust seems to be quite predictable when task characteristics are mainly concept-focused, a dynamic pattern of mixing codes and the way in which trust is built in virtual space can be expected. Future research in this direction with a different methodology is recommended to find new strategies for e-learning under the GLO model.
References


TRANSCULTURAL COMMUNICATION VIA E-LEARNING


### Appendix 1

**Deductive and inductive categories of data analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal themes</th>
<th>Transculture under the GLO model</th>
<th>E-learning under the GLO model</th>
<th>Elements of transculture after e-learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-themes</td>
<td>Definition of transculture</td>
<td>Characteristics of trans-cultural communication</td>
<td>Characteristics of e-learning and trans-cultural communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Self-affirmation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Form and tool</strong></td>
<td><strong>ICT platform</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self determination</td>
<td>• Synergy between both human and non-human actors</td>
<td>• Capacity to connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-efficacy</td>
<td>• Second paradigm shift</td>
<td>• Informal learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal category and sub-categories</td>
<td><strong>Hybrid</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interacting process</strong></td>
<td><strong>A tool for cognitive dimension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rhizomic and dynamic forms</td>
<td>• Feedback and leadership</td>
<td>• Conveying concept of transculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Multiple identities</td>
<td>• Construction of meaning</td>
<td>• Fortifying notion of transculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consensual identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Distributed cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not between A and B, but C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third culture</td>
<td><strong>Attitude of openness</strong></td>
<td><strong>A tool of skill dimension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transcultural identity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating virtual culture</td>
<td>• Active collaboration</td>
<td>• Transcultural mind matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Third teacher</td>
<td>• Process of building consensual identity</td>
<td>• Innovative minded person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 21st century library</td>
<td>• Mutual trust (obtained by)</td>
<td>• Inclusive identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Culture of play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

41 Deductive categories are in black and inductive categories are in purple letters. Newly emerged categories and findings from interviews are in red letters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory culture</th>
<th>Hybridization process in third space</th>
<th>A tool of affective dimension</th>
<th>Transnational trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Youth-self-generated culture</td>
<td>• Embodiment</td>
<td>• Socialization and familiarization</td>
<td>• Solidarity through a sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Network and connectionism</td>
<td>• Glocalization</td>
<td>• Globally communal mindset</td>
<td>• Global responsibility and morality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Informal sociability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culture of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dependence on face to face com.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of experiential learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Digital divide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Definition of Principal and Subcategories

**Transculture**

**Self-affirmation.** affirmation of one’s own culture.

| Deductive subcategories[^42] | **Self-determination**: an individual as an active agent toward growth and development/intrinsic motivation based on his own value, playful state of curiosity  
**self-efficacy**: competence, feeling of mastery, belief in one’s own ability, feeling pride, positive emotion about self, craftsmanship |
| --- | --- |

**Hybrid.** inclusiveness on common ground, sharing multi-facets for consensual identity formation.

| Deductive subcategories | **Rhizomic and dynamic forms**: unpredictable, transformable, unrestricted; no rule for fine combination, pleasure of flow, imagination, exploration, testing limit  
**Multiple identities**: a multicultural self, alternative world  
**Consensual identity**: sharing a goal based on collaboration and negotiation as a solution for conflicting views between core and periphery values  
**Not between A and B; it is something else, C**: unknown territory, novelty |
| --- | --- |

**Third culture.** a set of transformed practices through multiple cultural backgrounds under a specific context.

| Inductive subcategories | **Creating virtual culture**: hobby culture, DIY community, alternative realities  
**Third teacher**: constantly available online teacher  
**21st century library**: Third space of inspiration and empowerment by meta cognitive activities  
**Culture of play**: fuel of creativity and learning capacity, free and unstructured play for experimentation, play for growth |
| --- | --- |

[^42]: Sub categories: 1) predominant category is underlined, 2) deductive categories are in black and inductive categories are in purple letters.
**Participatory culture.** a common language through shared understandings, mutual attention, connected feeling, attachment to peers, and the experience of developing things together with others as producers of knowledge.

| Inductive subcategories | Youth self-generated culture: youth programs to foster non-academic skills as a source of fun  
Network and connectionism: value driven everyday connection for stimulation, socially magnified and fragmented forms of like-mind online community  
Informal sociability: virtual third space relationship among diverse people  
Culture of learning: culture through learning together in a spiral process across time |

**Transcultural Communication**

**Form and tool.** a form of synergic communication between humans through media; media makes people who they are.

| Inductive subcategories: | Synergy between both human and non-human actors: interactions between human and non-human actors, generativity.  
Second paradigm shift: learning relationship through the internet, bring together like-minded individuals to magnify behaviors |

**Interacting process.** The process of feedback and leadership and constructing meanings through interaction and participation in socially shared learning activities.

| Deductive and inductive subcategories | Feedback and leadership (inductive): feedback for exploring, coping with challenges, comparing, aligning, and adapting with immediate adjustment, emotional rewards. Leadership for offering, supporting, and empowering. Both of them are related to dialogic teaching and confirming one’s own idea with others.  
Construction of meaning (deductive): active interpretation, interacting with peers, cultural formation in relationship, learning by doing, socially constructed sense |

---

43 Digital platforms, which suggest different ways of manipulation according to users’ capacity and ability. This characteristic can stimulate users as self-generative and creative learners.
**Attitude of openness.** The psychological security\(^{44}\) based on a horizontal communication structure, listening to members’ voices even controversial ideas. A facilitating element to lead to consensual identity and to build trust towards others in a stable way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deductive subcategories</th>
<th>Active collaboration: no fear of failure, active quest for novelty, exploration of ideas, social engagement, reciprocity, exchanging multiple views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process of building consensual identity: put together in different ways, joint attention, co-operation and harmony, need to unify various perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual trust: sense of relatedness in an open system, perceived availability and support, enthusiasm for sharing and contributing, moral infrastructure(^{45})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hybridization process in the third space.** a process of manipulating various forms of fusion, which are contingent, unpredictable, multifaceted, and unfinished; merging cultural practices to produce sense-making, which allows all parties to feel comfortable.\(^{46}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inductive and deductive subcategories</th>
<th>Embodiment (inductive): manipulation, embodied interaction with artifacts, metissage and creolization, created and recreated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glocalization (deductive): global and local contextualization online and offline, contradictory cultural realities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E-learning**

**Characteristics of ICT platform.** Multimodal communication capacity to connect individuals enabling the construction of knowledge together; context of informal learning, which is less restricted in time and space and enhances personal motivation to participate voluntarily and to select autonomously information based on one’s own value for self-mastery.

---


\(^{46}\) Shimoni, B. (2011). p. 155
### Deductive and inductive subcategories

| Deductive and inductive subcategories | **Capacity to connect (deductive):** inspiring learning settings, content driven community, multimodal communication  
| Informal learning (inductive): extra-curricular learning, free and unsupervised, intellectual challenge, pulling down one’s own information through a network as reform of library and fertilization of resources |

---

**A tool for delivering transculturalism (cognitive dimension).** Training through multi-dimensional approaches to reduce the ambiguity of the concept of transculture.

| Deductive and inductive subcategories | **Conveying concept of transculture (deductive):** recognition of cultural difference through virtual connection under a sense of relatedness and security  
| **Fortifying notion of transculture (deductive):** push and pull discussion characterized as sharing and contributing; reinforcement of new identity creation  
| **Distributed cognition** (inductive): two-way flow relationship between an individual and a hybrid environment in open space, maximizing the user’s control on learning, blending virtual and physical realms through expanded mental capacities |

---

**A tool for exercising transcultural communication (skill dimension).** The practice through virtual dialogic collaboration in contingent situations, which will create various hybridization.

| Inductive and deductive subcategories | **Virtual interactions (inductive):** flexibility and problem solving skills in multiple situations through manipulating metaphorical models during enthusiastic participation  
| **Online dialogic conversations for learning (deductive):** negotiation of sense, collaborative knowledge, and virtual feedback shaping learning ecology |

---

**A tool of social familiarization via transcultural communication (affective dimension).** Cultural acquaintance, empathy, social cohesion, trust, and global engagement brought by gradually internalized cultural sensibility through transcultural communication.

---

47 Adopted from Hutchins (1995)
## Deductive subcategories

**Socialization process**: social cohesion, willingness for joint attention based on story-telling and study sharing; available and perceived support; social talk through portable devices

**Globally communal mindset**: will to engage, trust

## Limitations of e-learning

Need for face to face intervention given that e-learning cannot generate transcultural communication independently.

## Inductive subcategories

**Distance**: a barrier causing weak ties, no strong impression, and inconstant follow-up among members because everyday task is priority

**Dependence of face to face learning**: no way to replace unique dynamic from face to face relationship

**Lack of experiential learning**: difference between knowing and doing; unavoidable hands-on learning for certain tasks

**Digital divide**: problem of internet connection

## Transcultural Elements under GLO

**Transnational competency**: The ability to cope with the rapidly changing environment through analytic, creative, communicative and functional skills in order to address potential knowledge: lifelong learning required.

## Deductive and inductive subcategories

**Collaborative communicator (deductive)**: collaborative and expressive communicator  

**Praxis (inductive)**: active learner, not observer, learning through practice, flexible in real and digital life, easy setback to challenge, 4C’s

**Creative leadership (inductive)**: individual originality incorporating others’ values

## Learning aptitude and constructed knowledge

Aligning personal power with shared vision and finding the way of dealing with different viewpoints creates social capital as common resources facilitating knowledge sharing and construction through continuous interaction of building trust.

---

49 4C means connect, construct, contemplate, continue (Learning Report, 2011, p. 107)
Inductive and deductive subcategories:  

| The reflective learner model (inductive): reflective and creative state of mind of learners, systemic creativity, self-realization, transformation by stretching reality | Constructed knowledge as social capital (deductive): multiple knowledge forms, converting uncertainty into manageable risks, playful construction, prototyping culture |

**Transcultural identity.** A toolkit and repertoire, which allows an individual to become a resourceful person facilitating consensus; simultaneous attachment to multiple cultural homes without abandoning old identities to assume new ones[^2]

| Deductive and inductive subcategories: |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| **Transcultural mind matrix (deductive):** open-ended, novel, and playful mindset, epistemological curiosity | Innovative minded person (inductive): ethic of hacker, who sees world as a hackable platform, improvisation, unprecedented level of imagination, provocation, expanded mental capacities |
| Inclusive identity[^3] (deductive): inspiring global belonging transcending national boundary, integrating multiple forms of learning through play |

**Transnational trust.** Mutual sympathy and commitment, sense of solidarity, and social ties; an abstract form of trust[^4] for global perspective can be theoretically promoted by transcultural communication generated through the cognitive and skill dimensions by e-learning; more trust can be consolidated by socialization and familiarization in the affective dimension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deductive subcategories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solidarity Through a sense of belonging:</strong> respect and commitment towards other members, mutual sympathy, social cohesion, sense of belonging, psychological well-being, link with caregivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global responsibility and morality: purpose, quest for something meaningful, global awareness &amp; sustainability, global citizen, cosmopolitanism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: It means more about behavior than thought (Playing Report, 2010, p. 26).
Appendix 3

Letter of information (form)

[Letterhead of institution]

[Date]

[Interviewee Name] [Address]

Dear [Interviewee Name]:

My name is Elodie Sung Eun Song, and I am a student in the MA program of the department of communication in the arts faculty of the University of Ottawa. I am writing to invite you to participate in the research project for my master’s thesis, which mainly aims at discovering the development of global learning organizations in terms of cultural shift. As organizations need a new consensual worldview to share among team members due to intense cross-cultural activities, online transcultural communication may build this identity for people from different cultural backgrounds; e-learning, which includes all online learning activities, is seen as a generator for transcultural communication. In cooperation with [name and title of foundational interviewee], I have identified a list of individuals who have played prominent roles in founding and shaping the development of a global learning organization project since 2011. The majority of interviews will be conducted either via Skype or email as scheduling and resources allow. The interviews will be recorded digitally subject to the consent of interviewees.

I sincerely hope that you will consider participating in the research for my master’s thesis entitled “Transnational organizations’ cultural shift through transcultural communication generated by e-learning via the Global Learning Organization (GLO) model”. I will be contacting you by e-mail in the near future to confirm your interest in being
transcultural communication via e-learning

interviewed. Please feel free to contact me as specified below with any question. The consent form will be sent upon your acceptance of interview.

Sincerely,

Elodie Sung Eun Song,  
University of Ottawa  
Email: esong040@uottawa.ca

Sylvie Grosjean, Ph.D  
Acting Chair, School of Information Studies  
Associate Professor 
Department of Communication  
University of Ottawa  
Email: sgrosjea@uottawa.ca
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Appendix 5

Interview Guides

Introduction

I am very glad to meet you via Skype. First of all, I thank you so much for your help. Your collaboration with me today will allow me to verify some details concerning the global learning organization process in the Play Game Group to bring empirical information for elaborating my thesis.

Part 1: Definition of transculture under the global learning organization (GLO) model

1. If the GLO model aims to produce a cultural shift towards a global mindset, how can transculture as new culture be defined in transnational organizations during implementation of GLO?
2. How should the culture should be treated in terms of shared vision and consensual identity among team members of different cultural backgrounds?

Part 2: Characteristics of transcultural communication under the GLO model

1. What are the main communicative solutions to resolve conflicting views such as core (company) and periphery values (local unit) in order to have a consensual identity?
2. What are the main difficulties and issues in transcultural communication?
3. During the GLO process, how was consensus obtained through transcultural communication? How did members manage to work together?

Part 3: Characteristics of e-learning under the GLO model in transnational organization

1. E-learning as an ICT platform

What can be mentioned as the unique merits of e-learning and online communication for bridging cultural differences?
2. Tool for delivering transculturalism (cognitive dimension)

How has transculture been perceived as a conceptual notion among e-learning users?

3. Tool for exercising transcultural communication (skill dimension)

3.1. How has e-learning generated sense-making process through dialogic conversation among different cultures?

3.2. Do virtual activities via networking make projects more reliable through better understanding and multi-criteria perspectives?

4. Tool for social familiarization and interaction (affective dimension)

Does e-learning generate a familiarization of cultures that inspires the spirit of inclusion and trusting others?

5. Limitations of e-learning

What are the limitations and challenges of e-learning via the GLO model?

Part 4: Outcomes of transculture through e-learning and transcultural communication under the GLO model

1. What results can be documented concerning transnational competency, learning aptitude, transcultural identity, and transnational trust after the GLO model?

2. What are the real outcomes of a cultural shift after the adoption of the GLO model?

Part 5: Conclusion

1. What are the main experiences and impressions throughout the GLO?
## Appendix 6

### Synthesis of embedded case: unit 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal themes</th>
<th>Transculture and transcultural communication under the GLO model</th>
<th>E-learning and transcultural elements under the GLO model</th>
<th>Elements of transculture after e-learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-themes</strong></td>
<td>Definition of Transculture</td>
<td>Characteristics of transcultural communication</td>
<td>Characteristics of e-learning and transcultural communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal category and sub categories</strong></td>
<td><strong>Self-affirmation</strong></td>
<td>Interacting process</td>
<td>ICT platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-affirmation</td>
<td>Feedback and leadership</td>
<td>Capacity to connect: new learning context, multimodal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>Construction of meaning</td>
<td>Informal learning: no restriction, pull model for personal motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hybrid</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consensual identity</strong></td>
<td>A tool for cognitive dimension</td>
<td>Conveying concept of transculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory culture</strong></td>
<td><strong>Culture of learning</strong></td>
<td>Attitude of openness</td>
<td>Active collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory culture</td>
<td>Process of building consensual identity</td>
<td>Process of building consensual identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture of learning</td>
<td>Mutual trust (previous face to face contact indispensable)</td>
<td>Mutual trust (previous face to face contact indispensable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Virtual interaction: active, flexible, collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogic conversation: negotiation of sense, collaborative knowledge, feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

55 Deductive categories in black, inductive categories in purple, newly emerged categories from interview in red. Predominant category in bold letter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hybridization process in third space</th>
<th>Glocalization</th>
<th>A tool of affective dimension (<em>previous face to face contact necessary, and method of development is unpredictable</em>)</th>
<th>Transnational trust Solidarity via sense of belonging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialization and familiarization</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance on face to face com.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of experiential learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of experiential learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 7

## Synthesis of Embedded Case: Unit 2\(^{56}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal themes</th>
<th>Transculture under the GLO model</th>
<th>E-learning under the GLO model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subthemes</strong></td>
<td>Definition of transculture</td>
<td>Characteristics of e-learning and transcultural communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristics of transcultural communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal category and subcategories</strong></td>
<td>Interacting process</td>
<td>ICT platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback and leadership</td>
<td>Capacity to connect: new learning context, multimodal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of meaning</td>
<td>Informal learning: no restriction, pull model for personal motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hybrid</strong></td>
<td>A tool for cognitive dimension</td>
<td>Learning aptitude and constructed knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conveying concept of transculture</td>
<td>Reflective learner model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forting notion</td>
<td>Constructed knowledge as social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third culture</strong></td>
<td>Attitude of openness</td>
<td>A tool of skill dimension (it can be most effective when it is mixed with face-to-face learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of play</td>
<td>Active collaboration</td>
<td>Virtual interaction: active, flexible, collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process of building consensual identity</td>
<td>Dialogic conversation: negotiation of sense, collaborative knowledge, feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual trust (obtained by face to face contact)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{56}\) Deductive categories in black, inductive categories in purple, newly emerged categories from interview in red. Predominant category in bold letter. Affective dimension of e-learning is not a predictable dimension.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory culture</th>
<th>Hybridization process in third space</th>
<th>A tool of affective dimension (previous face to face contact necessary for overseas training education program but no need for global dialogue partnership: depends on the nature of task)</th>
<th>Transnational trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth self-generated culture</td>
<td>Glocalization</td>
<td>Socialization and familiarization Globally communal mindset</td>
<td>Solidarity through a sense of belonging Global responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Limitations**
- Distance
- Dependence on face to face communication
- Lack of experiential learning
- Digital divide
Appendix 8

The reflective learner model by the Play Game Group

Model Structure

The experiential learning model refers to three stages of creative activities and four layers of learning components connected through the model by transcultural communication. Boden’s three types of creativity are thus critical components in learning: connect and explore ideas cognitively and practically, then transform the ideas to solve a real problem (Learning report, 2011, p. 79-80).

- **Connecting** – being able to connect a question or problem with your personal interests, existing knowledge, and the situation you are in.
- **Exploring** – being able to use personal competencies to experiment with alternative solutions.
- **Transforming** – being able to apply your knowledge in new situations, and share this toward an original purpose.

The four layers refer to the individual learner, the learning experience, the learning relationship, and the learning context: this is “an inter-related system, founded on self-determination and motivation”. It refers to “the change as a process of moving from knowledgeable to becoming knowledge-able… pursuing a growing interest in other people’s point of view” (Learning report, 2011, p. 80).

- **the learner** – your individual competences and abilities
- **the learning experience** – how to use your competencies
- **the relationships** – how to relate knowledge to other people, objects and networks
- **the context** – how to organize places and situations to support learning process
The creative reflective learner works proactively to set personal goals, experiment with solutions, and implement these into new situations. The table below shows how the process of learning happens through three stages of creativity, engaging the four elements in the system (Learning Report, 2011, p. 101):

57 The source allows to use materials such as public domain. As the company name is modified due to anonymity, the site name can be provided upon request.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connect</th>
<th>Explore</th>
<th>Transform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner</td>
<td>How you are motivated and achieve autonomy</td>
<td>How you challenge yourself to grow skills and optimize performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning experience</td>
<td>How you learn most effectively</td>
<td>How you evaluate your results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting the relationships</td>
<td>How you share and express your knowledge</td>
<td>How / who / when you seek the support of other people and resources to ensure that you perform at your best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting the context</td>
<td>Deciding the places and situations where you learn best</td>
<td>How you can organize your learning environment to support your process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>