Stream 13. Public Sector Management and Not-for-Profit

Competitive session

Abstract only in program

Effective cross-cultural capacity development: The importance of boundary contact conditions

Capacity development partnerships between highly-qualified expatriates and host-country counterparts have become an important developmental approach used in the international aid and development sector. This paper reports the results of an investigation into the factors contributing to the effectiveness of these cross-cultural capacity development relationships (Australian development professionals in Viet Nam). Forty such relationships (20 deemed effective and 20 ineffective) were analysed through semi-structured interviews with expatriate development workers. Shared trust between expatriate and counterpart was identified as central to effective capacity development. The relationships that the expatriates perceived as effective were characterised by a number of 'boundary conditions' that closely resemble the conditions of interpersonal contact theory, including equal status between expatriate and counterpart, interdependent cooperation, and opportunities for acquaintance.

Contemporary approaches to international development efforts are undergirded by a philosophy of capacity development, an interpersonal and participative 'horizontal' approach to knowledge sharing and skill transfer (Eade, 1997; Sherraden, Stringham, Sow, & McBride, 2006).To achieve this, the international aid and development sector make use of qualified and experienced expatriates, commonly by embedding these experts inside host organisations (typically NGOs) in recipient countries. A key element of the success of these initiatives is the ability of the expatriates to forge effective interpersonal working relationships with host-country national (HCN) counterparts and local communities (Eade, 2007; Eyben, 2013; Lough & Matthews, 2013). However, research into the nature of interactions between expatriates and HCN counterparts is scant, and little is known about the generic nature of the relationships and what makes them effective.

This paper reports one phase of a broader study examining the nature of the relationship between professional expatriate development workers and HCNs. Specifically, the research sought to unearth factors that influence the effectiveness of these relationships, and the strategies used by expatriates to fashion more effective relationships. In doing so, the study takes a development actor perspective (Long, 2001) by focusing on the individuals who participate in international development.

The paper starts by reviewing the disperse literature base that has informed this study. Next it summarises the research method and presents the findings of our investigation. We conclude by considering the implications for practitioners and researchers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

While empirical studies are limited, the expatriate-HCN relationship in international development is likely complex, influenced by perceived and real power imbalances, the potential for miscommunication and mistrust stemming from cultural differences, and contextual factors like time, resource access, environmental circumstances and the abilities of the parties involved (Fee & Gray, 2011; Girgis, 2007). What research exists has tended to highlight two elements of the relationship. The first is power imbalances, often implicit in the ways in which different participants are categorised. Girgis (2007) suggests that these stem from disparities between HCNs and expatriate aid workers in relation to control of finances, knowledge levels, and expatriates' outsider status. Supporting this,

McWha (2011) reports that perceived power differences between expatriate and local aid workers inhibited the relationships necessary for capacity development.

Other authors have drawn attention to the importance of the non-work side of expatriate-HCN relationships (see, for instance, Fechter, 2012). Girgis (2007) highlights the importance of devoting energy, time and resources to developing friendships as a means of overcoming the complexity of international development. She reports that expatriates deploy a range of techniques to nurture the friendship with HCNs, including negotiation, suggestive dialogue (to allow the HCN to consider ideas and translate them to a local context), and acknowledging local knowledge and capacity (Girgis, 2007). In an exploratory study, McWha (2011) found that relationships (and hence capacity building) between expatriate and HCN aid workers in Cambodia was facilitated by: (a) effective communication (listening and listening to, being understood, being open and honest), (b) friendship (socialising with colleagues), (c) reciprocal learning/teaching (recognising that learning is reciprocal), and (d) confidence in the ability of oneself and the other individual.

Research outside the international aid and development sector also provides a useful insight into what might contribute to effective capacity development. Trust, defined as the willingness to be vulnerable to others (Mayer & Davis, 1995; Schoorman, Mayer, & Davis, 2007), has been identified as fundamental to collaboration and knowledge sharing (Huemer, von Krogh, & Roos, 1998; Kasper-Fuehrer & Ashkanasy, 2002) by enabling risk-taking and information and idea sharing. Among the building blocks of trust are perceptions about a person's ability, integrity and benevolence (Schoorman, et al., 2007), emotional bonds (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998), and organisational culture (Andrews & Delahaye, 2000). Trust can be especially complex in cross-cultural relationships (Yuki, Maddux, Brewer, & Takemura, 2005) and diluted by, for instance, perceptions of (non) proficiency in language (Neeley, 2013; Tenzer, Pudelko, & Harzing, 2014).

Finally, research looking at contributors to constructive cross-cultural interactions centres on Allport's intergroup contact hypothesis (1954), one of the most researched and influential theories in social psychology (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Kawakami, 2003; Pettigrew, 1998). Contact theory, as it is known, identifies a number of boundary conditions that contribute toward prejudice reduction and

3

provide opportunities for stereotype correction during intergroup interactions (Levin, van Laar, & Sidanius, 2003). These include:

1. both parties perceiving status equality (Brewer & Kramer, 1985; Moody, 2001);

2. participation that is voluntary, and participants interacting and exchanging information willingly (Stephan & Stephan, 1996);

3. joint cooperation between the two groups toward a common objective (Blanchard, Adelman, & Cook, 1975; Chu & Griffey, 1985);

4. interactions that enable participants to develop meaningful personal relationship (Miller, 2002) via frequent, long-term and intimate contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006); and

5. having the importance of the interaction sanctioned by institutional support, including by authority figures like organisational leaders (Amichai-Hamburger & McKenna, 2006; Morrison & Herlihy, 1992; Slavin, 1985).

Empirical studies demonstrate that positive contact does not require all five conditions to be optimal, or even present; however, most studies have shown positive effects of intergroup contact, even when some conditions were absent or sub-optimal (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000).

While contact theory is primarily interested in prejudice reduction, researchers have called for the theory to be applied to a greater variety of 'mundane, seemingly unimportant encounters that constitute the overwhelming majority of everyday contact experiences' rather than focusing on the 'prejudice problem' (Dixon, Durrheium, & Tredoux, 2005, p. 703; Hewstone & Swart, 2011). With this in mind, the current study was underpinned by two research question:

> **RQ1:** *From the perspective of expatriate development workers, what factors contribute to effective cross-cultural interpersonal capacity development?*

> **RQ2:** *What strategies do expatriates development workers use or suggest in order to achieve more effective cross-cultural interpersonal capacity development?*

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

An inductive, exploratory research design was used. The purposive sample comprised 20 Australian development professionals who had undertaken a capacity development placement in Viet Nam. Table 1 summarises features of the sample and their placements.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

As the table shows, participants undertook placements ranging from 9 to 42 months over the period 2007-14. Most were embedded in international NGOs (9/20, 45%) or domestic NGOs (7/20).[1] All placements were coordinated and administered by an INGO based in Australia through which participants in this study were recruited.

Data was collected via semi-structured interviews using a variation of the critical incident technique (Flanagan, 1954). Respondents were asked to identify two relationships with HCN counterparts: one that they perceived to be effective in terms of achieving capacity development outcomes, and one that they perceived to be ineffective. Thus, the sample for analysis comprised 40 CD relationships: 20 effective, and 20 ineffective. Interviews focused on expatriates' perspectives of the main outcomes of, and contributors to, the effective and ineffective relationships.

Interviews were conducted via video-conference (Skype), telephone, or in person and ranged in duration from 40 to 75 minutes. Eighteen of the 20 interviews were recorded and transcribed in full; for the remaining two, both researchers took and collated detailed notes. Data coding was a collaborative and iterative process involving both authors. Initially, inductive themes were drawn from the data. As patterns began to emerge, these themes were reconciled with existing theories. This thematic analysis commenced prior to the completion of data collection, and so emerging themes were identified and tentative propositions then 'tested' as subsequent interviews were collected (Teunissen et al., 2007); notably the conditions of contact theory. This meant that the analytical process was iterative, with the researcher 'zipping' 'back-and-forth … between data collection and data analysis' (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009: 251) as a way to enhance process validity, as well as to critically examine the researcher's understanding emerging from responses (Andersen & Skaates, 2004).   Data was coded to descriptive and thematic categories for both effective and ineffective relationships. Within-category themes were then mapped out, compared across groups, and related to the broader context of the respondents' experiences.

FINDINGS

---

[1] The domestic NGOs represented in this study were registered, established and managed within Viet Nam, and had objectives and operations directed solely at local communities and/or issues. However, the majority of these received funding from international donors. The demands of international donor organisations for governance and reporting was often a source of tension for the expatriates in this study, whose English language skills meant that they frequently became a conduit between the external international donor and the host organisation.

All respondents were able to identify at least one effective and one ineffective relationship. Typically, these relationships were with HCNs counterparts from the host organisation, although four expatriates identified CD relationships with external counterparts. Overwhelmingly, *shared trust* between HCN counterpart and expatriate was identified as most crucial to the effectiveness of cross-cultural CD relationships. This was raised proactively in a range of contexts by 13 of the 20 expatriates, and confirmed as a central tenant of effective CD by the remaining seven:

> *Number one was trust ... (expatriate # 2)*
>
> *Of course trust is important; it's an entry point for everything you want to do and I worked hard to try and build that trust (effective CD relationship, expatriate #13)*
>
> *I realised that he actually didn't trust me in lots of ways; he really didn't understand why I was there or why I wanted to be there ... there was a real lack of understanding and lack of trust (ineffective CD relationship, expatriate #5)*

Much of expatriates' discussion of relationships with HCNs revolved around ways to develop or maintain this shared trust, and trust-building was perceived as central to their effectiveness as capacity developers. When looking at the factors that contributed most strongly, we distilled five features which, according to expatriates, distinguish effective CD relationships from ineffective ones: (**1**) perceived similarity and equality, (**2**) mutual openness and two-way learning, (**3**) interdependent cooperation toward a common goal, (**4**) opportunities for acquaintance, and (**5**) a supportive organisational environment and leadership. Table 2 summarised the key elements of each of these conditions, identified strategies that expatriates used and suggested to promote these conditions, and provides exemplar quotations from descriptions of both effective and ineffective relationships. We briefly discuss each condition below.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE
----

1. Perceptions of similarity and equality between expatriate and host-country national

Literature suggests that the starting point for most expatriate-HCN relationships is one of difference (culture, language) and inequality (experience, qualification). Yet CD relationships that expatriates saw as effective were characterised by similarity and status equality with HCN counterparts.

Most prominently, when expatriates talked about effective CD relationships, they emphasised how they had been accepted as a '*peer*' (expatriate #4) rather than a subordinate or (more commonly)

superior. For instance, expatriate #14 noted 'I was anxious to be seen as a peer and I'd like to think that I was'. In contrast, ineffective CD relationships were more likely to be with counterparts who deferred to expatriates' expertise, a behaviour which limited knowledge sharing opportunities (*'I tended to get ... a lot of, 'You're the expert, so you can do it''*; expatriate # 11). Most expatriates attributed any perceived inequality to culturally-derived status markers; notable gender, qualifications and age (e.g. '*There's two really important features of working in Viet Nam, one is age and the other is qualifications or experience',* expatriate # 10). Perhaps because of this, demographic and experiential markers of similarity were identified as being important to building effective CD relationships. Most prominent were a shared outlook (typically HCNs who possessed a 'Western' mindset), and common gender, age group, or professional background (e.g. *'We're all females and our marital status (is the same) ... I think actually that's quite a big thing'*, expatriate #15).

Critical to the effectiveness of CD partnerships was the way in which the expatriates managed these perceived status differences. Several reported consciously and strategically re-negotiating the power relationship with their counterpart (e.g. *'I'm constantly rearranging that (power) balance because it's handed over to us in, really an - in sometimes uncomfortable way'*, expatriate # 12). While a range of techniques were identified, the most commonly used were variations of 'suggestive dialogue' (Girgis, 2007) and active attempts at in-group inclusion:

> *I will tend to put myself in a position where I'm asking for people's approval to do things ... it just make it seem a little bit like I'm working for them (expatriate #14).*
> *It's the to-ing and fro-ing where I consciously make every effort to have her on the same level as me, that we both have skills and knowledge, and we are working together to find the commonality (expatriate # 12).*

2. Mutual openness and two-way learning

Five expatriates identified the enthusiasm and motivation of their counterpart as the major factor in an effective relationship (#4, #9, #11, #17, #18) and several others identified it as important (e.g. '*They were very eager. ... couldn't wait for me to get there and they wanted to learn',* expatriate #17). In contrast, six respondents (#4, #5, #6, #11, #13, #14) attributed ineffective relationships to counterparts who lacked motivation, were unwilling to share knowledge or learn (e.g. '*He's just lazy and doesn't care'*, #11), or who (the expatriate believed) were non-voluntary participants in the relationship:

There was definitely pressure (on him to be my counterpart)… I don't think (the counterpart) liked the job (expatriate # 6)

Relationships are generally structured for one-way capacity development (from expatriate to HCN), and in effective CD relationships HCN were able to recognise the value of the learning being imparted (e.g. '*They saw the value and everyone got value out of me because I worked with everyone'*, expatriate #13). However, also prominent among expatriates' beliefs about effective CD relationships was that learning must be two-way, and that the expatriate (not just counterpart) were motivated and expecting to learn. Sixteen expatriates spoke at length about their own learning from their effective (and in some cases ineffective) CD relationships; terminology like 'two-way learning' and 'mutual learning' were common. Several expatriates took steps to ensure that HCNs were aware of this by, for instance, explicitly acknowledging the contribution of counterparts:

(I)t's got to be with a sense of mutual learning … it wasn't contrived but I made it known to my counterpart that … it has to be a two-way learning process, your counterparts need to have that sense (that) it's a two-way learning experience (expatriate # 1).
(The) most fruitful relationship that we can get out of this is I learn something from you – you learn something from me (expatriate #7).

3. Interdependent cooperation toward a common goal

Effective CD relationships were characterised by a high degree of interdependence in the interactions between expatriate and HCN. This manifested in several ways. The first was the intensity of the work relationship. In general, expatriates saw regular, sustained, and sometimes intensive one-to-one interactions with HCNs conducive to CD. Direct collaborations – where expatriates and HCNs worked jointly side-by-side on problems, projects or tasks – opened opportunities for expatriates to model appropriate behaviours (the most commonly reported mentoring technique) or discuss processes or decisions (e.g. '*Through my relationships ... I was able to share new ways of kind of interacting with each other and doing things'*, expatriate #3). More than one expatriate discussed this condition as part of a conscious capacity building strategy of focusing on the *process* of working with the counterpart, rather than the *outcome* of the collaboration. As expatriate #8 explained it:

It sounds so cliché but it's true it's the process it's not the outcome. I'm not saying the outcome is not important I'm just saying that anyone can produce the outcome but if the staff have to produce it themselves then doing it for them is not going to enable them to do it.

This interdependence was amplified when expatriates and HCNs possessed compatible skill and knowledge (e.g. expatriates #14, #15, #19). In effective CD relationships, projects were organised such that HCNs' knowledge of the local context, culture and stakeholders complemented expatriates' technical knowledge and skills. Notable here is the role of HCN's culture-specific knowledge (including language skills) as a gateway for developing trust and achieving CD outcomes:

> *I come from a more academic background ... (HCNs) have a lot of experience and local knowledge working in the region ... that was a really important input (expatriate # 14).*
>
> *I saw that also this was – this was actually a good relationship to work together with because then our differences were also quite complementary (expatriate #15).*

A final contributor to perceptions of interdependence came from tangible markers of success. In general, expatriates felt that achieving concrete outcomes early in a placement (i.e. 'quick wins') helped to demonstrate their credibility and worth to their counterpart:

> *... that was a really early (success). They could see the difference ... immediately, so that was an early platform to sort of working together (expatriate #17).*
>
> *You've got to somehow get into double figures on your batting average ... the people who have been successful are the ones who establish credibility quickly…. and to do that you've got to ... demonstrate you're bona fide (expatriate #2).*

4. Opportunities for acquaintance

Another central theme that characterised the expatriates' accounts of successful CD relationships was the opportunity to develop friendships outside the 'formal' work relationship. Regular meetings and interactions offered the chance to get to know each other in a work context. However, the participants emphasised in particular the importance of social interactions like informal lunches, excursions, or family events (e.g. '*As you share experiences together, as you do things together, as you share yourself, you will build relationships*', expatriate #10). Expatriates reported using social settings strategically in the early stages of their placement as a mechanism to develop the friendship that they felt was necessary; these included accepting or extending invitations to coffee, meals, karaoke, holidays, drinking sessions, and parties with HCNs. Opportunities for personal self-disclosure (e.g. sharing family information and photos) were also important trust-building tools. Field trips to rural communities, outstations or international conferences were identified as particularly potent

opportunities to better understand each other's backgrounds, to build trust and to strengthen the

friendship in ways that flowed across to the workplace:

> *We were all there away from the office and (away) from doing whatever work we had to do, and I think that helped to build that relationship. After that, anything I wanted or anything I needed I can ask ... and it will just happen (expatriate #18).*
>
> *We were out and we were doing things which gave me a really good platform to start from ... It helped amazingly to build the relationship because we travelled together, be on the buses together and be on the motor bikes together ... we just got to know each other I think which really helped rather than just being in the office every ... (expatriate #17).*

While a combination of work and social interaction was common in successful CD

relationships, less successful relationships were characterised by a much more superficial engagement,

with little or no interactions outside work. Not surprisingly, crucial to developing friendships was the

counterparts' English language skills (or in a minority of cases, the expatriates' competence in

Vietnamese language). This was the most frequently mentioned HCN characteristic that contributed to

effective CD. Some expatriates recognised the role that they could play in improving language fluency

and creating opportunities for HNCs to get to know them. One approach used by at least eight

expatriates (#1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 16 & 17) was to organise and conduct English 'classes' with varying

degrees of formality for counterparts and other staff (outside the expatriates' formal role).

5. Supportive organisational environment and leadership

Finally, when expatriates talked about effective CD relationships, they emphasised the importance of

an organisational context that supported and encouraged their interactions with HCN staff. In

particular, managers of the host organisation were crucial in providing the structure and authority to

sanction and facilitate contact between the expatriate and HCN staff. This was achieved in a number

of ways, including recognising the value of expatriate contributions in front of HCN staff (e.g. '*(The*

manager) would say to the other (staff), 'You're so lucky to have (her)', expatriate #11), visibly

collaborating with expatriates themselves (e.g. expatriate #20), and consciously trying to include

expatriates as organisational 'insiders' despite their temporary tenure (e.g. expatriate #16). Managers

who supported effective CD relationships were more explicit and better organised in orchestrating

meetings and creating opportunities for knowledge sharing between expatriates and HCNs, especially

early in the placement. They also assisted by providing greater opportunities for expatriates to clarify

respective roles, responsibilities and boundaries for the expatriate-counterpart relationship:

> *(The manager) encouraged me on my arrival to sit with each of (the staff) for an hour or two*
> *as the best way of understanding their job. I sat next to them … just learning about what they*
> *did and it did teach me a lot (effective CD relationship, expatriate # 16).*
>
> *There was no (induction) at all … they took me to the office and left me there. It was just like a*
> *tin shed … on a main highway (ineffective CD relationship, expatriate #17)*

Finally, respondents felt that host organisations which had prior experience working with

expatriate staff had developed more effective mechanisms to facilitate expatriate–HCN interactions.

Examples of these provided by respondents were orientation and induction meetings (e.g. expatriate

#16), discussing responsibilities and expectations (e.g. expatriate #12), and regularly scheduled

progress reviews (e.g. expatriate #6). Beyond such formal arrangements, participants also emphasised

the contribution of a friendly office culture where both expatriate and HCN views were heard and

respected (e.g. '*This is a family. This is not a workplace, not as I know it*', expatriate #20).

DISCISSION

In 1954 Gordon Allport identified boundary conditions that can improve intercultural relations and

reduce prejudice. Fifty years later, our exploratory study of effective capacity development among

Australian expatriates in Viet Nam shows that similar conditions appear to characterise those

relationships that are most likely to be effective. While the conditions unearthed in our inductive study

are not identical to those of contact theory (for instance, similarity between expatriates and HCNs,

condition 1) the likenesses are, we believe, stark. At one level, this may be unsurprising. Studies are

starting to unearth a range of benefits of optimal contact conditions, including trust, empathy and

perspective-taking (Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011; Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, & Cairns,

2009), and while we are cautious of generalising too broadly from an exploratory, context-specific

study, we suggest that these conditions can form the basis of a model which begins to tease out some

key features of effective cross-cultural capacity development. Such a model is well positioned to lay

the foundation for strategic action by organisations seeking to increase the efficacy of their CD

initiatives. For instance, the features and associated strategies in Table 2 can provide practical utility to

NGOs by (a) guiding the design of interaction conditions between expatriates and HCN counterparts,

and/or (b) diagnosing (and correcting) dysfunctional CD relationships. The findings point to a number of relatively minor initiatives that could improve the efficacy of cross-cultural CD relationships, from determining criteria for recruiting and selecting expatriates, to establishing conditions within the host organisation that will support the relationship. It also begins to unpack some specific strategies that expatriates use in their CD efforts. As one expatriate explained it, '*People come with good intentions but to articulate that into fundamental change you need to bring in strategies as well' (#20).* While our findings are most relevant to organisations in the aid and development sector, we note that expatriates in the corporate sector are commonly asked to play similar roles as mentors, trainers and capacity developers for local staff when 'localising' subsidiaries (Law, Song, Wong, & Chen, 2009). Thus, the findings may be of interest beyond the not-for-profit sector.

The boundary conditions of effective CD relationships identified in Table 2 raise interesting issues for practitioners and researchers alike. To take just one example, expatriates' knowledge of the host culture is generally seen as being favourable to assignment success. Yet our findings suggest that a lack of cultural knowledge – genuine or feigned – can, in fact, be an impetus for effective capacity development; as a funnel for two-way (rather than one-way) learning (condition 2), and as a trigger for interdependent cooperation (condition 3). While we do not go as far to suggest that culturally ignorant expatriates may be more effective, the results do spotlight a potential trap for fully acculturated expatriates, who may miss out on vital opportunities to develop the capacity of counterparts. Based on these findings, we suggest that future research is warranted to identify what type and degree of cultural knowledge is optimal for effective CD relationships.

Our results also provide a platform for future researchers to finesse and extend the conditions that we identify here. As an example, the specific context of the study (Australian and Vietnamese partnerships) limits its generalisability; for instance, one possible explanation for the apparent success of these expatriates in addressing status inequality (condition 1) may be the large difference in power orientation (Hofstede, 1997) between the two cultures, and the culturally-derived skills of Australians capacity developers at deploying status minimisation strategies. Similarly, we are realistically cautious of some results like attributed similarity between expatriate and HCN to effective relationships (condition 1) which may have been biased by similarity attraction effects (Byrne, 1971).

Consequently, future research must encapsulate different cultural contexts, larger and broader samples of expatriates and –most importantly – include the perspective of HCN counterparts and managers, both absent in this study. We believe that the findings here provide a useful starting point for this important work.

Table 1: Research participants

Code	Age	Gender	Employer organisation (type)	Professional category*	Placement commencement (year)	Placement duration (months)	Interview transcript (words)
1	65	M	Government	education	2007	42	7,776
2	64	M	Government	Education	2009	13	8,543
3	40	F	Domestic NGO	Capacity building adviser	2010	11	8,540
4	35	M	International NGO	Design, Engineering, Science & Transport	2009	18	6,981
5	65	F	Domestic NGO	Management	2011	24	6,882
6	52	F	Government	Health	2010	28	7,904
7	62	M	International NGO	Business, Human Resources & Marketing	2012	12	9,121
8	38	F	International NGO	Design, Engineering, Science & Transport	2012	12	5,129
9	70	M	Domestic NGO	Education	2012	9	Notes (7 pages)
10	63	M	Domestic NGO	Business, Human Resources & Marketing	2011	23	8,496
11	50	F	Government	Education	2011	24	7,031
12	59	F	Domestic NGO	Legal, Social & Welfare	2012	18	7,144
13	40	F	International NGO	Design, Engineering, Science & Transport	2011	24	8,693
14	31	M	International NGO	Legal, Social & Welfare	2012	12	6,692
15	29	F	International NGO	Legal, Social & Welfare	2011	31	8,703
16	66	M	Domestic NGO	Business, Human Resources & Marketing	2012	18	10,143
17	61	F	Domestic NGO	Business, Human Resources & Marketing	2013	12	8,011
18	52	M	International NGO	Health	2012	13	10,859
19	33	F	International NGO	Design, Engineering, Science & Transport	2009	18	4,898
20	56	M	International NGO	Management	2013	24	Notes (8 pages)

* Australian Bureau of Statistics: Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO)

Table 2: Five conditions of effective cross-cultural capacity development relationships (summary)

Condition	Features of effective relationships	Strategies to build effective relationship	Example responses (effective CD relationships)	Example responses (ineffective CD relationships)
1. Perceptions of similarity and equality	a. Expatriate and HCN share similarities age, gender, background. b. Expatriate and HCN perceive each other as peers (equal status).	• Expatriate deploys strategies to minimise status differences. • Expatriates seek opportunities to position self as in-group.	• I saw myself very much as a peer … I was much younger than everybody else, and, and I was also very anxious to appear that I wasn't trying to tell people what to do (expatriate #14). • I consciously make every effort to have her on the same level as me, that we both have skills and knowledge, and we are working together to find the commonality (expatriate #12).	• They didn't respect me, because I was younger (expatriate #4). • We found out later that (expatriates were) being paid more than (HCNs) … and there was a bit of a friction between those two different statuses (expatriate #19).
2. Mutual openness and two-way learning	a. Both parties are enthusiastic about the relationship and motivated to learn. b. HCNs recognise that learning is two-way (both expatriate and HCN learn).	• HCN share expatriates' motivation for the CD relationship and objectives. • Expatriate is explicit in valuing and acknowledging learning from HCN.	• They were very passionate, very caring people who wanted to do better and who wanted to learn (#3) • They were very eager … they wanted to learn – they were very eager to learn so that really helped (expatriate #17). • I'm here to learn, and the most fruitful relationship that we can get out of this is I learn something from you – you learn something from me. Together we find a kind of a fruitful sort of part (expatriate #7).	• He didn't put any effort into helping achieve the goals of the project … wouldn't do anything, unless there was money in it … a superiority complex I suppose (expatriate # 4) • In her mind …I was apparently an expert and she was there to learn whereas I was saying that actually I wanted to learn (expatriate #5).
3. Interdependent cooperation towards common goal	a. Expatriate and HCNs possess complementary skills (including HCNs local cultural knowledge) b. Achievement of tangible 'success' early in placement.	• Expatriate focuses CD efforts on the process of collaboration rather than just the outcome.	• I spent a number of days with him over months just trying to get him to think about (the problem) … … If I was to do it myself it would only take a fraction of the time but to spend time with him (expatriate #8). • I was very focussed on not just delivering results, but teaching her how to do things (expatriate #10). • Then they see that it is truly adding value … (they) felt like they had something concrete finally that they could show people to show what we're doing … mutual respect really came about because I delivered something concrete for him … seeing is believing (#13).	• With [the counterpart] I'm just doing the (work) by myself and it's actually easier for me that way. … But the [relationships] where I've (collaborated) are really the ones that … I'd done a better job and learnt along the way too. (expatriate # 11). • I discovered that he was staying outside the office doing all the organising of the staff and so on from somewhere else so when he came to the office he'd actually done his work (expatriate #5).
4. Opportunities for acquaintance	a. Opportunities for social interactions between expatriate and HCN, including field trips. b. HCNs' competent communicating in English.	• Expatriate and HCN extend and accept invitations to non-work social events. • Expatriate and HCN assist each other to develop fluency in a	• A friendship definitely helped (capacity building) and a friendship helped him ask questions as well (expatriate #4). • The kinds of things that helped us bond I think were our field trips where we socialised (expatriate #13). • If you simply have a transactional relationship with your colleagues, then that's what you'll end up with, a transactional	• They did know some English but they were just not confident enough to use it with us (expatriate #19). • I didn't really hit it off …. maybe … because there is a bit of a drinking culture … and I didn't necessarily drink a lot with him. So yeah … he would avoid meetings

		common language. • Expatriate provides English language support for HCNs.	relationship. … As you share experiences together, as you do things together, as you share yourself, you will build relationships (expatriate #10). first of all and … he'd sort of just cut me off and started rambling about other things. (expatriate #4).
5. Supportive organisational environment and leadership	a. Organisational environment supports and encourages expatriates' interactions with HCNs. b. Organisation has prior experience working with expatriates.	• Manager/leader actively facilitates contact through clarifying roles, offering induction, and endorsing interaction between expatriate and HCN. • Host organisation makes active efforts to include expatriate in the organisational in-group.	• Understanding the ground rules.… and getting those resolved from day one, so that we're all on the same page (expatriate #2). • (The manager) was at great pains to include (expatriates and HCNs) in everything … he took photos (of us together); there's a couple of lovely photos from that day … it never occurred to me [why he did that] … I think probably as a way of getting me involved (expatriate #16). • (The manager) took me around … and introduced me to everyone (expatriate #4). • I felt like we never had that, the opportunity facilitated by the organisation to see ourselves as working together … there wasn't clarity for us about what our working relationship should be and how we should work together and how we should collaborate together (expatriate #15). • The complete lack of structure, the complete lack of real concern about what you did (expatriate #7). • Nobody told me to do anything for the first three months, which was a bit of a challenge (expatriate #12).

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

Amichai-Hamburger, Y., & McKenna, K. Y. A. (2006). The contact hypothesis reconsidered: Interacting via the Internet. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication, 11*, 825-843.

Andersen, P. H., & Skaates, M. A. (2004). Ensuring Validity in Qualitative International Business Research. In R. Marschan-Piekkari & C. Welch (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for International Business* (pp. 464-485). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Andrews, A. M., & Delahaye, B. L. (2000). Influences on knowledge processes in organizational learning: The psychological filter. *Journal of Management Studies, 37*(6), 2322-2380.

Blanchard, F. A., Adelman, L., & Cook, S. W. (1975). Effect of group success and failure upon interpersonal attraction in cooperating interracial groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*(6), 1020-1030.

Brewer, M. B., & Kramer, R. M. (1985). The psychology of intergroup attitudes and behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology, 36*, 219-243.

Byrne, D. (1971). *The Attraction Paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.

Chu, D., & Griffey, D. (1985). The contact theory of integration: The case of sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 2*, 323-333.

Dixon, J., Durrheium, K., & Tredoux, C. (2005). Beyong Optimal Contact Strategy: A reality check for the contact hypothesis. *American Psychologist, 60*(7), 697-711.

Dovidio, J., Gaertner, S., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past, present and the future. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*, 5-20.

Eade, D. (1997). *Capacity-Building: An Approach to People-Centred Development*. Oxford, UK: Oxfam.

Eade, D. (2007). Capacity building: Who builds whose capacity. *Development in Practice, 17*(4 & 5), 630-639.

Eyben, R. (2013). The sociality of international aid and policy convergence. In M. D. (Ed.), *Adventures in Aidland: The anthropology of professionals in international development* (pp. 139-160). New York: Berghahn.

Fechter, A.-M. (2012). The personal and the professional: Aid workers' relationships and values in the development process. *Third World Quarterly, 33*(8), 1387-1404.

Fee, A., & Gray, S. J. (2011). Fast-tracking expatriate development: the unique learning environments of international volunteer placements. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(3), 530–552.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The Critical Incident Technique. *Psychological Bulletin, 51*(4), 327-358.

Girgis, M. (2007). The capacity-building paradox: Using friendship to build capacity in the South. *Development in Practice, 17*(3), 353-366.

Hewstone, M., & Swart, H. (2011). Fifty-odd years of inter-group contact: From hypothesis to inegrated theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 50*, 374-386.

Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and Organisations: Software of the Mind, Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Huemer, L., von Krogh, G., & Roos, J. (1998). Knowledge and the concept of trust. In G. von Krogh, J. Roos & D. Kleine (Eds.), *Knowing in Firms: Understanding, managing and measuring knowledge* (pp. 123-145). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kasper-Fuehrer, E., & Ashkanasy, N. (2002). Communicating trustworthiness and building trust in interorganizational virtual organizations. *Journal of Management, 27*(3), 235-254.

Law, K. S., Song, L. J., Wong, C.-S., & Chen, D. (2009). The antecedents and consequences of successful localization. *Journal of International Business Studies, 40*, 1359-1373.

Levin, S., van Laar, C., & Sidanius, J. (2003). The effects of ingroup and outgroup friendship on ethnic attitudes in college: A longitudinal study. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*, 76-92.

Long, N. (2001). *Development Sociology: Actor Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Lough, B. J., & Matthews, L. (2013). Measuring and conveying the added value of international volunteering *Forum Discussion paper 2013* International Forum for Volunteering in Development.

Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. S., F.D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 709-734.

McKnight, H., Cummings, L. L., & Chervany, N. L. (1998). Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review, 23*(3), 473-490.

McWha, I. (2011). The roles of, and relationships between, expatriates, volunteers, and local development workers. *Development in Practice, 21*(1), 29-40.

Miller, N. (2002). Personalization and the promise of contact theory. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*, 387-410.

Moody, J. (2001). Race, school integration, and friendship segregation in America. *American Journal of Sociology, 107*, 679-716.

Morrison, E. W., & Herlihy, J. M. (1992). Becoming the best place to work: Managing diversity at American Express Travel related services. In S. E. Jackson (Ed.), *Diversity in the Workplace* (pp. 203-226). New York: Guilford.

Neeley, T. B. (2013). Language matters: Status loss and achieved status distinctions in global organizations. *Organizational Science, 24*(2), 476-497.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytical test of the intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751-783.

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*, 271-280.

Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (2007). An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 344-354.

Sherraden, M. S., Stringham, J., Sow, S. C., & McBride, A. M. (2006). The Forms and Structure of International Voluntary Service. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 17*(2), 156-173.

Slavin, R. E. (1985). Cooperative learning: Applying theory in desegregated schools. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*(3), 45-62.

Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., & Cairns, E. (2009). Intergroup trust in Northern Island. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 45-59.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of Mixed Methods Research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tenzer, H., Pudelko, M., & Harzing, A.-W. (2014). The impact of language barriers on trust formation in multinational teams. *Journal of International Business Studies, 45*, 508-535.

Teunissen, P. W., Scheele, F., Scherpbier, A. J. J. A., van der Vleuten, C. P. M., Boor, K., van Luijk, S. J., & van Diemen-Steenvoorde, J. A. A. M. (2007). How Residents Learn: Qualitative evidence for the pivotal role of clinical activities. *Medical Education, 41*(8), 763-770.

Yuki, M., Maddux, W. M., Brewer, M. B., & Takemura, K. (2005). Cross-cultural differences in relationship- and group-based trust. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(1), 48-62.