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ABSTRACT

Cooperation projects rooted in cultural ties, such as South-South cooperation, are contemporarily receiving unprecedented attention from the international development community. This focus on specific types of partnerships points to an increasing concern that who a development actor partners with matters. One reason behind the comparative advantage of South-South cooperation is that countries from the global South have similar social and cultural situations. Yet when and how culture practically matters to development has not been thoroughly explored within urban planning.

This thesis examines whether, when, and how cultural affinities matter for the successful design, management, and implementation of urban planning projects in the global South with international partnerships. By exploring the experiences of urban professionals working on collaborative projects in Maputo, Mozambique, this thesis argues that broadly speaking, culture does matter for cooperation and urban development, but whether cultural affinities and differences matter or not for a project largely depends on the project’s context. Simply speaking, national culture does not always matter. Consideration of culture beyond the national level to a sub-cultural level, such as employment and organization-type, often specifies when, how, and how much cultural affinities matter with cross-cultural urban planning cooperation projects. Ultimately, culture is a factor that needs to be more explicitly explored at a nuanced level and included in the design and management of collaborative urban planning projects. Further, culture should be a topic of conversation in promoting reflective practice and the goal of learning in development, such that cross-cultural exchange can be more enabling for urban development.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Culture, Cooperation, and Urban Development

South-South and triangular cooperation are contemporarily receiving "unprecedented attention" from both the South and the North, becoming a major subject of international conferences (Special Unit for South-South Cooperation, United Nations Development Programme, 2009: 23) and the focus of multilateral initiatives, such as the World Bank Institute’s establishment of the South-South Knowledge Exchange. Yet this focus on who collaborates with who on development projects (North-South, South-South, or trilateral) is certainly no new topic for consideration within international development. Countries in the global South have formally banned together to promote South-South cooperation since 1955 with the Bandung Conference, which was a response to the colonialism and neocolonialism that previously dominated much of how development occurred in the global South in the near preceding centuries. Trilateral cooperation notably entered into international development in a formalized way in 1972 with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) creating a special unit to promote technical co-operation among developing countries, known as TCDC for Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries. The formation of various specific, strategic development partnerships grew over the second half of the 20th century, suggesting an increasing emphasis on building certain types of partnerships that could be strategic in carrying out particular development goals. Carolini explains that this hybridization and diversification of South-South and trilateral partnerships points to an increasing concern that who a development actor partners with matters (forthcoming a).

Diversification of South-South and trilateral partnerships occurred as these types of partnerships developed with more focus on specific geographies and sectors, such as cooperation efforts forming around the urban scale in the mid-1990s. South-South and trilateral cooperation formalized within the field of urban planning and international development with the establishment of partnerships such as Slum/Shack Dwellers (SDI) in 1996, Cities Alliance in 1999, and United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) in 2004. The formation of partnerships looking specifically at international development within urban planning suggests that the topic of who partners with who has specific relevance to the field of urban planning within international development.

There are many different lenses through which to consider why who you collaborate with matters. One argument is that the global South shares a certain set of historical experiences that causes countries within the global South to ban together (Cesarino, 2012). A second related argument is that South-South cooperation efforts are a better vehicle for development because they do not
engender serious power imbalance (Guevera, 1964). A third argument points to the importance of commonalities in geography, which can create specific development challenges (Vazquez, 2013). A fourth lens is that a comparative advantage of South-South cooperation is that countries in the global South have similar social and cultural situations (Special Unit for South-South Cooperation, United Nations Development Program, 2009). Relating to this fourth lens, North argues that culture matters to development because culture is slow to change, and thus culture can hinder some reforms that are not aligned with extant culture while accelerating other reforms that are aligned with extant culture (1990). This thesis will explore the validity of this theory that culture matters to development.

More specifically, this thesis will explore the hypothesis that culture matters to “success” in urban development projects by nuancing when and how culture matters. This topic will be explored by explaining how urban professionals working in Maputo describe what works and what does not work in their collaboration projects and why. These stories will be used to analyze the validity of notions of whether South-South cooperation projects create more enabling environments for effective exchange than North-South cooperation projects because South-South cooperation projects have more cultural affinities. Ultimately, this thesis explores how development realities reflect multiple drivers of outcomes, including but not limited to cultural affinities. As Michael Woolcock describes, development projects have “high causal density” (2013: 8); this point of Woolcock’s nuances North’s point that culture matters to development. What will ultimately be argued and shown in this thesis is that there are complexities within the importance of cultural affinities and collaboration on urban development projects, and that context is critical in determining when, how, and how much cultural affinities matter for the successful design, management, and implementation of urban planning projects in the global South with international partnerships. This argument can help guide international organizations looking to support South-South and trilateral cooperation, because a more nuanced understanding of when, how, and how much cultural affinities matter for international cooperation will enable the formation of more fruitful partnerships. As will become apparent throughout the case studies in this research, cultural context needs to be discussed at a sub-national level when establishing partnerships for effective cooperation in urban development, as different aspects of culture that are more specified than the macro-geographical scale often have a greater impact on developing effective partnerships.

Literature Review

This literature review will begin with defining what is development, because how development is defined affects how one interprets success in urban development.
Then literature defining development is connected to literature on learning and power, as these become central themes in considering what successful urban development might look like with cooperation projects. After getting into broader topics that relate to cooperation in development, such as organizational theory and communication, this section concludes with defining culture, as culture is the topic being focused on in this thesis as one key factor that is foundational in how international development organizations think about collaboration.

**What is development?**

In looking to evaluate when development projects are successful or not, a brief discussion of what is ‘development’ is important. Amartya Sen made an important contribution to the field of international development in shifting the paradigm of development arguing that development is not purely about economic development, but more importantly about freedom, where individual agency and social arrangements are key to the primary ends and the principal means of development (1999). This idea of development being about freedom is critical to a discussion about cooperation and planning, as cooperation entails an environment where all parties in the cooperative effort have an opportunity and the directive of choice within the partnership structure to direct and influence the project. The ends of a project within the “cooperation” spectrum are not solely about economic development, but also about ensuring agency for those in the context where the project is taking place to promote holistic development. On one hand, South-South cooperation may be thought to promote more freedom for partners because the global South might not be restricted by histories of paternalism from the global North. Yet on the other hand, ultimately, the idea of development as freedom is incongruent with the notion that South-South cooperation may create a more enabling environment for effective exchange than North-South cooperation, because such prescription of partners contrasts with the idea of freedom. This thesis will address a gap discussing whether and how much of the contemporary academic conversation on “what is development” is being appropriately applied to practice through current policy initiatives like South-South cooperation.

**Connecting development, learning, and power**

Discussions about cooperation in international development should be connected with the more recent literature which looks at development as learning. Understanding this scholarly background for development and learning is especially important in light of leading multilateral organizations, such as the World Bank, promoting a focus on knowledge exchange (World Bank Institute, 2013). Greenwald and Stiglitz argue that “a central focus of development policy should be, how to promote learning, how to create a ‘learning economy and society’ “ (2012:
conclusion). In focusing on industrial policy, they critique neo-classical models and Washington Consensus policies which viewed learning and innovation as outside of economic development policies. In contrast, they cite how the success of East Asia’s development largely depended on a recognition of the importance of learning. This last point relates to Amsden’s work on the rise of the manufacturing industry in East Asia being dependent on the transfer of knowledge-based assets (2001). Greenwald and Stiglitz’s and Amsden’s work provides case-backed evidence for learning being a critical part of development, including economic development (Carolini, forthcoming b).

The importance of incorporating space for learning in the international development project sphere has recently been emphasized by those such as Pritchett, Samji, and Hammer. Pritchett et al. promote the idea of ‘structured experiential learning’ to build learning objectives into a project (2012). Andrews, Pritchett, and Woolcock call for the importance of an active learning mechanism with development projects (2011). A gap in the literature that this thesis addresses is bringing this emphasis on learning within international development specifically into urban planning and considering how culture influences learning objectives and urban development.

Most directly, Sabel and Reddy (2007) advocate a “learning-centered approach to development” (73). Their promotion of learning comes from their critique of a dominant orthodoxy in international economics which has had the core assumption over the previous two decades that there was a good, established array of alternatives that did not require further learning. In response, they argue for a re-arrangement of new relations between actors, as well as changes to the rules that govern these relations, such that experimentation and mutual learning can occur. Sabel and Reddy address power relations, suggesting the idea of “de-hierarchical” relations in multi-lateral funding institutions like the IMF and World Bank becoming “learning-to-learn” institutions (2007: 88). Like Connell (2007) and McFarlane (2010), they argue that the development “expert agent” has led to the exclusion of the “weak” (2007: 73-74). They address issues of power and learning, as they call for learning to be “collective” (75). These ideas about power were also central to the discourse on learning introduced by Freire (1970).

Freire’s connection between power dynamics and development (1970), and the work of aforementioned scholars on learning dynamics, relates to much of the current focus on South-South cooperation in international development. The idea of balanced power dynamics has been one of the intrinsic ideas to why South-South cooperation is an improvement over North-South cooperation. Furthermore, another prominent contemporary argument is that South-South cooperation can be just as imbalanced a mechanism of development aid as traditional North-South relationships as leaders emerging within the global South, such as Brazil and South
Africa, engage in what is often labeled as South-South cooperation (Alden and Vieira, 2005; Quadir, 2013). In this case, imbalanced power relations can occur between these emerging leaders of the global South and countries with more economically or politically weak circumstances. This thesis addresses a gap in the literature on how an individual’s or an organization’s cultural and sub-cultural positionality within a cooperation project can influence the perception of and/or reality of such power dynamics, and how culture should be addressed in collaborative projects in response to such perceptions and realities.

In order to discern how power dynamics might emerge in cross-cultural collaboration projects, an important idea to grasp is Sanyal’s idea of different ‘planning cultures,’ where different places have different ideas and methods for approaching urban planning (2005). The literature on ‘planning cultures’ has tended to focus on the movement and origination of planning ideas. But how the interaction of different planning cultures affects cross-cultural collaboration, and ultimately successful implementation of collaborative planning projects, is a gap in the literature this thesis will touch on. In considering how different planning cultures interact, integrating concepts of power dynamics becomes important, as the styles and histories of different planning cultures influence whether balance or imbalanced power relations occur between partners. Furthermore, the notion of different planning cultures reflects a key theme in this thesis that planning needs to consider and embrace the complexities of urban development.

Some of the most recent work in framing development turns towards addressing the complexities of development. Woolcock explains how “development professionals engage with issues of increasing ‘complexity’: consolidating democratic transitions, reforming legal systems, promoting social inclusion, enhancing public sector management” (2013: 16). This list of complex development issues from Woolcock are all topics that are increasingly central to urban planning. In response to addressing such matters, Woolcock calls for a change in implementation strategies that address the “decidedly (wickedly) complex” issues development professionals must address today (2013: 16). As part of this recognition of the complexity of development challenges, international development policy literature is turning more towards focusing on the contextual nature of each setting, and how best practices and policies cannot all universally apply (Peck, 1990; Andrews, Pritchett and Woolcock, 2012). Addressing the contextual nature of each setting reinforces the idea that collaborative projects must consider each partner’s planning culture, acknowledging how places and organizations have different ideas and methods for approaching urban planning. This thesis will conclude with ideas about how development professionals could react to the complexities that occur when collaboration is occurring across cultures.
In order to deal with working between different planning cultures on complex issues, communication becomes a key topic. Professional literature within the business and corporate environments provides much attention to communication strategies in gaining organization efficiencies. In this sector, improving cross-cultural communication within a multi-national project team is seen as a critical path for achieving successful project implementation (Hofstede, 2010). In contrast, the role of communication or its substantive study within urban planning and development evaluations is often limited to exploring communication between experts and communities impacted, or what could be viewed as the “client” in a business realm. Further, business management literature looks not only at communication, but also at the development of trust across national cultures (Doney et al, 1998). Another gap this thesis will address is how alike business and corporate environments, the study of communication and building trust within urban planning and international development is key for interactions among planners and technicians themselves, not just for interactions between planners and communities from different cultures. Addressing communication between partners is a critical avenue for creating healthy relationships that can address the complex, contextual issues in urban development. Further, addressing communication between partners will better enable working with individuals and organizations from different planning cultures.

Framing of culture

Culture, it has been suggested, “is probably the broadest concept of all those used in the historical social sciences. It embraces a very large range of connotations, and thereby it is the cause perhaps of the most difficulty” (Wallerstein, 1990: 31). Acknowledging the difficulty in framing culture, this thesis will look to the most-encompassing definitions of culture. North defines culture based on Boyd and Richerson’s definition as the “transmission from one generation to the next, via teaching and imitation, of knowledge, values, and other factors that influence behavior” (1985: 2). Another useful definition of culture is from Giddens, which states that the concept of culture “consists of the values the members of a given group hold, the norms they follow, and the material goods they create” (1989: 310). What is particularly helpful with this definition is the emphasis on how culture includes a society’s pattern of work and its ideologies. Thus, when discussing culture in this thesis, culture will include, but not be limited to, certain behavioral traits of a group of people which are shaped by shared attributes such as certain knowledge, values, and language.

An important point to understand about culture is its slowness to change. This concept may seem bizarre in our contemporary technological world where a so-called new fashion or music fad appears every month. Yet this thesis explores
culture as it relates to values and behaviors, which run much deeper. Douglas North describes how even when there are changes in the formal rules of a society, change happens much slower because of informal constraints. North describes the origin of these informal constraints as coming from “socially transmitted information and are a part of the heritage we call culture” (1990: 37). Establishing this connection between culture and the notion of informal constraints is helpful in establishing a basis for the idea that culture does not readily change, and is thus something urban planning must react to and work within.

Yet, while culture is slow to change, it is not stagnant. Another one of the aspects of culture that will be important in this discussion is the concept of how cultural identities shift with history. As Hall explains:

Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But like everything which is historical they undergo constant transformation. Far from being externally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power (Hall, 1990: 225).

This idea of cultural identities changing with the context of the times seems obvious, but it is important to explicitly state and explore, because as many of the cases in this research showed, assumptions that can easily be made about when culture might matter in cooperation often do not hold true because these assumptions are based in ideas of past, not current, cultural identities and relationships. Nonetheless, an important counterpoint that will also be explored through this thesis is how the legacy of colonialism and race can be more unchanging in shaping cultural identity. These are the types of nuances within culture that this thesis will address.

In considering when culture matters, part of the point is to illustrate that culture is not an ultimate or unitary explanation for when collaboration fails or succeeds. As Geertz states, “culture is not a power, something to which social events, behaviors, institutions, or processes can be causally attributed; it is a context, something within which they can be intelligibly- that is, thickly- described” (1973: 14). In exploring how culture affects collaboration projects in Maputo, culture is thought of as a way to explore complexities in the context of and the interpretation of the meanings of these interactions, not as a power that clearly determines the outcomes of a cooperation project.

Further, this discussion of when, and for whom, culture matters in development cooperation is not meant to make absolute statements. Conversely, the objective is to speak to some observations within one specific context, with the ultimate goals of (a) showing an example of the complexity of the relationship between culture and development, and (b) illustrating the importance of deeply considering and reflecting on this relationship when establishing and working within cooperation projects.
Context of Maputo, Mozambique

Maputo, the capital of Mozambique, provides a valuable context for this research because of its complex cultural background. Mozambique has a diversity of native cultures, and the country’s cultural landscape became increasingly diverse during colonization with interactions with Europeans, as well as with traders from the Indian and Arab worlds. More recently, this cultural diversity has further intensified as natural resources bring large foreign involvement in the country’s capital.

Mozambique’s history as a Portuguese colony began with the arrival of the first Portuguese explorers in 1498. Until the twentieth century, the Portuguese occupation was limited primarily to coastal trading areas with occasional military activity in the interior. Portuguese presence increased in the early twentieth century, as present-day Maputo became the colonial capital in 1902, and Portuguese settlers increased after WWII. By 1960, 52% of the population in present-day Maputo, then known as Lorenço Marques, was white. Further cross-national cultural complexity came to Maputo with the city’s coastal position. Mainly since the early 1800s, and even before that time, cities along Africa’s Indian Ocean coast had large Indian populations, which were largely involved with trade and subsequently retail. Maputo was no exception, with around 6,500 Indians in 1960. For the same reasons, Maputo also began to develop a small Chinese population (Morton, forthcoming).

The Portuguese population played a large role in Maputo’s urban development, as the city’s urban design became more similar to European urban design traditions than those in Africa. During this time period, Maputo’s distinct center city was colloquially known as the City of Cement. Much of the central city was developed with modernist architecture, with high-rise apartment buildings along large, wide boulevards. Such urban design stood in stark contrast to the shantytown growth around the so-called Cement City. The band of shantytown settlements was often called the Cidade de Caniço (“City of Reeds”) (Morton, forthcoming).

While Portuguese rule over Mozambique ended in 1975 when power transferred to the arguably socialist Marxist Frelimo party, the ties between Portugal and Mozambique inevitably continued. The period immediately after independence was followed by a large migration of the Portuguese out of Mozambique. But Portuguese populations have trickled back to Maputo, especially as job opportunities are harder to find in Portugal, and language and cultural heritage provide a natural draw in Maputo for Portuguese who are looking to move abroad (Harding, 2012).

In addition to Mozambique’s colonial history, the country’s natural resources have also played an important role increasing cross-cultural interactions. Since the
1980s, the discovery of mineral wealth, primarily coal and natural gas, created an influx of Western and Chinese investments, both public and private (Nylen, forthcoming), as well as interest from neighboring African countries. Some have considered investment in the country as neocolonialism, which has increased cross-cultural interactions. Such natural resources, as well as the relative political stability Mozambique has had in comparison to neighboring African countries in the 1990s and 2000s (Carolini, forthcoming a), has brought great foreign investment in Mozambique. The "donor community" in Mozambique financed 54% of the country's budget in 2007 (Nylen, forthcoming) and 40% in 2012 (Mozambique Economy Report, 2013; Reaud, 2012). Such international involvement in Mozambique has also supplemented the already ethnically diverse population in Maputo as foreign expatriates and development professionals from around the world come to Mozambique. The history and precedent of cross-national interaction with countries from the global North and global South in Maputo makes this city a valuable place for this research.

Methodology

This research used two different ways to explore this hypothesis in Maputo, Mozambique. The first method was through broader exploration; organizations in Maputo were identified that have dealt with many different types of collaboration projects. The reasoning behind this tactic was that such organizations could provide valuable insights in being able to compare many different types of partnerships. Additionally, these organizations could suggest insightful, timely projects for more in-depth exploration. Interviews at three larger, management organizations were conducted: one at the National Planning and Institutional Department for the Republic of Mozambique, four at the National Association of Municipalities in Mozambique (ANNaM), and one at the City of Maputo's International Relations Office (see list below for exact information on interviewees).

The second method was through in-depth exploration of collaboration projects. One of these projects was identified before the broader exploration interviews, while the other three were identified through key contacts interviewed in the field. As part of the in-depth exploration, interviews were conducted with multiple individuals working on a project from different positions. This design allowed for verification of ideas, and more importantly, comparison of how individuals from different cultural positions were responding to the same project. The four projects/partnerships researched more in-depth included: The Italian-Brazilian Triangular Cooperation Program for the Urban Upgrading of Chamanculo-C, the Millennium Challenge Account Mozambique Land Project, the Barcelona-Maputo Sister-City Partnership, and Participatory Budgeting in Maputo.
Before research began, this thesis planned for one primary in-depth case of a trilateral project between Brazil, Mozambique, and Italy for upgrading the “bairro,” or neighborhood, of Chamanculo-C in Maputo. Cities Alliance was also involved in the formation of this partnership. This case study would have been well-positioned for examining how cultural affinities matter with the success of urban development projects, because Mozambique was partnering with one country from the global South and another from the global North. A proposed plan of implementation for this trilateral cooperation was written in 2010, and the project was known to be underway because of Gabriella Carolini’s previous fieldwork. But once field research began, it became apparent that this one case study would not be able to provide enough evidence, as many parts of the project were currently on-hold and some of this project’s different partners would not be present in Mozambique during the time of the field research. Thus, the methodology expanded to include different primary cases for in-depth exploration. How these primary cases were selected depended greatly on the availability and willingness of key informants to participate in an interview, as well as their ability and eagerness to provide further contacts. Ultimately, exploring a broader range of projects was incredibly valuable to this thesis’ conclusions, because many of the key findings supporting the conclusion came from examples unknown before field research, and finding such cases before entering the country would have been difficult since they are not well publicized.

Contacts were primarily gained through a snow-balling technique. Initial contacts were often gained through MIT alumni or professor connections. Ultimately, informal interviews were conducted with 33 individuals, including second interviews with six of these individuals (see list of interviews below). COUHES’ approval for interviews was received prior to fieldwork. Interview questions were always prepared prior to the interview and often reviewed beforehand by Professor Carolini through email exchange, especially towards the beginning of the interviewing process. While most interviews contained questions with the same core ideas, the questions were always individualized for each interview. As the fieldwork developed, questions were altered such that the wording better asked for the desired information. A critical part of the redevelopment of these questions and identification of areas for further exploration occurred through roughly bi-weekly skype conversations with Professor Carolini during fieldwork. These skype meetings were also critical for myself in staying

---

1 COUHES is MIT’s policy requiring that the Committee on the Use of Humans as Experimental Subjects review and approve all research involving human subjects that is performed under the auspices of MIT
encouraged with doing fieldwork, especially during times of waiting and changing direction.

A hired translator was present for almost all interviews. The main translator was a Mozambican well-referenced from an American who has been living in Maputo and working in the development and news industry in Mozambique for multiple decades. In order to gain more trust and engagement from the interviewee, I took time to learn Portuguese, such that I could provide a general introduction of myself, my translator, and the topic in the informant’s primary language. I studied Portuguese for about three months before leaving for Mozambique, both with a weekly class at the Cambridge Center for Adult Education as well as with a language-partner exchange program run through MIT. Upon arriving in Maputo in June, I spent two weeks exclusively studying Portuguese with private lessons, and then I continued with these lessons as I began my period of fieldwork. Having time set aside before my fieldwork to focus on becoming familiar with living in the city of Maputo and interacting with people there was critical for being able to show genuine interest and commitment in interviews.

Most informants in management and administrative positions could speak some English, but a translator was helpful to provide translation when the informant was unsure of a word or felt he/she could more easily express a statement in Portuguese. Most informants in a more technical position used the translator for the majority of the interview. One main translator was used, as this provided for continuity and was especially helpful as the translator became familiar with any specific urban planning terminology, as well as with the names of organizations, individuals, and projects being researched. A further advantage of using one primary translator was the translator’s relationship with the informant became important in building trust for repeated interviews. Also, having one translator was critical for myself in building trust with the translator, which helped to increase the translator’s willingness to share cultural insights with me, as well as my willingness to ask the translator for clarification. After interviews, time was taken with the translator to review any comments that could not be translated during the interview, as well as to reflect with the interviewer about the tone of the interview. This reflection was important, because the translator could provide cultural context for a situation.

At the beginning of interviews, informants were asked if the interview could be recorded. The majority of informants agreed. These recordings were transcribed generally within a couple of days. Occasionally informants asked that a statement would not be recorded or a quote would not be written; during such instances, I also clearly turned off the recording and stopped writing notes. Mental notes on the gist of the idea were taken and recorded after the interview.
Any notes taken during interviews were re-typed as soon as possible immediately after interviews to mitigate the loss of information. In addition to typing the content of interviews, during this time, I intentionally took time to reflect upon the interview, considering questions such as how the informant presented himself/herself during the interview, and when comments might have been in a more political tone versus a more casual tone. The skype conversations with Professor Carolini were helpful to allow me to reflect on my interviewing methods and adjust them with the insights Professor Carolini could provide from her previous fieldwork in Maputo.

Repeated interviews were a crucial technique for gaining more in-depth information, especially around more sensitive topics such as race. Gaining repeated interviews in the international development field can be particularly difficult as individuals frequently travel.

Being a young, engaged foreign student seemed to help in gaining some interviews. An enthusiastic, humble attitude was critical for gaining second interviews and further contacts at the end of interviews.
## List of Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Organization (Eng)</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title (Eng)</th>
<th>Date(s) interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chamanculo-C</td>
<td>AVSI</td>
<td>Alessandro Galimberti</td>
<td>Representative in Mozambique</td>
<td>6.21.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVSI</td>
<td>Felisbela Materrula</td>
<td>Social Technician</td>
<td>7.4.13; 7.24.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVSI</td>
<td>Flavio Nheato</td>
<td>Field Social Technician</td>
<td>7.4.13; 7.25.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVSI</td>
<td>Martins Navingo</td>
<td>Field Social Technician</td>
<td>7.4.13; 7.25.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVSI</td>
<td>HélioManhiuse</td>
<td>Field Social Technician</td>
<td>7.4.13; 7.25.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMM- Dept. of Urban Planning and Environment</td>
<td>Cesar Cunquara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technician</td>
<td>7.16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMM- Dept. of Urban Planning and Environment</td>
<td>Silvia Cabrita</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMM- Dept. of Urban Planning and Environment</td>
<td>Rogério Nuvunga</td>
<td>Supervisor of Urban and Environmental Issues on Cham-C project</td>
<td>7.17.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMM- Dept. of Urban Planning and Environment</td>
<td>Elionio Cossa</td>
<td>Head of Division of Urban Plans for CMM</td>
<td>7.29.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMM</td>
<td>Luís Nhaca</td>
<td>Councilor for Urban Planning and Environment</td>
<td>7.31.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA Moz. Land Project</td>
<td>HTSPE</td>
<td>Ian Rose</td>
<td>Team Leader; MCA Technical Assistance to the Land Component</td>
<td>7.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HTSPE</td>
<td>Catarina Chidamarawla</td>
<td>Community Outreach and Gender Technician</td>
<td>7.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DNFT-MCA</td>
<td>João Carrilho</td>
<td>Project Coordinator of Land Component</td>
<td>7.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DNFT-MCA</td>
<td>Halima</td>
<td>Social Technician with National Planning Department</td>
<td>7.8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DNFT-MCA</td>
<td>Douglas Black</td>
<td>Technical and Cadastral Advisor for DNFT</td>
<td>7.24.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>Mario Ruy Marques</td>
<td>Technician for Land Resources and Management</td>
<td>7.18.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>Evan Freund</td>
<td>Deputy Resident Country Director</td>
<td>7.23.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona-Maputo Partnership</td>
<td>International Cooperation Barcelona City Council</td>
<td>Jordi Cortés i Roldán</td>
<td>Director of International Relations and Cooperation</td>
<td>7.13.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipality of Barcelona</td>
<td>Genís Amàs Pàez</td>
<td>Director of Municipal Markets in Barcelona</td>
<td>7.13.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AECID</td>
<td>Maria Salazar Gonzalez</td>
<td>Official for the Institutional Support Project for the Municipalities of Mozambique</td>
<td>7.3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Budgeting</td>
<td>CMM Municipal Directorate of Finance</td>
<td>Laura Parruque</td>
<td>Assistant Director/Deputy Director</td>
<td>7.25.13; 7.26.13; 7.31.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMM</td>
<td>Antonio Mabuie</td>
<td>Technician of Infrastructure at the KaMobukware Administration</td>
<td>8.1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/ General</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Sara Candiracci</td>
<td>Urban Planning Advisor for WB Pro-Maputo Program</td>
<td>6.17.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANAMM</td>
<td>Dionísio Cherewa</td>
<td>Secretary General of ANAMM</td>
<td>7.19.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANAMM</td>
<td>Clémio Justino Cubace</td>
<td>Official of Communication</td>
<td>7.19.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANAMM</td>
<td>Abel Manhique</td>
<td>Official of Programs</td>
<td>7.19.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANAMM</td>
<td>Pedro Laice</td>
<td>Official of Cooperation</td>
<td>7.19.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Christian Kapfensteiner</td>
<td>Program Officer Municipalities, Monitoring &amp; Civil Society</td>
<td>7.3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Cândida Moiane</td>
<td>National Director of Planning and Institutional Development</td>
<td>7.16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities Climate Change</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Cris Rangel</td>
<td>Consultant in Urban Planning for the MAE/DNDA</td>
<td>7.3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2: When Cultural Affinities Matter

Different Ways Cultural Affinities Matter

Martins Navingo, a social field technician from AVSI, reflected during an open discussion on international cooperation that he thinks working with Brazil is a good thing, and a better option for Mozambique than for working with a country like Italy. Though of course Navingo was speaking on very generalized terms, his point is of interest for urban planning and international development more widely as it hints to the importance of cultural affinities in the implementation of collaborative development projects. Navingo continued that there is an “African-ness” to Brazilian culture that simplifies working together (July 4, 2014). Navingo did not expand on what exactly he meant by his description of “African-ness;” the reference referred to more of a general feeling or sense that can be hard to describe, but the vigor with which Navingo made this statement indicates the importance of the concept of shared cultural affinities that is worth exploring. This chapter expands on and explores some of the factors that Navingo’s general description of “African-ness” could include, such as shared experiences, shared “ways of being,” and shared work styles. Of the informants who spoke about what shared attributes make for a successful project, the most commonly cited factors were shared experiences/problems, followed by language, work styles, and ways of being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Factor</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Ways of Being</th>
<th>Work Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewees that referenced (n=33)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Many interviewees might not have referenced one of these cultural factors, because the conversation may have not been focused on this specific topic.

These four cultural factors were not generally prompted during interviews, because as discussed in the literature review, culture is a broad concept that is difficult to define (Wallerstein 1990). Thus, in keeping to an all-encompassing view of culture, informants were left to generally identify cultural factors that affect collaboration by themselves.2 Considering this research approach, the fact that four key themes emerged suggests significant importance for closely addressing these four themes.

The first subject of exploration in this chapter is that of the importance of shared language, as while this was not the most commonly cited factor, this was generally the first cultural attribute interviewees referenced in considering what

---

2 By using a translator, it was hard to completely control for leading questions.
factors are critical for creating an enabling environment for effective project cooperation.

Before discussing the case studies in this section, an interesting observation from the conversations discussed below is how informants frequently made large blanket statements grouping individuals and organizations together into continents and global regions, and then attached cultural characteristics and traits to these in a way that alluded to stereotyping. Discussing generalizations is difficult to avoid in a conversation around culture and collaboration, especially with limited time during interviews. As will be expanded in the last chapter, discussing cultural affinities and differences is difficult, and a fear of stereotyping and harming others often inhibits the discussion of culture in international development. Yet, such fears surrounding bias and discrimination should not stop conversations around cultural affinities and differences from occurring, because without these conversations, there is no way to address the bias, discrimination, and stereotyping that exists, but often goes unaddressed. As argued in the conclusion, what ultimately is needed to enable more nuanced, accurate discussions around and understandings of culture is cross-cultural communication training and reflective practice. Conversations around culture and collaboration will need to start somewhere. What this thesis hopes to accomplish is that by acknowledging existing frameworks, a gap is highlighted in the need for promoting reflective practices in urban development that encourage more nuanced understandings of culture.

**Shared language**

Similarity in language can be one of the most important cultural attributes for establishing a positive environment for exchange and cooperation. A common language clearly makes exchange easier for a number of reasons that do not directly relate to culture, such as the number of difficulties that come with needing translation. The phrases, tones, and double meanings of words in a language can all give nuanced cultural references that are not easily understood by a non-speaker. While nuanced differences can occur within a language between regions and subcultures, speaking a language still provides a basis upon which such differences can more quickly be understood and communicated in comparison to when there is not common linguistic ground for two parties.

But even beyond the inherent difficulties of communicating across languages, culture plays an important role because as North explains, culture is a “language-based conceptual framework” (1990: 37). North alludes to the idea that language influences the way humans cognitively interpret and organize information (1990). Building off of this idea North presents, the language we are familiar with can

---

3 The terms for exchange and cooperation will be used interchangeably for the remainder this thesis.
influence how we see, interpret, and communicate a situation. Thus, a shared language provides grounds for greatly easing exchange and creating an enabling environment for development.

Multiple key interviews pointed to how a primary reason that Brazil is a major country with South-South Cooperation projects in Mozambique is because both places are Lusophone countries. An important point to note from all interviews described below was that the informants initiated the importance of language without a leading question on the importance of language in exchange. For example, when one informant, Sara Candaricci, the Urban Planning Advisor for the World Bank “ProMaputo Program” at the Municipality of Maputo, generally reflected on collaboration projects in Maputo, she initiated a discussion about how Brazil is the major player in South-South Cooperation projects in Maputo, and a major reason for this is language. Candaricci referenced how the use of English is limited in Mozambique, which limits Mozambique from partnering with many other countries. A practical example from Candaricci’s work is that as part of ProMaputo, she has been involved with developing a masters degree in Maputo on slum upgrading, and the majority of the materials for the program come from Brazil, because of Brazil’s language similarity and their “expertise” in urban policy (June 17, 2013). Another informant, João Carrilho, the Project Coordinator of the Land Component for the US Millennium Challenge Account Mozambique Land Project, stated that an advantage of working with Brazil over other countries is that Brazil speaks the same language (July 2, 2013). Similarly, Dionisio Cherewa’s, the Secretary General of ANAMM (the National Association of Municipalities in Mozambique), first reason for explaining why ANAMM’s major upcoming municipality-municipality exchanges are between Brazil and Mozambique is because of language (July 19, 2013). Six informants from the Chamanculo-C Triangular project referenced language as a primary reason for Brazil’s involvement in the project. Cesar Cunguara, a Technician for the CMM Department of Urban Planning and Environment who has worked on the Chamanculo-C Triangular Project, and Luis Nhaca, the Municipality of Maputo’s Councilor for Urban Planning and Environment who oversees the Chamanculo-C Triangular Project, both stated that the first reason why it is easier to work with Brazilians than North Americans or Europeans is because of language (July 10, 2013; July 31, 2013). Another informant working on the Chamanculo-C project, Felisbella Materrula, who is a Mozambican working for AVSI as a Community Activities Coordinator and Social Technician, stated that the training of Mozambican social technicians for completing a household survey in Chamanculo-C was better with the Brazilians than with the Italians because of language and communication; she stated, “their [the Brazilians’] communication flowed much better” (July 4, 2013). Also from the Chamanculo-C project, a Mozambican working as a Social Field Technician for AVSI, Hélio Manhisse,
responding to the question of whether it is easier to have exchange with people from different places, noted that “it's easier with people from Brazil, because of language; it's much easier, it's a more fruitful experience because of language” (July 4, 2013). Another Social Field Technician being interviewed at the same time, Flávia Nheoto, concurred that exchange is easier with Brazil because of the communication aspect (July 4, 2013).

These different informants come from a variety of positionalities, further emphasizing how language is an universally important point in enabling exchange. Sara Candaricci is a foreigner, while the other informants referenced above are Mozambicans. Furthermore, Candaricci, Carrilho, Cherewa, and Nhaca are all in more senior management positions, while Cunguara, Materrula, Manihisse, and Nheoto are all technicians. Candaricci and Carilho speak fluent English, and Cunguara and Nhaca speak moderate English, which further emphasizes the point of similar language being critical for aspect for cross-cultural collaboration, as it is not only viewed as a critical point for those who speak Portuguese in Maputo, but also by those who have the ability to exchange in English, which is globally the most common shared language for cross-cultural exchange in development work. Thus, these individuals’ responses are reflective of the nuances of why similarity in language is important beyond the basics of making communication easier.

Brazil is not the only Lusophone country that works well with Mozambique. Despite a troubled history, Portugal has a major presence in collaborative projects in Maputo. A primary example occurs with Maputo’s development of participatory budgeting. Laura Parruque, the Assistant Director for the Municipality of Maputo’s Municipal Directorate of Finance, explained how when Maputo started developing its participatory budgeting in 2008, the country that Maputo communicated the most easily with regarding participatory budgeting was Brazil. Parruque explained that with Brazil being one of the pioneering countries with participatory budgeting, many seminars were held in Brazil. But as of 2012, according to Parruque, Maputo works the most easily with Portugal. The Municipality of Maputo has a Portuguese consultant who they connected with through the World Bank, so this consultant has been the key instigator of why the Municipality of Maputo currently works more with Portugal. Parruque explained that exchanging with Portugal is “very easy, very simple, especially because we are both Portuguese speaking countries.” She continued that with any doubts her department has regarding developing Maputo’s participatory budgeting, they do not hesitate in asking their Portuguese colleagues questions through email (July 25, 2013). The fact that Portugal has a strong role with international collaborative projects in Maputo, one that Mozambicans view as enabling, is critical for making the argument about the importance of shared language as a cultural affinity that enables exchange, because while Brazil fits into many of the categories referenced below (shared experiences, work styles, and ways
of being), Portugal, as a European country, does not share many of those aspects of cultural affinities with Mozambique. Connecting linguistics studies with project implementation for international development in urban settings could provide some valuable insights into further understanding in which contexts having a shared language is more critical.

Despite language being seemingly obvious as a key aspect of collaborative work, the value a shared language brings to collaboration rarely gets explicit substantive attention in critical analyses of international development urban planning projects. Neglecting to clearly address this factor is a serious oversight in projects seeking to understand what creates successful project implementation in the international development sphere, especially regarding urban planning projects where there is such a concentration of development work. Furthermore, with development projects in the urban landscape, one could more easily assume that language is not as critical of a factor because of the availability of translators and the trend that urban areas contain a more educated, global population that is more likely to be bilingual. While translators and moderately bilingual individuals may be more common in urban areas, as discussed above, the ability to communicate extends beyond words to the nuances of the tones, phrases, and double meanings of a language, meaning the importance of a common language should be considered, even in settings where translation might be slightly easier. Ultimately, these results suggest that even more broadly, urban planning needs to pay attention to communication strategies within cross-cultural project teams, drawing from business management literature such as Hofstede (2010). Because while speaking the same language can help enhance the chance of nurturing mutual understanding, sharing a language does not directly cause mutual understanding. Language, while often the most obvious, is only one major factor in communication.

Shared experiences

The notion that culture comes from sharing an experience might best be defined by the literature on organizational culture, in which Schein states that “culture is what a group learns over a period of time as the group solves its problems of survival in an external environment and its problems of internal integration” (1999: 111). Thus, Schein argues that “organizations can be presumed to have ‘strong’ culture because of a long shared history or because they have shared importance intense experiences” (ibid: 111). This definition of culture relates to South-South cooperation, because countries that have had shared experiences, such as colonialism and the development of informal settlements, are thus more likely to have cultural affinities. Such cultural affinities can make exchange easier between different countries. In fact, after language, the second factor of cultural affinity most informants tended to raise was about shared
experiences and similar problems. As referenced in the introduction, a key part of the push for South-South cooperation in international development has been based on the idea of the value of shared experiences. Shared experiences might first be thought of as important for development and planning because places with similar problems have needed to come up with solutions to these problems that other places might not have experienced within recent time periods, so places within the global South might have key insights and knowledge for dealing with similar problems in current contexts. Chadreque Lucas Massingue, the International Relations Technician for the Municipality of Maputo, stated that working with Brazil is easier because, “the histories are similar, the colonization was done with the same power- common history” (July 31, 2013). Massingue's reference to the importance of history relates to Hall's explanation of cultural identifies having histories (1990). Maputo and Brazil show an example where colonization can create cultural affinities in the move of resistance. One illustration is that a society might strengthen its collective in such a context, with more emphasis on mutual caregiving.

Another shared experience more frequently referenced in interviews was the shared experience of challenges with urban poverty and informal settlements. Candida Moiane, the National Director of Planning and Institutional Development for the Republic of Mozambique's Ministry of State Administration (MAE), succinctly answered my question about whether it is easier for a Mozambican agency to learn from Ecuador (the country MAE recently worked with) or Germany (the country that recently provided the connection between Ecuador and Mozambique) stating, “Most of the experiences of those developing countries are easy to accommodate in our context, [more] than those who are European, very far from us” (July 16, 2013). Similarly, in a joint interview with three officials of different departments within ANAMM (the National Association of Municipalities in Mozambique), they nodded in consensus when one stated that Mozambique “learns best from those with the same type of problems” (July 19, 2013). The ANAMM Technicians have worked with partners from a broad range of countries, varying from developed countries like the Netherlands and Canada to countries at a similar level of development to Mozambique, such as Zambia and Angola. The fact that the idea of shared experiences being an important factor for creating an enabling environment for exchange came from informants working in a variety of levels in a project, from technicians to administrators, who have worked with a variety of partners, strengthens this argument.

Similarly, Dionisio Cherewa, the Secretary General of ANAMM, when asked about why ANAMM's major upcoming municipality-municipality exchanges are between Brazil and Mozambique, responded that after language, the second key reason for choosing to exchange with Brazil is because of similar experiences and issues (July 19, 2013). Responding to the same question, the ANAMM Technicians
further explained that Brazil is large, so it has a variety of experiences in different places (July 19, 2013). Mozambique’s exchange with Brazil is rapidly growing; in August 2013, around six Brazilian cities and eight Mozambican cities met to discuss a variety of topics, including participatory budgeting, land cadastre, and urban requalification (UCLG, 2014). With Brazil being a larger country with a wide variety of experiences, different cities from Brazil can share on this array of topics.

The establishment of the trilateral project in Chamanculo-C was also largely based on the shared urban challenges between Brazil and Mozambique. Cesar Cunguara, Felisbela Materulla, Silvia Cabrita, Luis Nhaca, and Alessandro Galimberti all explained how the Brazilians were an important part of the partnership because they had experience working in favelas. Silvia Cabrita, a Portuguese development professional who has had the position of the Chamanculo-C Project Coordinator for Maputo’s Office of Urban Planning and Environment for one year, stated that Brazil is similar to Mozambique because “they have the same problems... of informal settlements and poverty.” In a subsequent question about cultural similarities, she said that she “see[s] the similarities” (July 16, 2013). Cultural similarities come from shared experiences, as the type of environment people grow up in can influence their ways of approaching life.

Similarly, the Technicians from AVSI emphasized how partnership with Brazil has occurred because of shared experiences. One Field Technician, Flávia Nheoto, stated:

“I also believe that the learning experience is more fruitful with Brazil, not only because of the communication aspect, but also because of the conditions in Brazil... they also have a lot of slums in Brazil... and the intention of the Brazilians is to share their experience on how they have brought changes to these slums and how they improve the lives of people still staying in those slums” (July 25, 2013).

Furthermore, Felisbela Materulla, a Mozambican Social Technician for AVSI, explained how exchange between Brazil and Mozambique regarding urban planning and informal settlements works well because the specific situations of informal settlements exist in both places, “so it’s much easier for someone who knows the reality [such as the Brazilians] to understand and be able to impart knowledge for someone who is in a similar situation.” Materulla further explained that the Brazilians having practical knowledge of such situations, and not just theoretical knowledge, makes communication simpler and clearer with Mozambicans (July 24, 2013). Practical knowledge here could include a knowledge of the culture that develops in informal settlements. While there are still cultural differences between the informal settlements in Maputo and Alvagados that the AVSI technicians needed to explain to the Brazilians working on the project, the number of these cultural
differences are less with partners who have practical knowledge of working in informal settlements.

Of course, the opposite argument is also of interest. People from initially different cultures can also gain experience working in a different environment, and through such experiences, their ability to effectively collaborate with those from a different culture changes. Materulla explained that for some of the Italians working in Mozambique with AVSI, their knowledge about working in informal settlements in Maputo does not just come from theoretical knowledge, but also from practical knowledge of working in the reality of informal settlements, because they were in charge of the project in Alvagados for ten years. Thus, according to Materulla, these Italians “know the realities, they speak the same language, so there is no difference in that sense” (July 24, 2014). Thus, an important nuance to consider is how individuals who are born in one culture can develop additional cultural affinities, which means they can help in creating an enabling environment for exchange on a collaborative project, even if they were not born into the culture of their partners, but they have spent time in shared experiences so they can develop cultural affinities with their partners. Here, Geertz’s idea, mentioned in the literature review, of culture being a context in which complex situations can be explored and described is relevant as individuals or organizations in a project team may have multi-geographical-cultural histories; thus, while an individual’s or an organization’s origin may not be from the global South, his/her/its ability to effectively communicate and work in a cross-cultural team on a project in the global South may be enabled by shared experiences. Understanding North’s argument that culture is slow to change (1990), simply having a shared experience may not be enough to gain cultural affinities. As will be emphasized in the conclusion, reflective practice might be one way to accelerate the process of reflecting on new experiences and understanding how these experiences influence the development of different knowledge, values, and behaviors.

Overall, both arguments provide ground for ways in which collaborative development projects should be designed to seriously and explicitly consider the time required to create enabling environments for all parties involved in a cross-cultural exchange. This evidence suggests that ideally staffing and situating of urban development projects should consider whether partners on a project have shared experiences. To further optimize project implementation, project evaluations should take an introspective level of reflection on the variable of what type of shared experiences project actors have.

Shared “ways of being”

The concept discussed above about shared experiences connects to the idea of shared “ways of being.” Certain experiences can influence one’s affects,
expressions, and preferences. Furthermore, different cultures have different habits that can be viewed as a "way of being." Anecdotally, this can include simple observations such as whether individuals tend to wait in lines or clumps of people. Over the past few decades, many academics in fields such as anthropology, psychology, and organizational management have worked to develop dimensions of cultural variability to describe cultural differences in the ways people think, feel, act, and communicate. Seminal works on cultural classifications include Hall's high/low-context concept (1976), Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory (1980), and Lewis's model of cultural classification (2005). These classifications for behavioral patterns deeply delve into differentiating cultures by concepts such as individualism, uncertainty avoidance, and the importance of verbal or non-verbal communication cues. Such models can be helpful in explaining behavior, but are also critiqued for their assumptions and oversimplification (for example, McSweeney 2002 & Jones 2007). Thus, for the purposes of this discussion, cultural variations that can influence the different ways people behave will more broadly be categorized as different "ways of being," which was a term used by one of the informants, Luis Nhaca, in these interviews (July 31, 2013). This description relates to Hall's definition of culture as the "way of life" of a people, including the sum of their learned behavior patterns, attitudes and material things (1959). Similar "ways of being" are important for collaboration not only because a different habit might be offensive to a person from another culture, but even for those who are cognizant about trying to look past such differences, naturally shared ways of being are important because they create common ground which can ease exchange and cooperation in development.

Regarding shared preferences, when the Brazilians worked with the Mozambicans on developing and carrying-out a socio-economic survey of Chamanculo-C, Felisbella Materrula explained that communication not only flowed well between the Mozambican social technicians and the Brazilian trainer because of language, but also because of "a lot of identification with the cultural side." She expounded, "The Brazilian way of being, it helps." She spoke specifically of how the Brazilian technician worked in the field with the Mozambican social technicians: "Going into the field, he [the Brazilian trainer] would speak with everyone. He felt comfortable. He was at ease. It was very good he went by foot, just here to there, he walked" (July 24, 2014). An underlying idea from Materrula's comments is that Westerners often walk less in the informal settlements in Maputo, using cars more frequently, which is different than how a larger percentage of the local Mozambicans travel in these areas by foot and bus. The Brazilian technician might have been more familiar walking in such informal settlements from having spent time in the favelas in Brazil. Further, even the manner in which individuals walk can be indicative of their national culture. A way of being, such as how one prefers to
travel or tends to move, can be a powerful affinity that creates more common ground between two groups, thus enabling exchange.

Regarding shared affects and emotional expressions, another way one of the Mozambican informants, the Social Field Technician Flávia Nheoto, described the difference between Brazilians and Westerners is that Brazilians are “very open and happy.” (July 25, 2013). Nheoto described Brazilians as this way during a discussion on whether it is easier for Mozambicans to have exchange with people from different places. Cultural affinities regarding how loudly and openly one expresses emotions can be important in creating a comfortable environment for exchange.

Another shared “way of being” that was repeatedly referenced throughout my interviews was the importance of shared work styles in creating a positive environment for exchange. This notion of shared work styles relates to the idea of organizational cultures, which is deeply rooted in management literature (for example, see Hofstede et al. 2010). Shared work styles are especially relevant to creating enabling environments for urban planning development projects and their implementation. Conflicting work styles in regards to expectations and pace can create a negative environment, while conversely, shared work styles can create a positive environment. Four different informants, from a variety of positions, referred to inhibiting aspects of different work styles for creating an enabling environment.

Cesar Cunguara, a Technician for the CMM Department of Urban Planning and Environment who has worked on the Chamanculo-C Triangular Project, stated, “The Europeans and North Americans, are more pragmatic, cold, and direct, so there is a lot more responsibility when working with Europeans and Americans, because the chance to miss is almost zero.” Cunguara expanded that it is his general opinion that the West can be much faster to stop providing assistance or aid if the recipient does not meet some standard or goal during the project (July 24, 2013). As Cunguara’s statements imply, such high expectations of a foreign country during collaboration can create a negative environment in building trust because if the exchange is more power-conscious there is less room for error in a project.

Felisbella Materulla stated, “The Europeans and Americans, they have a certain discipline, a culture that is different from Brazilians and Africans.” She expounded there is a visible difference in the methodology of how Europeans and Americans do projects in a way that is more “rigorous.” In contract, the Africans and Brazilians have a very similar methodology where they “take the rules more leniently.” Materulla explained that this difference in the way these cultures’ methodologies occurs “because it’s a way of being, it’s a personality.” For Materulla, part of the way she defines this personality difference is describing “Brazilians as more friendly” (July 24, 2013). While Europeans and Americans may not consider
themselves as less friendly, they could have different ways of expressing friendliness than Brazilians and Africans. For Brazilians and Africans, being friendly might translate into one being more flexible with project rules, while for Americans and Europeans the relation between friendliness and rigidity with work might not be as strong. Yet such difference in work styles can make a huge difference, which showed with Materulla’s emotional reactions with this question. When she began answering my question about how cultural differences affects the power dynamics in a work environment, she quickly stated, “there is a difference,” and laughed for a long time before stating, “I would be a hypocrite to say no” (July 24, 2013).

Differences in the work styles of various cultures can create some un-intentioned perceptions which can have repercussions in inhibiting the creation of an enabling collaborative environment.

Similarly, another informant, Candida Moiane, the National Director of Planning and Institutional Development for the MAE, explained, “The only difference I see is, from Europeans and Americans, they like things very well defined, very precise, which sometimes doesn’t fit for us. And they work with a projection, that this must be in that way, or that solution” (July 16, 2013). From the opinion of Cunguara and Moiane, working with Europeans and North Americans is often less preferable, because collaborators from these regions have less flexibility in their processes with more stipulations. With such different work styles, friction can be created that inhibits foundations such as respect that can be an important basis for creating an enabling environment for project implementation. Also, when there are cultural differences with Westerners including many stipulations within projects, this does not help to create a positive environment if such expectations only create fear and animosity from the Mozambican side.

However, an additional complexity exists with why Mozambicans often prefer a work culture that has less stipulations. Candida Moiane continued that Mozambicans often prefer to work with more “risk takers” from Latin America and Asia, because these so-called “risk takers” approach development work in a way that means results are visible faster. Moiane gave the example of how when constructing a five mile road, collaborators from Latin American and Asia may be more likely to start construction more immediately than North Americans or Europeans (July 16, 2013). While Mozambique may prefer working with those from Latin American or Asia for this reason, such similar work styles might not create a positive environment for project implementation in the long run, because the project might not allow time for Mozambicans to adapt a method to their context. Thus, considering Woolcock’s insight into the matching of project types with implemental complexity, such partnerships with a shared fast-results work style might be more beneficial for more straight-forward projects that can be more universal, yet such partnerships might be less helpful for more complex projects. As more instrumental
or critical urban planning projects generally tend to be more complex and long-term, considering whether project partners have shared work styles is of particular importance.

Furthermore, the Western culture of prioritizing efficiency and productivity over spending casual time with people can create a friction between Mozambicans and some Western foreigners that can inhibit the creation of an enabling environment. Two informants with different position levels both emphasized this point. From someone at a more entry level position, Hélio Manhisse, a Social Field Technician for AVSI, reflected on his experience as a Mozambican working with Italians, stating, “When they [the Italians] are here, they don’t have much involvement with the community, they are only involved with the work. Although the Mozambicans are very friendly, they [foreigners] are the ones who often create this barrier or separation” (July 25, 2013). From someone with a more management position, Laura Parraque, the Assistant Director for the Municipal Council of Maputo Directorate of Municipal Finance, agreed during an interview with the prompt that sometimes Americans are too concerned with efficiency. She continued that Americans need to focus on both efficiency and building strong relationships (July 26, 2013).

The boldest comment regarding conflicting work styles came from Martins Navingo, one of the Mozambican Social Field Technicians working on the Chamanculo-C project. Navingo stated, “Many times Brazil fits in more effectively into our reality than most Western countries. Maybe because of the similar professional level they have, they tend not to have that imposing trait of trying to force their will. That arrogance” (July 25, 2013). Depending on how universal higher education is in a place, cultures can have recognizable differences in their work styles based upon how “professional” the work culture is. Another informant, Elonio Cossa, who started working on the Chamanculo-C project in 2008 as an Urban Planning Technician for the Municipality of Maputo, stated that in working on the Chamanculo-C project, it was easier to work with the Brazilians because “the Brazilian aspects were dealt with in a less technical way, but with the Italians, the whole complicated process was very technical” (July 29, 2013). When one group communicates in a more technical way, this can be interpreted as harmful for collaborative projects, possibly creating a negative environment. As Navingo’s statement suggests, if the level of professionality or technicality one group uses is drastically different from the understanding of another group, such differences in work styles can come across as imposing, creating harmful power dynamics as one group may see the other as arrogant and inconsiderate to a different context. An affinity with a level of education and professionality can be an important aspect of cultural affinities that matter with exchange.
In considering the design and implementation of critical urban planning projects, an important point to consider regarding shared work styles is Woolcock’s point that projects are not universal and simple, and how ultimately most projects have complexities regarding a place, meaning repercussions of some sort occur if consideration of local context is not taken. Candida Moiane might have hinted at such an idea, when she closed the conversation about shared work styles stating, "[Currently] we want to see results immediately, we prefer to just do it, but maybe in the future, things will change" (July 16, 2013). Different work styles certainly have trade-offs when it comes to different aspects, such as speed and thoroughness as Moiane alludes to here. Thus, in considering the work styles of potential collaborators for urban planning projects, different work styles might be preferred depending on how success will be defined. When a goal of the project does not easily align with the work style of host country, then including a partner who comes from a different cultural work style might be an intentional strategic decision. In this case, such differences should be clearly acknowledged, and strategies should be developed to aid partners in recognizing differences and working through them.

Identifying similarities and differences in work styles strongly relates to Sanyal’s discussion of different planning cultures (2005). One way for project managers to think through different work styles in relation to cross-cultural collaborative urban planning projects could be to consider ways in which different partners’ planning cultures may differ and align.

As the next chapter will explore, cultural affinities should not be the definite, final factor in establishing partners for a successful urban planning development project; the more salient point is that cultural differences and affinities should be thoroughly considered and recognized during project design and evaluation. Then strategies can be developed to mitigate what conflicts could occur due to cultural differences, especially in differences in work styles.

**For Whom Cultural Affinities Matter**

How important cultural affinities are to the implementation of an urban planning project with international collaboration can vary depending on the positionality of those involved with a project. This section will explore some of these factors, including: (1) how closely the worker interacts with the community; (2) the level of the worker in the workforce and subsequently what extent of previous exposure the worker has had with those from different cultures; (3) an individual’s ability to communicate cross-culturally; and (4) how race can matter for some as a part of cultural affinities. As part of the discussion on the level of the worker in the workforce, a nuance will be explored in how those in more administrative and political positions address the potentially sensitive topic of culture.
**Level of interaction with the community**

Cultural affinities can matter more for those who are working at a closer level with the community on urban development projects. In contrast to many of the individuals working in more management and office positions who focused more on the cultural affinities between Brazil and Mozambique that eased collaborative work, the social field technicians working on the Chamanculo-C project spent more time discussing the cultural differences between Brazil and Mozambique. When it came to working in the field with the community in Chamanculo-C, Flávia Nheoto reflected on how while the Brazilians “came in with some experience, they brought a reality different from ours.” She explained how there was “a need to adapt [their experience] to our reality, to our cultural norms and customs” (July 25, 2013). A colleague of Flávia’s, Hélio Manhisse, further explained the role of the Mozambican technicians in developing the socio-economic survey with the Brazilians and Italians because the Mozambicans “know the places, the norms and customs, the local language (Changana), how they live, behaviors, and how to approach people” (July 25, 2013). Thus, when it came down to the fieldwork aspect of completing the socio-economic survey for the Chamanculo-C project, knowing the specific norms and customs of Mozambique was critical in working with the community. The AVSI technicians would share their knowledge of local cultural norms and customs with the Brazilians and Italians, suggesting how an understanding of cultural differences becomes of particular importance in working with the community.

**Level of the worker in the workforce and exposure to other cultures**

There is also often a difference in how much cultural affinities matter depending on a worker’s position on a project. Often more entry-level workers in urban development projects have had less experience in interacting with individuals from different cultures, which means that for these individuals, cultural affinities can be more important. The Mozambican informants who were the most brashly outspoken in regards to working difficulties with Westerns were the most junior social field technicians working for AVSI. Two of these individuals, Manhisse and Nheoto, had never worked on a project with international individuals before working on the Chamanculo-C project. During a second interview with these individuals, after Navingo first used the word arrogant to describe Westerners, Nheoto’s emphatically continued how Brazilians are “not arrogant” in comparison to Westerners, who “have this attitude of ‘we’re from the first world so we know everything’… and think they are superior.” She related her opinion of Westerners having an attitude of superiority to a sense that “they [Westerners] never come and
observe what the people’s desire are” (July 25, 2013). From Nheoto’s limited experiences in working with foreigners, she might have different perceptions of Westerns than those who have worked more with foreigners. Nheoto continued this discussion by describing how Western donors have been inconsiderate in past informal settlement development projects and requalification projects because they relocated people without first consulting them. She referenced how Western donors and the Mozambican government have started talking with the community and asking the community how they can help. But, clearly Nheoto still connects the West’s past actions with a perception of Western arrogance. Similarly, Manhisse discussed his perception of how many Westerners are in Africa to make money, and staying only long enough to make money. This certainly may be the scenario of many foreigners in Mozambique, but that is not the entire picture. Yet for those who have had limited personal interactions with foreigners, the negative stories often heard on the news or hear-say, and the extremely visible results of foreigners who build large, exclusive real estate, often can give a limited cultural perception of outsiders for those who have had less exposure to foreigners.

In contrast, Laura Parruque, the Assistant Director for the Municipality of Maputo Directorate of Finance, has worked with individuals from numerous different cultures. Parruque’s perspective may differ from her fellow Mozambicans who have had less exposure to other cultures, as she has gotten the chance to interact with more good-willed outsiders. Thus, instead of more immediately biasing someone based on their racial or ethnic heritage, she has a more open view, that “either the foreigners come to help [others], or to help themselves.” (July 26, 2013).

An important point to consider in comparing Manhisse and Nheoto’s statements with Parruque’s is how Manhisse and Nheoto may have felt more open to speak due to their more entry level position, which might not come with as much of a sense of the need to speak politically correct as might come with a more administrative position such as Parruque’s. The next section will more fully explore this nuance.

Political position of a worker and subsequent views

Another administrator in Maputo, Luis Nhaca, the Counselor of Urban Planning and Environment for the Municipality of Maputo, was similar to Parruque in how he provided more of a nuanced perspective to working with foreigners who

---

4 Yet, during the interviews with Manhisse and Nheoto, as conversation developed, there was not a sense that they viewed me, a Westerner, as overly arrogant. They might not have viewed me as arrogant because of a number of factors, including: (1) I was introduced to them by a Mozambican they trust, Felisbella Materulla; (2) I was a student interested in learning about their job and experiences; and (3) We had time through the course of the interview for me to show respect.
have fewer cultural affinities with Maputo. When discussing the Chamanculo-C project with Nhaca, and whether he thought it has been easier for the Municipality of Maputo to learn from the Brazilian or Italian partners, or if there had not been a difference, at first he responded, "No, there wasn't [a difference]." But then noted there was a nuanced difference, continuing "the biggest difference that existed is way of being, the character, of the Brazilians and Italians, but in terms of knowledge, no. But personality wise, yes" (July 31, 2013). So for someone in a higher level position in Maputo, there is an acknowledgment of cultural differences between Brazil and Italy, but such differences are triumphed by the sense that the knowledge of the Brazilians and Italians was comparable.

This answer reveals a common perspective currently within international development that knowledge can be the great equalizer, as suggested by those such as the World Bank promoting "The Art of Knowledge Exchange" as a way to enable the global South (2013). Nhaca’s response shows a struggle to think that rational knowledge should triumph over the softer, emotional aspects of exchange. After Nhaca acknowledged the cultural differences between Brazil and Italy, he concluded, "but we are in a globalized world now," as if to say that such ‘personality’ differences should not matter in collaboration, and that instead head-knowledge should be a great equalizer. As the conversation continued, there was a continual, noticeable struggle between Nhaca’s internal responses to my question and his crafting of a political response. When questioned whether the personality differences between partners can make a difference in how easy it is to have an exchange, he initially responded "yes" in Portuguese, before switching to English to say, "you don't feel any difference in terms of knowledge" (July 31, 2013). One possibility for Nhaca’s answers seeming to switch back and forth on whether cultural differences matter could be that for someone of his leadership and political position, there is an ideal that all different cultures should be able to provide benefit in a collaborative project. Part of this ideal, especially coming from the perspective of someone as the head of the city of Maputo’s planning department, could be a motive to be open such that Maputo can get as much aid as possible from different countries. This conversation certainly hinted that Nhaca does note character differences with partners from different countries that can add more ease or difficulty to a project, but maybe for people in more political leadership roles, such as Nhaca and Parruque, they might try to overlook such differences. These findings show that the connection between power, learning, and development, as promoted by Freire (1970), clearly has important implications for whether and how cultural affinities and differences are perceived and addressed within cross-cultural collaboration projects. As will be expanded on in the concluding chapter, these findings should be applied to considering how culture is addressed with urban planning practitioners. How culture is addressed needs to vary depending on an individual’s relation to different
power dynamics that might be occurring, such as how much the individual works with managing development aid and international relations.

**Ability to communicate cross-culturally**

Cultural affinities may also matter less for those who might be termed “champions” in easily being able to work with others from different cultures. Such individuals might have more of an ability to work cross-culturally, with greater natural abilities to read and interpret body language or quickly learn foreign languages. An example of an individual who has been a champion in working with others from a different culture is Cesar Cunguara, who currently works as a Technician for Maputo's Department of Urban Planning and Environment. When the Italians from AVSI started working in Chamanculo-C in 2010 and 2011, Cunguara spent a lot of time with the Italians as they worked on the preliminary parts of the project, such as creating an operation plan and framework for the project. Cesar Cunguara discussed how at first it was difficult to work with the Italians because they had a very technical approach on topics he had never seen before, yet he continued to work side-by-side with the Italians; others may have become more discouraged and quit in such a situation, yet Cunguara was successful in being able to stay with the project. Cunguara explains how now he is the “entrance door” for consultants coming to work with his department. With repeated exchange with foreigners, Cunguara has developed an ability to more easily communicate with outsiders, creates an interesting cycle, because he is someone who has repeated opportunities to work with foreigners. This creates a cycle where Cunguara has more chances to develop skills at working cross-culturally than his other colleagues.

Another example of a champion in working with others from different cultures is Bruno Lopez, who is the National Directorate of Lands and Forestry (DNTF) Deputy Team Leader for the land tenurization project with MCA. Douglas Black, an American working under DNTF as a Technical and Cadastre Advisor on this project, talked about how easily and effectively Lopez and him worked together in developing a curriculum for training people to be land surveyors. Black explained how Lopez is a native Mozambican of Portuguese descent who was educated in Brazil and South Africa. Black also commented how Lopez is “very good at being culturally sensitive” (July 24, 2013). Some individuals have the ability to be more culturally sensitive simply do to their personality, which might make having cultural affinities with a partner less critical in creating a positive environment for exchange. Acknowledging that some people have greater skills working cross-culturally is important for designing ways to create more enabling environments for cross-cultural exchange, as such individuals can be assets for leadership and mentorship.
In relation to race

Cultural identities can be rooted in the legacies of colonialism and race, which for some individuals, matters more than others. Laura Parruque, the Assistant Director for the Municipality of Maputo Directorate of Finance, explained that there is often racial discrimination in Maputo, where a white person will often get an opportunity or job position over a black person (July 26, 2013). One Mozambican black informant (Anonymous Interview, July 24, 2013) was extremely bitter about a white Portuguese professional getting a higher job in the project, which this informant felt qualified for. Such bitterness was apparent throughout the interview, and most of the discontent this individual expressed related to the person selected being previously outside of the municipality. Yet another possible variable in this informant’s discontent could have been in regards to the position going to a white individual. As Parruque explained, “It is true that there is something inside of us because of our history.” Parruque is determined to not let race affect her work; she stated, “We need to focus on development and professionalism to make things work,” and, “I personally do not have any resentment towards color, or nationality” (July 26, 2013). Yet for others, the legacies of colonialism and race are still part of their cultural identity in such a way that can make deeply trusting and appreciating those they affiliate with oppression more difficult because of perceived power and privilege.

Part of what might explain for whom the legacies of colonization and race still matter is that cultural identities shift with history. As Hall explains:

Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But like everything which is historical they undergo constant transformation. Far from being externally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power (1990: 225).

This idea of cultural identities changing with the context of the times seems obvious, but it is important to explicitly state and explore, because as many of the cases in this research showed, assumptions that can easily be made about when culture might matter in exchange often do not hold true because these assumptions are based in ideas of past, not current, cultural identities and relationships. Thus for some, the legacy of colonialism might not inhibit exchange, such as how Laura Parruque discussed the positive exchange over participatory budgeting between Maputo and Portugal. Parruque and others may have experienced a new chapter of history where a positive relationship exists between Mozambique and Portugal. But other individuals may have not yet experienced such changes in history at a personal level, and thus, their cultural identities still may be more shaped by the legacies of colonialism and race.
Conclusion about for whom cultural affinities matter

The statements from these interviews suggest that having closer cultural affinities can matter more directly when urban development projects are occurring with more technical workers than in comparison to working with those in more managerial and administrative positions. Higher-administrators and higher-level managers likely had more interaction with foreigners, and thus they might have more of a sense about which areas in a cross-cultural exchange will be easier and which will be more difficult. Further, these individuals may have often had more education, which could be another factor in having more of a knowledge background for different cultures and thus cross-cultural communication. In contrast, those who have had less interaction with outsiders and less education might not have as much of a sense about which areas in a cross-cultural exchange will be easier and which will be more difficult, making entering into a cross-cultural exchange possibly more unsettling. Part of this sense relates to how easily partners can build trust. Professionals who have been able to have positive experiences with those from other countries may have built up more of a personal system for more easily determining which outsiders they can build trust with. In contrast, for more entry-level workers who have had less interactions with outsiders, they might need more time to build trust with an outsider. Thus, for more technical workers, cultural affinities may be more important than for higher level workers, especially initially, in building trust in a way that can create an enabling environment. When asking the AVSI Field Technicians whether one caring Western outsider still carries the baggage of his/her country, Helio Manhisse responded, “muito” (very much) (July 25, 2013). For those who have not had as much exposure with Westerners, the legacies of colonialism, race, and neocolonialism could be a stronger part of one’s own and others’ cultural identity, which could make it harder to relate across cultures that do not share such histories.

Yet while helpful, even this discussion about the difference between technicians and administrators about the comfort level of working with foreigners must be nuanced. Those in higher-political positions may be more likely to state they have a sense of ease in working with foreigners who appear to be pursuing aligned goals because of diplomacy and political reasons. However, whether they truly feel this ease more than those in more technical positions, or whether they see expressing this ease as part of their position, would be an area for further investigation. Those who have had more cross-cultural interactions might have had more experiences to realize other’s shortcomings, and such realizations could impede further cross-cultural interaction. In fact, in contrast to how some of the administrators stated that cultural affinities did not matter as much, during interviews, these professionals sometimes seemed more reserved in their
comments than those in more of a technical position, who sometimes felt easier to build camaraderie with between the investigator and interviewee.

With all of this in mind, planning policy should consider that it is not just differences in knowledge between places that can affect how easily an enabling environment can be created. Acknowledging that cultural affinities can and do matter is critical for creating international collaborative projects in urban planning that can be completed and enable all parties’ learning. This acknowledgement will enable the “collective” learning that Sabel and Reddy call for within the international development field (2007: 75). Since individuals cannot readily control their cultural background, and there is a rightful fear of discrimination and bias, those in international development shy away from talking about how cultural affinities and differences affect project design. However, as these interviews show, cultural affinities and differences can affect a collaborative project’s internal relations and subsequently the ability of the project to create positive change. Thus, planning policy needs to pay attention to cultural affinities in urban planning projects. Reflection and conversation about culture and collaboration should be implemented in planning practices. The feasibility of this reflection in different contexts will be further explored in the concluding chapter.

An interesting note from the table in this chapter’s introduction about the frequency that different cultural factors were mentioned during interviews is to consider how having cultural affinities related to work styles was still a relatively common reference. The most commonly cited cultural factor of shared experiences and problems goes with much of the prevailing thinking about why South-South cooperation efforts might create a more enabling environment for exchange. The repeated theme of the importance of language and shared work styles suggest these are factors that need to be seriously considered in urban policies as well. There are associations that focus on sharing language, such as the Union of Capital Cities of Portuguese Language (UCCLA). An interesting area for further research and establishing networks might be in looking more into work style affinities, and considering how this cultural factor can be discussed more and be more a part of establishing networks and partnerships. Ultimately, the fact that these interviews revealed different, distinct cultural factors that affect collaboration emphasizes the theme that development professionals must respond to complex issues, as noted by Woolcock 2013), because even the issue of culture itself is increasingly multidimensional and complex in our globalizing world.

An important point to elucidate is that this chapter’s argument is not suggesting that differences in these cultural aspects will entirely inhibit the success of a project. Instead, the major point is that such similarities and differences should be outwardly acknowledged and discussed through an urban planning project’s design and implementation. Only with an open discussion can the specifics about
what will matter in the project be addressed, because as explored in the next chapter, cultural affinities do not always matter, and thus a lack of cultural affinities should not always prevent the development of a cross-cultural collaborative project in urban planning.
Chapter 3: Cultural Affinities as a Necessary but Insufficient Factor

A number of cases arose during my interviews where cultural affinities did not seem to matter as much as other factors in creating an enabling environment for cooperation on urban planning projects in Maputo. These factors, which will be explored in detail in this chapter, included: (a) the number of partners working on a project and the scale of a project; (b) the other affinities between partners, such as organization-type and job-type; (c) the assets partners from other cultures can bring to a partnership, such as networking; (d) the type of project, such as whether it is more concrete and straightforward; (e) the amount of experience partners have; (f) the length of time of the partnership; and (g) the project financing. Ultimately, this chapter concludes exploring some of the challenges of establishing projects with partners who do not have cultural affinities, and how the challenges of working cross-culturally can often be overcome with an attitude of respect for cultural differences.

The importance of small numbers and a smaller-scaled project

Having smaller numbers of people and partners involved with a project can be more important than cultural affinities in creating an enabling environment for international project cooperation. Similarly, having a smaller scale of work can be more critical for creating this type of enabling environment than cultural affinities. For example, a number of urban planning development projects in Maputo demonstrated that a project can be more successful with two partners because of greater ease with communicating and organizing collaboration. These findings coincide with the business management literature, which has well identified the importance of considering team size, and how it can often be a tempting to overemphasize the benefits of large teams while ignoring coordination costs (Hackman et al., 2000).

Chadreque Lucas Massingue, the International Relations Technician for the Municipality of Maputo, explained that Maputo has a very easy exchange with Barcelona even though these cities have very different histories, and thus to some extent different cultures, stating, “Maybe because of the number of technicians- only two. They send two, we send two. When the number is not so much, I think there is no chance to make confusion/problem.” Massingue eagerly agreed with the suggestion that maybe municipal technicians can learn best in small groups (July 31, 2013).

Similarly, Jordi Cortés i Roldán, with the International Cooperation Barcelona City Council, who has been working on the Barcelona-Maputo partnership since it began in 2006, stated that of the different projects undertaken by the partnership, the one true success thus far in completing a project has been with a project...
improving the city of Maputo's archives. The project was about organizing the city of Maputo's archives into shelves instead of piles on the floor. The project was completed in 2008, and it has been maintained since then. During the project, there were exchange trips with technicians from both cities going to the other city. In this case, a major change occurred even though the reform was not aligned with extant culture. Jordi referenced how the project changed people in Maputo's city government's ways of thinking and acting; previously, there was not a culture of organizing things in the main municipal building, but after this project there was (July 13, 2013). One argument could be that this project was successful in creating a reform that is not aligned with extant culture because the project was small in scale and began with changing only the actions and thinking of a few technicians, who have been able to sustain this change and further share the change with their colleagues.

In contrast, in the Chamanculo-C project with Brazil, Italy, and Mozambique, where two of the partners, Brazil and Mozambique, share more cultural similarities than Barcelona and Maputo, a repeated theme through interviews was the difficulties that occur with too many partners. Sara Candiracci, Alessandro Galimerti, Luis Nhaca, and Cesar Cunguara explained how a challenge with the project has been how there are three different sources of funds, from Italy with AVSI, Brazil, and Cities Alliance, and how these different sources are responsible for funding different portions of the project (June 17, 2013; June 21, 2013; July 31, 2013; June 10, 2013). Different portions of the project have been delayed as certain partners have not provided the funding promised, which is especially difficult when certain parts of a project depend on the other parts of the project being completed first. For example, the Brazilians are responsible for the physical part of the project, and this part of the project was delayed because of the Brazilians not providing funding at the scheduled time. Luis Nhaca explained how the project was extended twelve months because of such delays due to different procurement procedures. Furthermore, Cunguara expands that what is difficult in this project is that there is not one manager, but that each partner has its own procedure. As the partners act independently, they rarely come together, and instead visit the project site at different times, so there is rarely a place for face-to-face discussions and debates. This emerging theme of cross-cultural communication being a specific difficulty with cross-cultural collaboration will be highlighted throughout this section and expanded on in the concluding chapter as a practical aspect to address in creating more enabling environments for cross-cultural collaboration.

While the establishment of this trilateral cooperation project in Chamanculo-C was based in the ideal of two of the partners sharing cultural affinities, the number of collaborators and the management structure of the project seems to be an inhibiting factor that outweighs many of the benefits that could come from cultural
affinities. If the Brazilians have to wait on City Alliance or AVSI for moving forward with some step, as waiting occurs, then the enthusiasm and energy about the project might drain, especially as frustration with waiting occurs and resources go towards simply keeping the project active instead of truly progressing with the project. Then when the time finally occurs for interaction between the Brazilians and Mozambicans, where cultural affinities would be an asset, complacency, and even bitterness, could have arisen from waiting, thus losing some of the benefits that could have occurred from this exchange. Especially since the scale of the project is larger, more difficulty can occur in collaborating over a number of years on the many different aspects of this project. This case supports the main theme of this chapter that culture is often a necessary but insufficient factor for building enabling partnerships; as will be discussed throughout this section, culture is just one of the many factors that should be considered when building and managing collaborative urban development projects.

Similarly, another project that has been challenged by coordinating between many different partners was the development of the masters degree program in Maputo on slum upgrading as part of the program ProMaputo. Sara Candiracci, the Urban Planning Advisor for the World Bank ProMaputo Program at the Municipality of Maputo, worked on establishing this program by coordinating between all of the partners, which includes the World Bank, the Municipality of Maputo, the Faculty of Architecture at the University of Eduardo Mondlane in Maputo, Cities Alliance, and AVSI. In this case, with the partnership including Cities Alliance and AVSI, there is an inherent idea that there is value in the cultural affinities between Brazil and Mozambique, as both Cities Alliance and AVSI have been involved in Brazil with the slum upgrading program in Alvagados. The masters program will include a two week trip to Brazil in 2014, and much of the masters material is from Brazil. Yet despite how the partners in developing this masters program are meant to be a bridge between those with cultural affinities, according to Candiracci, the program has been deeply challenged by the large number of partners involved in this project (June 17, 2013). Similarly, Chadreque Lucas Massingue made a general statement about collaboration with multiple partners from his various experiences that might help to give some insight into why the collaboration with developing this masters program has been difficult:

“When a number is small, small groups, it’s like a corporation. Bilateral is ok, it’s me and you. But when it’s multilateral, if there is an issue we need to discuss, first I have to contact here, what do we need to do? And time is going” (July 31, 2013). Massingue’s comment about communication with multiple partners reveals a couple of different points. Communication with multiple partners scattered across the
globe can draw out a project's development, making partners frustrated in a way that inhibits ease of exchange. Furthermore, if someone has to take energy to consider who they should consult about something, while this may seem to only take a minute, that extra amount of effort could be the difference between a partnership where exchange is limited to only the most critical points versus frequent exchange that can occur over smaller details which may be less critical in that exact moment but can help develop broader knowledge for the longer term. In these examples, even though some partners have cultural affinities, which could help ease the project's development, the characteristics of having a large number of collaborators or a large, complex project requiring lots of communication can overwhelm the value cultural affinities bring to the partnership. Thus, if all else is equal, drawing on the discussion in the previous chapter, cultural affinities do matter in creating a more enabling environment for exchange. However, when it comes to the feasibility of managing complex projects with multiple partners, the benefits cultural affinities between partners can bring can be overtaken.

Speaking more towards the benefit of having a smaller number of people, and not just a smaller number of collaborators, Mario Ruy Marques, a Mozambican working as a technician for land resources and management for the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), spoke about his experience with an exchange trip to Tanzania in 2010. The MCC led a trip to Mozambique because this was another country where the MCC was doing a land tenurization project. With Tanzania being a bordering country to Mozambique with relatively similar experiences and culture, one might expect this trip to be extremely beneficial. Yet Marques' tone in talking about this trip was not overly enthusiastic. His main comment was that the trip included people from a variety of departments, including environmental affairs, community engagement, and the provincial land department (July 18, 2013). The objective of including such a variety of people and keeping the trip so wide was to expose people. Such broad exposure could be good for motivation and providing an open environment for individuals to discover things on their own. But from Marques' comments on this trip, one might infer such breadth might have been too broad in creating an environment where exchange could really occur. Marques offered how when designing study tours, there needs to be consideration of the size of the group, ensuring that the group is not too large. Once again, this relates to the importance of drawing business management literature into designing international development urban planning projects, as those such as Hackman et al. (2000) can provide valuable insights regarding the size and composition of effective teams.

An area for further exploration would be to examine how exchange experiences with fewer people on more focused topics can be more beneficial in creating a positive environment for exchange. Marques suggested that in designing who will go on a study tour, there should be thought about the expertise of the
individuals going on the trip, and who their correct counterparts might be in another country, and what types of institutions within two partnering countries do similar work (July 18, 2013). For best creating enabling environments for exchange on urban planning projects, institutional policies for study trips should not only carefully consider what cultural affinities at the national level exist between involved parties, but also what other affinities exist.

In conclusion, when considering how many partners an urban planning project should have and how large such a project should be, policies need to explicitly consider the multiple dimensions of such a decision, including but not limited to the psychological and sociological aspects of large, complex projects. Commonly considered factors in picking partners might be the politics and financing of a project. Furthermore, more explicitly expressed factors might be how multiple different cross-cultural partners can add value to a project because of the different perspectives, experiences, and assets each partner brings. A factor less commonly part of the explicit conversation might be the complexities of human resource management with multi-partner projects, such as how project speed and the presence of visible deliverables affects motivation and discouragement for all those involved in the project, but especially for project managers and implementers, because such discussions can seem "soft." An attitude might exist that project partners should have the dedication and professionalism to persevere through long, difficult projects. Ultimately, in considering all that goes into successfully implementing a project, the design of a project needs to carefully consider at what point the costs outweigh the benefits of a larger project. Project designers need to have explicit discussions regarding the trade-offs that occur with increasing the complexity of projects. The concluding chapter will speak more to the barriers to, importance of, feasibility of, and contextualization of such conversations.

The importance of other affinities: organizational-type

Other affinities such as organizational-type and job-position level can be more important than cultural affinities in creating enabling environments for exchange. One repeated example in Maputo is how the organizational affinity with a partner of being a municipality can be more important than a cultural affinity. Candida Moiane's, the National Director of Planning and Institutional Development from the Republic of Mozambique's Ministry of State Administration, first comment about what makes enabling partnerships was about partnerships between municipalities. She commented on how Mozambique has established municipality-municipality partnerships with cities in Africa, Europe, Asia, and Latin America. She continued how these municipal partnerships are generally "oriented by the experience shared." Municipalities have shared experiences of learning how to deal with solid waste collection, garbage collection, infrastructure management, and
financial management, so these partnerships are generally oriented around these topics. The fact that Mozambique establishes municipality-municipality partnerships with cities on such a diversity of continents, and that Candida initiated speaking about municipality-municipality partnerships, suggests that this organizational affinity is important. Candida continued how municipalities in Mozambique are asking for a database that could show what types of cities are strong in different areas, so a city in Mozambique could contact another city when it has a question on a specific issue (July 16, 2013). Such requests from different municipalities in Mozambique suggest how much cities view municipality-municipality partnerships as valuable partnerships to develop.

The importance of municipality-municipality partnerships is central to the work of the National Association of Municipalities in Mozambique (ANAMM). In discussions on collaborative projects, technicians at ANAMM noted that one of the most successful partnerships they have been part of was a trilateral project between two Mozambican cities, Xia-xia and Moatiz, and a Canadian city, Guelp. The two principle goals of the partnership were institutional development and community development. Between 2007 and 2010, this partnership worked on a specific project to improve the capacity of Mozambican technicians to build a land cadastre (July 19, 2013). What is especially important to note here is how this is a municipality-municipality partnership where the Canadian and Mozambican partners have little shared culture, yet the technicians still referred to this exchange as successful.

Chadreque Lucas Massingue has facilitated Maputo’s partnerships with sister cities for four years. The Municipality of Maputo currently had over twenty sister cities as of July 2013. The sister city relationship that Massingue said has been the most enabling for Maputo is a partnership between Barcelona and Maputo, which began in 2006 (July 19, 2013). Those who have worked as part of the Barcelona-Maputo partnership talked about how the success of this partnership largely comes from the shared affinity of each partner being a municipality. Jordi Cortés i Roldán, who has been working on the Barcelona-Maputo partnership since its beginning stated, “As another municipality, we understand the problems.” Jordi repeatedly referenced the importance of a universal language of municipal-management (July 13, 2013). Genís Arnàs Pàez, the Director of Municipal Markets in Barcelona who was in Maputo at the beginning of a technical exchange on Maputo’s food markets, eagerly agreed with Jordi, referencing how when he was with the Maputo market manager the day before, the two of them felt camaraderie as they realized how they experience many of the same challenges. For example, while the group was visiting the central markets, vendors would come up to the Maputo market director with claims about wanting more space. Pàez and the market director from Maputo found common ground as Pàez experiences the exact same type of claims when he goes to
the markets he manages in Barcelona. This knowledge that both parties have similar shared experiences probably helps in building trust that is critical. Knowing the other party has experience with the same day-to-day, somewhat trivial, challenges could be an important factor in setting the ground for exchange. As Pàez explained it, there is a universal language of municipal management (July 13, 2013).

María Salazar González, with AECID, the Spanish Development Corporation, stated that the most interesting collaboration project she has seen is the municipality-municipality collaboration between Maputo and Barcelona. She explained that part of the reason this is such a successful partnership is that municipal technical officials have empathy with each other, and they know what it is like to be in each other’s positions as municipal official. Furthermore, these individuals feel an equality of working in the same area. González helps in introducing people from Barcelona and Maputo, but she is not primarily involved with the partnership; the fact that such strong statements about the success of this partnership came from more of an outsider makes a strong statement about the potentially unique aspect of this partnership in comparison to others which are not between two municipalities.

An interesting nuance to consider is why Barcelona’s partnership with Maputo is more fruitful than other partnerships. One factor relates to the importance of cultural affinities; the Barcelona-Maputo partnerships shows how relative cultural affinities are an important aspect in meaningful municipal exchange. Another major factor is the dedication Barcelona has to sister city partnerships; not only does the city provide resources to staff an International Relations and Cooperation Department to manage sister city exchanges, but the city also extends resources to allow staff from other departments to be involved with sister city partnerships, so that practicing municipal technicians can share ideas. While Barcelona does not fund projects in Maputo, Barcelona has funded much of the travel expenses for the partnership. However, for the visit of Barcelonan city employees to Maputo in July of 2013, Barcelona did ask for Maputo to pay for the hotels and help with transportation. Engaging Maputo financially in this partnership could be a strategic decision for maintaining more neutral power dynamics.

Another point supporting the importance of exchange occurring between similar organizations is how the Municipality of Maputo has greater difficulty gaining experience when partnering with the private sector. In addition to Chadreque Lucas Massingue facilitating Maputo’s sister city partnership, he also facilitates Maputo’s partnerships with the private sector. Of particular interest, given the long debated role of private sector actors in development, was that Massingue discussed how the Municipality of Maputo can grow more through partnerships with municipalities than with the private sector: “It’s very difficult to
Massingue expounded how what a municipality can do is largely determined by a law, while private companies are not used to referring to such restrictions (July 31, 2013). The reality of how municipalities can relate in the way they function is an important factor in why these partnerships work well. Drawing back on Sanyal’s conversation of different planning cultures (2005), different sectors and organization-types may have different circumstances that cause them to develop different planning cultures. Understanding such differences may be key in designing effective exchange partnerships.

This conversation about the difficulty of the Municipality of Maputo learning from the private sector is especially important regarding the focus right now by multilateral international development institutions such as the World Bank on harnessing the private sector for development (The World Bank Institute, 2012). As part of the broader trend with many international aid organizations trying to position themselves as connectors for knowledge exchange, the World Bank Institute’s Focus on Public-Private Partnerships 2012 brochure states that part of the World Bank Institute’s approach to supporting public-private partnerships (PPP) is as “a global connector of PPP practitioners... including the provision of opportunities for peer-to-peer knowledge sharing, and South-South learning” (2012: 3). As this chapter will later discuss in more detail when explicitly look at the role of the global North in urban development in Maputo, international aid organizations can play a valuable role in urban development as a knowledge connector. What Massingue’s point highlights is how when international aid organizations are working to promote exchange, they should consider whether “peer-to-peer knowledge sharing” tries to connect peers from similar types of organizations. Thus, when promoting exchange about PPP, PPP practitioners from government agencies might find more value in being connected with each other for knowledge exchange purposes about effective ways to participate in PPP, and likewise, PPP practitioners from the private sector might find more value in being connected with each other for exchanging ideas about ways to strengthen PPP partnerships. Certainly value exist with partners from different organization and job types exchanging experiences and ideas; what Massingue’s point suggests is that more value might often come when knowledge exchange occurs between individuals in similar positions. Thus, events and networking meant to promote exchange around PPP should carefully consider not only if individuals working on similar types of projects, such as PPP projects, are being connected, but also whether individuals coming from similar positions within PPP projects have opportunities to connect.
Only recently have city-to-city exchanges been forged or supported more explicitly by international development organizations. Cities Alliance developed in 1999, the United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) formed in 2004, and the World Bank initiative the Urbanization Knowledge Partnership started in 2011. Understandably, following the establishment of such organizations, academic literature has begun to explore what is unique about city-to-city cooperation (Bontenbal, 2009) and what type of learning occurs with municipal partnerships (Devers-Kanoglu, 2009). Considering that the focus on international aid and development started in the mid 1900s, and that this conversation in the literature about the benefits of city-to-city exchange began only relatively recently, the field of international development has been on a long road of understanding the drivers of success for projects. Noting the relative recency of the discussion about city-to-city exchange provides some context for considering why culture has not been more specifically addressed in literature on urban development projects and their successful implementation. The importance of organization-type and culture are just two examples pointing towards the larger idea that context matters. This references what Peck (1990) and Andrews, Pritchett, & Woolcock (2012) all call for in focusing on the contextual nature of each international development project setting. Ultimately, what this evidence and the broader literature on international development suggests is that context must carefully be considered for creating successful collaborative urban planning projects, including but not limited to factors such as cultural affinities, organizational affiliations, and as will be discussed next, job-type affinities.

The importance of other affinities: job-type

Similarly, a partnership where there is exchange between the same type of professionals can also be more important in creating an enabling environment for exchange than simply a partnership with the same cultural affinity. From the evidence collected, the importance of affinity in job-type seems especially important when working on knowledge exchange within a specific sector. With the example explained above about the enabling environment created in the Maputo-Barcelona partnership over the project to improve Maputo's municipal markets, a key part of creating an enabling partnership related to how there was exchange between two municipal workers of the same position. Jordi Cortés i Roldán also referenced the enabling environment that was created by exchange between an architect from Barcelona and an architect from Maputo about redesigning Avenue Samora Machel into more of a pedestrian area (July 13, 2013). Even though these architects may face problems of different magnitudes, they still face similar problems, such as how to address public space in a city.
Furthermore, having individuals of a similar level work together in a partnership is critical. Cunguara described how the ease of exchange with Brazilians on the Chamanculo-C project changed drastically with the level of technician he was working with. He described how at first it was difficult to understand some of the Brazilian technicians when the collaboration was starting, but when they got the chance to talk with technicians at a more similar level, the exchange improved (July 10, 2013). This example shows how the factor of cultural affinity does not automatically create a positive environment for cooperation and that cultural affinities can be overshadowed by different levels of education and experience.

Douglas Black, an American Technical and Cadastral Advisor for the National Directorate of Land and Forestry (DNTF) and the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA), working on the land tenurization project, reflected on the exchange trips he went on with the project, one to Tanzania in 2010 and one to Rwanda after the trip to Tanzania. Both of these trips could have been positive environment for exchange because Mozambique, Tanzania, and Rwanda are all proximate-peer developing countries. Yet Black explained that sometimes after the trips individuals who went on the trips occasionally reference something from the trip, but “to say we brought something out of that, probably not.” He expanded that for intellectual exchange to occur, careful planning needs to occur so people with the same type of job meet each other “so they can relate to each other.” He also added that such exchange trips should have more clear objectives for participants such that there is intellectual exchange in addition to socialization (July 24, 2013). Certainly, in comparing exchange between individuals of similar jobs who are from different places, and one pairing has more cultural affinity than other, then cultural affinity may improve the environment for exchange. But the key point here is that having cultural affinities between groups does not automatically create an enabling environment, as there are other affinities that can trump cultural affinity, such as organization and job-type. In summary, these findings provide ample evidence to the importance of context in establishing the design of a development project, particularly in cities where there can be great contextual differentiation within the city, which might not be easy to discern as an outsider.

The relative importance of networking and the global North

Collaboration across cultural affinities, such as between the global North and the global South, can play a critical role in creating enabling environments for exchange because the global North can provide added value as a knowledge broker. The idea of the global North functioning as an enabler for urban knowledge exchange has become increasingly popular as international institutions such as the World Bank established networks like the Urbanization Knowledge Platform in
What this chapter hopes to add to the conversation is how cultural affinities play into South-North-South development cooperation, as the global North can facilitate exchange between countries that not only have knowledge about dealing with similar experiences and problems, but also between countries with cultural affinities. The global North as a connector between countries in the global South was exemplified by three aid institutions from the global North active in Maputo: (1) the German technical implementation agency, GIZ; (2) the US Millennium Challenge Account; and (3) AVSI, the Italian non-profit.

Christian Kapfensteiner, a Program Officer for GIZ, the German technical implementation agency, stated that GIZ provides added value because it provides additional support with its advisors in 130 different countries. When working on a project, there is a chance that someone within GIZ has done something similar in another country. According to Kapfensteiner, GIZ uses its international network to bring in new ideas (July 3, 2013). An example of GIZ's ability to provide a positive environment for exchange because of its worldwide network is exemplified by a project GIZ worked on with ANAMM. Three technicians in ANAMM's office described one of the most successful partnerships ANAMM participated in as a trilateral project between Mozambique, Malawi, and Zambia in 2010-2012 that GIZ facilitated and financed. The partnership's aim was to develop modules and training sessions for municipal workers on local finance and budget planning. Each country would adapt the training modules and sessions to the reality of their own country. The ANAMM technicians explained how GIZ could bring good experiences from other countries that it had worked in on this topic such as Indonesia (July 19, 2013).

In considering the importance of cultural affinities for determining project implementation success, an interesting point to question is why partnering with a country with less cultural affinities like Germany was viewed as so successful by Mozambicans working on the project. The positive nature of this case suggests that cultural affinity is not a required factor for determining successful project implementation.

João Carrilho, a Mozambican working with US Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) on the land tenurization project as the Project Coordinator from the Mozambican side within the National Directorate of Land and Forestry (DNTF), stated that an advantage of working with the MCA or another group from the global North is utilizing their world-wide network. The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), which provides financing for the MCA, holds a conference in Washington DC one week before the annual World Bank conference. Carrilho reflected on how at this conference, countries across the global South that the MCA works with gather together to converse and exchange views (July 2, 2013). Another Mozambican informant working on this project, Mario Ruy Marques, a Technician for Land Resources and Management for the MCC, spoke positively about going to the MCC.
conference in Washington DC in 2010 and 2012, especially because those years' topics aligned more with his area of work regarding technical information, and he was able to learn from case studies in other countries where there had already been a couple of years of implementation (July 18, 2013). An interesting role of the MCC here is being able to facilitate exchange between countries that may have more cultural affinities, but may not be able to gather together otherwise to talk about subjects such as land tenurization.

The MCC/MCA also held a land conference in Africa in Pemba, Mozambique around 2010/2011, where all of the MCAs in different countries in Africa came together to share their implementation strategies and lessons learned in working on land issues. Marques stated that he learned many different things at this conference and was exposed to several issues. He inferred that the conference was beneficial because it discussed technical topic like resettlement needs and settlement requirements (July 18, 2013). Carrilho, who also attended this conference, spoke about one example of an enabling exchange that occurred at one of these gatherings when Mozambique connected with Kyrgyzstan, a country João had never heard of before the conference. Mozambique was questioning how to deal with disclosing cadaster data for the sake of transparency about information but while also guarding sensitive information. Through this conference, Mozambique learned about how Kyrgyzstan balanced projecting privacy and disclosing information with its cadaster. Yet for João, more important than the sharing of information was simply knowing another country faces similar problems. For him, MCA created an enabling environment by Mozambican development professionals learning about others that share its problems and have different approaches to solving a problem. João explained how this type of exchange can help Mozambican development professionals gain confidence. He stated, "Learning is about gaining confidence, knowing what to do and when to do it." João suggests how an important part of creating an enabling environment is establishing partnerships that can build confidence (July 2, 2013). Here, the global North played an important role in connecting countries that can encourage one another with their successes in addressing similar situations.

Another type of facilitation that global North actors can do is not only creating places for exchange, such as conferences, but also providing direct connection between different cities that have faced similar problems, as well as providing publications which can spark exchange. Marques explained how he contacts the MCC land specialist in Washington DC, who acts as a "liaison" with various MCC land projects. Marques uses the MCC land specialist to help identify where the best practices are, and then Marques can get contact information to exchange with different countries on specific topics. Additionally, Marques explained how the MCC produces a newsletter on land projects, which he finds to be
informative" (July 18, 2013). These different types of facilitation are all different ways the global North can be helpful in urban development projects in Mozambique.

With the Chamanculo-C project, AVSI and Cities Alliance have played a critical role as a bridge between the Alvagados project in Brazil and the slum upgrading project in Chamanculo-C. Cities Alliance funded the publication of documents explaining the slum upgrading process Alvagados went through, which included information on how the project emphasized participatory planning as well as the integration of the social and physical aspects of urban planning. These documents became ways that Mozambicans could learn about planning practices happening in other places for slum upgrading. For example, Rogerio Nuvunga, now the Supervisor for Urban and Environmental Aspects of the Chamanculo-C Project for Maputo’s Department of Urban Planning and Environment, explained how he first learned about participatory planning and the integration of the physical and social parts of planning by reading Cities Alliance reports online (July 7, 2013). Now, Nuvunga is working on these very aspects of the urban planning project in Chamanculo-C, working with the Brazilian partners on the physical aspect of this project. In this case, an international organization, Cities Alliance, acts as a liaison by helping to transfer information from one country in the global South to another.5

Similarly, a value of international organizations expressed by Candida Moiane, the National Directorate of Planning and Institutional Development for the MAE, was how globally well-networked institutions, like GIZ and the World Bank, would be preferable for helping the MAE develop a database of which cities internationally have strength in different areas regarding municipal management, such that municipalities in Mozambique could develop partnerships with cities in different countries based on topics of need. Moiane expanded how multilateral and bilateral institutions that do a lot of work globally have knowledge about a variety of cities, and such information can even be divided into classifications like city size, such as which large and small cities excel with waste management (June 16, 2013).

An important complexity is that while the cultural affinity between Maputo and an organization from the global North providing networking may be less important, cultural affinities are an important part of the larger picture, as countries from the global South that are connected by the global North can further effectively exchange because of cultural affinities. As explained before, countries from the global South have a shared culture with a shared history of experiencing the North’s

5 While some may argue that Cities Alliance is a global South institution because many of its members are from the global South, I struggle to label Cities Alliance as a global South institution because the Alliance’s members and Board of Directors are predominantly from the global North. Yet, Cities Alliance in promulgating knowledge about the global South. Thus, in the spirit of Robinson in not wanting to prolong a dichotomy where labels can be misleading (2006), I label Cities Alliance as an international organization, as this organization’s composition and work may hint at what is truly international.
paternalism, which can be valuable for creating an enabling environment for exchange.

Despite the value shown in this chapter of the global North having a valuable place in South-North-South cooperation by being a connector between places with cultural affinities, these new types of development partnerships need to be critically examined to ensure they are genuinely promoting the global South, and not just promoting the global North's political and power aims (see McEwan & Mawdsley 2012, and Abdenur & Da Fonseca 2013).

**Concrete urban development projects over more complex projects**

Candida Moiane provided valuable insight on what types of projects completed with partnerships are generally more successfully implemented. She explained that while the most popular sectors for exchange within urban development are finance and administrative management, the projects most successfully adopted by cities within Mozambique are generally infrastructure and physical urban development. So while about one-half to two-thirds of all exchange projects reported by local Mozambican municipalities to the state are on the topics of finance and administration, the projects Moiane witnesses actually being adopted are the minority of projects related to infrastructure such as solid waste collection (July 16, 2013). Certainly, results from such physical projects would be easier to observe. Yet, that does not disregard Moiane’s explanation that projects that are more “precise” and “concrete,” such as around the issues of infrastructure and physical urban development, are easier for collaboration than around more complex issues such as finance and urban development. A point for further research would be to examine the extent to which collaboration over more complex projects might depend more on cultural affinities, while collaboration with more concrete types of projects might depend less on cultural affinities. Whether cultural affinities matter more for the successful implementation of more complex urban planning projects supports the theme of how context matters.

**The importance of experience**

An important reality is that countries at a similar level of development to Mozambique do not always have experiences in dealing with urban development issues that Mozambique can learn from. Often Mozambique’s neighboring countries, such as Malawi and Zambia, which might have cultural affinities with their position in the global South and Africa, do not yet have experiences they can share with Mozambique that automatically create a more positive environment where mutual exchange occurs. In the ANAMM technicians reflecting on the 2010-2012 trilateral project between Mozambique, Malawi, and Zambia that was facilitated and financed by GIZ, they said that Mozambique did not learn much specifically from Malawi and
Zambia because, "they [Malawi and Zambia] have experience, but they aren't very developed" (July 19, 2013). Mozambique has more experience than these neighboring countries in decentralization, so Mozambique did more in teaching the other countries about participatory budgeting. Granted, great value can exist in Mozambique being able to teach other countries (Carolini, forthcoming b). In such circumstances, what will be important is that the goals of a project for the instructing country are focused more on what those such as Sabel and Reddy advocate for with a learning-centered approach to development (2007).

Mozambican municipal technicians can often learn more knowledge from those at a similar or slightly more advanced level of development, because they have experience in dealing with the same types of problems that exist in Mozambican municipalities. A collaboration ANAMM facilitated in August 2013 was a short term course including six Brazilian municipalities and eight Mozambican municipalities. Dionísio Cherwa, the Secretary General of ANAMM, explained how Mozambique has a lot to learn from Brazil because of Brazil's experience in dealing with similar issues. He stated, "The technicians are advanced in Brazil with lots of experience and knowledge" (July 19, 2013). So while Brazil's cultural affinity of having similar problems is critical to why Mozambique continues to establish new partnerships with Brazil, the additional dimension that extends beyond cultural affinities is that Brazil has experience in dealing with these issues. In contrast, countries with the same problems that do not yet have experience in improving these issues do not always create the most enabling environment for Mozambique learning how to address its problems. As Cesar Cunguara, who has been working on the Chamanculo-C project since its first inception in 2006, explained, Brazil is in a similar situation to Mozambique, "but they are maybe 50 years ahead [in terms of development]." Thus, according to Cunguara, Mozambique can learn from Brazil, as well as have the foresight to avoid Brazil's mistakes and create "shortcuts" (July 10, 2013). Ultimately, a key factor for Mozambique in making Brazil a valuable partner is that Mozambique can learn from Brazil's knowledge in how it successfully and unsuccessfully improved urban development. Furthermore, regarding the Chamanculo-C project, as Luis Nhaca, the Municipality of Maputo's Councilor for Urban Planning and Environment, explained, a key reason for why AVSI, an Italian ngo, was chosen to work on this project was because of its experiences with working in Brazil's favelas (July 31, 2013). AVSI may not have cultural affinities with Mozambique, but their experience in Brazil made them a valuable partner.

An interesting nuance with Brazil's involvement with the Trilateral Chamanculo-C project is that Brazil committed to finance the physical survey and plan for Chamanculo-C, but they did not necessarily commit to completing this work themselves. During the summer of 2013, the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABD: Agência Brasileira de Cooperação) put out a request for different contract proposals
for this work in Chamanculo-C, and they opened the application globally. In
discussing this with Luis Nhaca, he was not concerned about the work being open to
any global consultant, even if the hired consultant did not necessarily have
experience with informal settlement development in Brazil. Nhaca stated that “the
technicians from these hired companies are the ones that have a better CV and
background, so they bring with them experience and knowledge, and one of the
things we require in the terms of reference in the transfer of knowledge” (July 31,
2013). Nhaca is making the argument that what matters more from the transfer of
knowledge with the Chamanculo-C project is not necessarily whether the parties
involved have cultural affinities, but whether the consultant has the better
experiences in improving informal settlements. Nhaca brings up a valuable point
that knowledge about particular issues in urban planning projects is a more
important factor in choosing partners than simply cultural affinities, because
without knowledge and experience, a partner cannot bring much added value to a
project. However, as the previous chapter argued, simply having such experience
and knowledge may not be enough to successfully implement a project in a foreign
environment; cultural understanding is key as well.

Also, a positive environment for exchange can be created when a country
without cultural similarities can still share experience in dealing with a topic the
country has experience in. For example, Cherewa explained how collaboration with
Canada was very helpful with Mozambique starting ANAMM, the National
Association of Municipalities in Mozambique, in 2004 because Canada had
experience and knowledge with starting the Federation of Canadian Municipalities.
Cherewa explained that with cooperation projects with Canada, “we don’t do
mechanical copying, but analyze the experience and adapt to our reality, so that it
can be according to our social and cultural reality” (July 19, 2013). In this case, the
topic of establishing a national association of municipalities depended less on the
shared experiences that might occur with a country having a more similar state of
development, in contrast to an issues such as improving informal settlements, which
Canada would have less experience dealing with. What is important here is how
ANAMM recognized the organization cannot simply copy a procedure from a
country with a different culture, but they must adapt the system to Mozambique’s
culture. Even though the two partners in this case did not share strong cultural
affinities, the partnership was successful, because they took Mozambique’s culture
into account. So ultimately, considering culture does matter. The nuance is that for
all partnerships to be successful, it is not required that both parties share cultural
affinities; instead, in some contexts cultural affinities are less important than
specific knowledge and experiences. This again references what Peck (1990) and
Andrews, Pritchett, & Woolcock (2012) say in regards to how best practices and
policies cannot all universally apply, and how international development policies
must consider each setting’s nature. This idea connects specifically to the findings from this research which suggest that one universal policy regarding how culture should inform the design of collaborative urban planning projects in international development would be insufficient, and that instead different policies and approaches will be appropriate depending on the project context.

Another interesting aspect to this idea of adapting urban planning techniques from one cultural context to another is how a third partner can provide experience or expertise in adopting a technique between two places. Candida Moiane explained how Mozambique can go to another country, maybe with some cultural affinities, and see a concept Mozambicans would like to operationalize in their planning. Then Mozambique’s Planning and Institutional Development needs to figure out how to adopt that system. Moiane explained that Northern development institutions, such as GIZ, can provide added value in this context because “they can assist in terms of technical, [suggesting comments such as] for you to adopt that system, you must revise your law, you must upgrade financial management, regulation” (July 16, 2013). In this partnership context, cultural affinities may matter less than a partner having experience and knowledge in identifying how to accommodate a model from one place to the next; this idea was discussed in Chapter 2 at the end of the section on shared experiences, with the example of the Italians with AVSI successfully collaborating in Maputo because of the organization’s ability to adopt experiences from Brazil. Since no two places are the same, there will always be a need to adapt a system to a different context. Those who have more experience adapting models, such as GIZ, can provide important insight because they have specific experience in identifying and highlighting technical aspects of projects that commonly need change to fit another context. Yet it should be noted that consideration of culture is still necessary, because those working to adapt a model will need to work closely with local partners to make sure changes fit are based on and fit within the new cultural context.

The importance of long-term engagement

Jordi Cortés i Roldán, the main Barcelonan contact for the Maputo-Barcelona partnership, explained that one of the factors that has created this enabling partnership is how the partnership has existed for seven years. With a longer term partnership, confidence can be built between groups. Roldán expounded that the Maputo technicians feel free to talk with the Barcelona technicians, because the Maputo technicians know the Barcelona technicians are not going to share their complaints with their superiors (July 13, 2013). Building this type of trust where one party knows the other party will be confidential takes time.

Similarly, Alessandro Galimberti, AVSI’s head representative in Mozambique, reflected on AVSI’s engagement in Chamanculo-C, and how as a non-profit, AVSI has
a long term commitment to Chamanculo-C (June 21, 2013). Thus, while the cultural similarities between Italy and Mozambique are limited, an enabling environment for exchange has still been created for some of Maputo's municipal workers, because they have had time to work with the Italians and build understanding. Cesar Cunguara explained how he really learned by working alongside the Italians. By working with them, he was able to learn about the preliminary parts of a collaborative urban planning project, including how to design an operation plan, framework, and timetable. While it took a couple of months for Cesar to understand the technical language being used, with AVSI's long term commitment, an enabling environment for Cunguara to learn in was created. In contrast, Cunguara reflected upon some of the Brazilians' visits to Mozambique as part of the Chamanculo-C project: "When they (the Brazilians) come here, always have too narrow a schedule, so we can't get much from them, too many meetings with different people."

Cunguara further explained how many of these meetings focuses around bureaucratic issues like contracts instead of technical discussions (July 10, 2013). A longer term partnership with partners that have cultural affinities might have the potential to be more fruitful than a longer term partnership with partners that do not have as many cultural affinities; but the example from the trilateral project in Chamanculo-C suggests that longer, constant engagement with a country that does not have great cultural affinity can still be more fruitful than a shorter engagement with a country that has more cultural affinity.

Regarding the same project, Felisbella Materrula also commented on the greater importance of time than cultural affinity when working with the community and project team. Commenting on how the community in Chamanculo-C responded to working with Italians versus Brazilians, she expounded that at this point “they [the community members in Chamanculo-C] look at the project team, and they don't differentiate the Italians from the Brazilians.” She explained that the situation might be different if a Westerner went to the community by himself or herself, but when a Westerner comes with the project team now, there is not a major difference: “Since they [the Italians] are already in the community for a year and a half or more, they have this closeness in the relationship, so now just get into the community with no problems at all, because of the trust they have with the activities they are developing” (emphasis added; July 4, 2013). Different cultural affinities may mean that it takes a longer time to build trust, but once the trust is built, from Materrula perspective, an enabling environment for exchange can be created. However, Materrula’s position on this idea may not be the same as those who live in Chamanculo-C. Materrula studied for her PhD in Brazil, and she works closely with the Italians from AVSI, so she may have a more open perception to working with foreigners than Chamanculo-C's residents.
These cases suggest that policies for urban planning collaborative projects should not discourage partnerships between places with less cultural affinities, because if proper time is allotted for building cultural understanding, fruitful exchange can occur. As further discussed in the concluding chapter, cross-cultural collaborative urban planning projects should consider as part of their project design what specific strategies can be used to enable cultural understanding.

**Enabling over aid**

Jordi Cortés i Roldán explained how the Maputo-Barcelona partnership benefits from Barcelona not being a financial aid provider. A more enabling environment for exchange can be created when Barcelona is not required to produce certain end products, and instead Barcelona can be more focused in sharing ways of thinking about municipal issues. This relates to the idea in the section above about the importance of long-term engagement, because partnerships connected with discrete finances often have shorter-term, defined lengths. But without a partnership being tied directly to aid, less pressures often exist. Roldán emphasized the importance of time, and how less limited time has been a key factor in the success of the Maputo-Barcelona partnership creating an enabling environment. Jordí expounded how Barcelona can be an artisan with its various municipal partnerships, not industrial (July 13, 2013). Each city is different, and Barcelona can approach each partnership on an individual basis, taking time to individualize each partnership.

Chadreque Lucas Massingue, who helped facilitate the Barcelona-Maputo partnership, agreed that better exchange can occur in a sister city partnership versus a private sector-city partnership because money is not a major factor in the sister city partnership (July 31, 2013). Thus, less pressure exists to do certain things, so more freedom exists to choose the types and time scales of project the sister city partnership will work on. This flexibility often does not come with a major donor tied to a collaborative projects. Many of the projects completed in the Barcelona-Maputo partnership may seem odd and less central to improving a city’s urban planning, such as a project that addresses the municipal archives or Maputo’s libraries. Yet, these projects should not be neglected, as they can be critical in developing certain processes for municipal management, which are valuable transferable skills. Furthermore, Roldán reflected on how a major multilateral donor may not want to prioritize an urban design project to improve the central downtown area of Maputo, but this is a project Barcelona will work on with Maputo, believing as a fellow city that the importance of an attractive, safe downtown area can be important for a city’s overall economic growth and development (July 13, 2013).
This case suggests that policies for urban planning collaborative projects should not be overly prescriptive or formulaic in establishing how partnerships will function. Certainly guidance from other cases is useful, but limiting projects from being flexible to the specific context can be counterproductive. As international development initiatives continue to turn towards encouraging South-South partnerships and trilateral partnerships, an important point to highlight is that each city is unique, and that South-South and trilateral partnerships will not automatically be a panacea because of cultural similarities between collaborators. As Robinson argues, “all cities are best understood as ‘ordinary,’” and thus cities should not be put into categories such as “Western, Third World, developed, developing, world or global” (2006: 1). Robinson argues that the framework of an ordinary city enables the analysis of the diversity, complexity, and distinctiveness of cities. Bringing this idea of the ‘ordinary’ city into discussion about collaboration efforts should help to provide more realistic expectations about the benefits that can come from any city-city cooperation, as each city, and each district and neighborhood within, has a distinct, constantly evolving culture that cannot be perfectly paired with another place. As Hall says, cultures are subject to continuous change (1990). Thus, as has been argued throughout this entire thesis, an emphasis should be placed on the concept of cultural affinities, not equivalence. Affinities suggests more of a notion of cultural chemistry between places, not strictly cultural similarity.

Ultimately, careful consideration must be taken as to how projects with South-South collaboration are financed and managed, such that the environment can be open enough to be enable exchange, yet that money can still be responsibly used that finances projects.

An attitude of respect and a willingness to learn

One factor that can often triumph over challenges created by cultural differences is whether or not a person has and shows respect for another culture. Laura Parruque, the Assistant Director for Maputo’s Directorate of Finance, stated, “We [as black people] like that many of the white people also respect our culture and us as people; that is what facilitates our exchange” (July 26, 2013). This comment came after a conversation on racial and colonial histories, which as discussed in the previous chapter, can have a negative affect on enabling cross-cultural exchange depending on the perspectives of the individuals involved. But as Parruque indicated, many of these difficulties can be overcome with respect.

Parruque referenced how Americans and Europeans can come across as ignorant if they give off the perception of knowing everything. But they can also come to Maputo with an attitude of wanting to learn more and gain experiences (July 26, 2013). From her statements, what seems to be most important in creating
an enabling environment for exchange is not necessarily cultural affinities, but whether both parties have an attitude of humbleness and a desire to learn. While such comments may seem "soft" or un-technical, those should not be reasons for ignoring the importance of attitude and respect in creating policies for collaborative urban planning projects. This research aligns with Sabel and Reddy's call for "collective" learning (2007: 75), such that a focus on all partners learning from a collaborative project can be an important policy focus for creating enabling environments for exchange and subsequently the successful implementation of urban planning projects.

**Conclusion on cultural affinities as a necessary but insufficient factor**

In most cases, all else being equal, cultural affinities do matter. However, the case rarely occurs when all else is equal. The cases shown in this chapter illustrate how when cultural affinities matter is more contextual. For some projects, more important factors for determining success might be the number of partners, the scale of the project, the presence of organizational-type and/or job-type affinities, the specific assets and experiences a partner brings to a project, the length of the project, and project financing.

As the previous chapter established, prioritizing collaborative partnerships where partners share cultural affinities should be a priority in urban planning and international development. Initiatives supporting South-South cooperation are important; however, they should not be viewed as a panacea for international development. Leaders of South-South cooperation initiatives should find ways that platforms for exchange help connect people from similar organizations and job-types, and not just people who share similar problems and experiences. In this context, the global North, which may not have immediate cultural affinities but still provides added value by using resources to help build networks, should be explicitly recognized as a valuable actor in cooperation projects. With time and humble attitudes, individuals from different cultures can understand each other and create successful environments for exchange. An important area of exploration for organizations and leaders promoting cross-cultural collaboration is to understand how trust and cultures interact. In response to the trend towards globalization and business disciplines showing the importance of trust in business management, organizational management literature explored how national culture influences the development of trust (Doney et al, 1998). *Explicit* consideration of how cultures influence the trust-building process will be key to allowing a variety of types of partnerships to be successful.

With the contemporary ideals of inclusivity, global-reach, collaboration, and mega-scale within urban planning and international development, one could envision how projects can become increasingly complex, with multiple players and
aspects. Yet this research shows that adding in such complexities can take away from the benefits that exchange and partnership can create. Suddenly, the benefits that might come from places with cultural affinities sharing tools for dealing with shared problems might be overshadowed by challenges with financing and donor obligations. Thus, donor policies should be sensitive to how their funding requirements can create successful, enabling environments for exchange.

One area urban planning and international development policy makers should be particularly aware of is how this research indicated that harnessing cultural affinities and addressing cultural differences takes time and flexibility, which projects with short timeframes and strict deliverables can inhibit. While this research very much supports Andrews, Pritchett, and Woolcock's call for the importance of an active learning mechanism with development projects, this research questions their emphasis of learning being 'rapid' feedback (2011). The idea of 'rapid' feedback takes on a very Western, short-term, objective-based learning approach. This 'rapid' feedback model may be enabling for some cultures, while it might create an inhibiting learning environment for others. Policies that promote learning within collaboration need to make sure they can be adjustable to partners' different cultures.
Chapter 4: How to Address Culture in Cooperation and Urban Development

Considering culture as a critical aspect of project management

Ultimately, what this research showed was that a stark divide should not be made between when cultural affinities matter and when they do not, because nuance matters. North's argument that culture matters to development (1990) does apply to considering what types of international partnerships should be formed to create effective partnerships, but a more nuanced understanding of the relevance of culture is required that considers gradients of relevance depending on the context. This research ultimately reinforces Woolcock's idea that the problems development professionals must address today are "decidedly (wickedly) complex" (2013: 16); as to whether cultural affinities and differences matter or not largely depends on the project's context. The case studies in this thesis provide evidence that the combination of North's and Woolcock's theories have important relevance for South-South cooperation in understanding how these projects work on the ground. Culture might matter more or less for different types of projects or at different phases of the same project. Or, culture might matter more or less to different people within the same project. Overall, culture is a factor that needs to be more explicitly included in the design and management of collaborative urban planning projects, and even more broadly, as a factor included in the education of those going into international development and urban planning. Culture needs to be included as part of reflective practice, which should be recognized as a practical part of successful international development, because reflective practice enables better recommendations for project management and implementation.

In 2009, the UNDP Special Unit for South-South Cooperation released a report stating:

Whilst general understanding and agreement exists on the value of South-South cooperation... discussions at the UN and other high-level meetings tend to focus on conceptual and political aspects of South-South cooperation... On the other hand, practical aspects of South-South and triangular cooperation tend to be neglected or touched superficially in such occasions (Special Unit for South-South Cooperation, UNDP, 2009: 23).

The recognition of this gap in practical knowledge about the aspects of South-South and triangular cooperation that can make for successful partnerships is critical for furthering the effectiveness of international cooperation and development. Recent initiatives and reports from major international development organizations suggests there has been a turn in trying to develop and understand more of the practical aspects of South-South and triangular cooperation. In November 2012, international partners started the project 'Capacity Development in Management of
South-South and Triangular Cooperation,’ which aims “to develop the capacity of Southern practitioners engaging in technical cooperation, including South-South and triangular cooperation” (Karasawa and Zhou, 2013: 3). As part of this project, in March 2013, a peer-learning training was held on Managing South-South and Triilateral Cooperation in Brasilia (Vazquez, 2013). The call to focus on practical aspects of cross-cultural collaboration is key, because as this thesis shows, culture is an key practical aspect of cross cultural collaboration that needs further emphasis. This thesis will conclude by trying to further a practical discussion on ways to consider culture and collaboration in planning for urban development, including looking at: (a) barriers to these conversations; (b) when and how to address culture; and (c) how to deepen peer-learning by considering sub-cultures.

Barriers to and the importance of talking about culture

In most cases, all else being equal, cultural affinities do matter. Yet despite the fact that cultural affinities do matter, how many urban planning and development projects with international collaboration consider the importance of cultural affinities during project planning, project design, project evaluation, and even at a larger scale of institutional policy making? Brief individual considerations and judgments may frequently occur, but how often do explicit, organized conversations occur around this topic? This research suggests that while planners might be hesitant to enter into conversations about cultural affinities and differences because these are not within purview of changes they are able to make, these are important topics to discuss.

Why do international development urban planners not discuss culture more? Why is culture not more of a central element in urban planning policies on international development? Is inward analysis about the cultural composition of team in such contexts common?

One central reason is culture cannot be controlled, and differences planning professionals cannot control for or easily incorporate into planning are hard to talk about. Furthermore, great fear may exist that discrimination and bias will occur, causing offense and hurt. Such sensitivity is reasonably greater with international development, as history has left a host of scars due to racial and cultural discrimination and bias. Thus, urban planners dealing with international collaboration might often chose to ignore culture in project design phases and internal staff discussion. Another reason conversations about culture may not occur is because of the difficulty of time constraints. Harnessing cultural affinities and addressing cultural differences takes time and flexibility. Yet a reality of projects is that limited resources often mean there are tight deadlines. Further, maintaining momentum and a sense of urgency when dealing with problems related to basic human needs is essential. A sense of limited resources likely inhibits attention
towards what might be thought of as a "softer" concern such as culture. This conclusion will address such concerns and provide some focused ways to effectively address the topic of cross cultural collaboration.

Ultimately, this research points to a gap in literatures on project evaluation and project design in international urban planning regarding the importance of culture. The engineering literature, in contrast, on project management and leadership has begun to explicitly emphasize the importance of considering culture. Schuhmann (2014) states:

Engineers doing business and leading across cultures must possess three distinct capabilities in order to be effective: (1) the curiosity and ability to observe human behavior, (2) an understanding of what drives human behavior, (3) the ability to modify one’s own behavior to fit the environment without compromising one’s identity. (69)

Those designing collaborative urban planning projects could make this third point a central part of establishing how team interactions occur. Collaborators need to reflect upon what underlying values and assumptions drive their individual behavior, and then compare these values and assumptions to those of their partners. Reflective practice should be engaged at both the individual and group level. Understanding what cultural affinities and differences exist between group members should help in developing project work plans that can create a engaging working environment for all parties where learning and project implementation successfully occur. While such an exercise might seem tedious and wasteful of limited resources, this research suggests such efforts could be critical to facilitate project implementation, because no context is the same.

When to address culture

The appropriate extent of conversations around cultural affinities and differences may vary with project length, project complexity, the number of collaborators, and the job-position of those interacting cross-culturally. As Candida Moiane hinted, conversations about culture may be less critical when a project is less complex and success is defined more by speed of implementation, such as with road construction (July 16, 2013). In contrast, with a project designed to be a test project for implementing and adapting new ideas, such as with the slum-upgrading project in Chamanculo-C, conversations about cultural affinities and differences might need greater prioritization, especially when the project is envisioned to set precedence for future projects. Considering how the level of complexity of a project relates to how critical considering culture is to a project’s successful implementation relates back to Woolcock’s idea regarding matching a project’s
design with a project’s problem; how much culture matters can vary with the difficulty of implementation of a project.

As chapter 3 showed, since culture often matters less when projects have a smaller number of collaborators or collaboration between similar organizations, culture may not need to be brought up as much with these projects; in contrast, explicitly addressing culture is of greater importance when there is a larger number of collaborators from multiple different organization-types, as communication can be increasingly difficult in these scenarios. Regardless of the scenario, reflective practice on culture is important; what may vary between scenarios is how reflective practice is conducted, with variations in its structure and formality.

Further, when and how culture should be addressed will vary with the experience workers have in working cross-culturally. For those who have not interacted as much cross-culturally, addressing this topic formally with more of a structured curriculum may be a good strategy to make sure core topics regarding cross-cultural cooperation are covered. For those who have interacted more cross-culturally, addressing the topic more informally may be an important strategy. As discussed in chapter 2's section for whom cultural affinities matter, many individuals in more administrative roles who have interacted more cross-culturally may be more likely to have frameworks for being ‘politically correct’ in stating that culture is less of a key factor than knowledge and experience for building partnerships where learning and project implementation can successfully occur. Thus, for those who have lived and worked in environments where political correctness is prioritized, valuable strategies may be to: (a) provide greater formal encouragement from respected individuals or organizations for considering this topic; and (b) to discuss this topic in an environment more removed from these individuals’ daily work places so they feel more open with talking about culture and collaboration.

Sometimes organizations may choose to collaborate with other organizations that have more recognizable differences in cultural work styles. Countries like Mozambique should have greater agency to choose partners based on multiple criteria, and whether partners have cultural affinities should not be an ultimately defining factor. What is important is that in cases where collaborators have greater cultural differences, discussion about culture should be more of a priority.

Looking more specifically at when to address culture in a project, consideration of culture is especially important during the project design phase. At this stage, careful reflection can increase overall project effectiveness, as potential conflicts during more resource intensive stages of the project can be avoided. If cultural conflicts occur, project managers should be willing to potentially delay next planned steps to address the conflict before problems expand. Reflection on cross-cultural communication should also occur at the end of projects to help inform future projects.
How to address culture: communication and trust

This research suggests that working across different cultures often initially more difficult for those who have not had as much experience with cross-cultural interactions, as well as for those for whom histories of cross-cultural conflict is a strong part of their cultural identity. Thus, a proactive step project designers and managers can take for urban planning projects with cross-cultural collaboration is to consider the trust-building process within the team. Urban practitioners should look to understand how a culture’s societal norms and values influence the concept of trust and how trust is often developed within a culture. Furthermore, urban planning academics should look more into frameworks that can provide insight into how trust may be established when parties embrace different norms and values, such as that of Doney et al. (1998). One way for building trust is by improving open communication.

Communication is one of the ways culture has the most impact on collaboration projects. Nishimura et al. argues for the importance of considering different communication cultures, as “being aware of these differences usually leads to better comprehension, fewer misunderstandings and to mutual respect” (2008: 783). Different cultures can have different communication styles, such as being quiet versus lively and using varying amounts of body language. Certainly such differences also largely vary between individuals, but there can also be observable trends regarding communication styles within a culture. The business literature widely argues for the importance of considering intercultural communication because, simply put, “organizations are made up of people” (Zografi, 2009: 133). While communication might often be labeled as a “soft skill,” business management authors emphasize the importance of studying communication differences between cultures so that efficient and effective communication can lead to ‘successful’ business relationships (ibid). Thus, extensive research in organizational management has explored cultural differences, and then applied such understandings to discussions on intercultural communication and even briefly specifically to development cooperation (Hofstede et al., 2010). Urban planners involved with cross-cultural collaborative projects need to delve into the wealth of this literature, and when considering cultural affinities and differences, they should focus on different communication cultures, as this focus is greatly important for improving the effectiveness and trust between members of intercultural teams.

Focusing on sub-cultures

Much of what this research uncovered was that how culture matters for a particular project will depend on the affinities and differences within participants’ sub-cultures. Culture is nuanced, with many different pieces; sometimes cultural affinities regarding shared experiences from being a country in the global South will...
be important in creating an enabling environment for learning and project implementation, while in other situations, cultural affinities regarding shared organization-type will be more important. Culture is often thought of from a macro-scale, such as a nation. Yet cultures also exist on sub-scales and "can be viewed as a function of organizational scale" (Schuhmann, 2014: 70). For example, different workplace types have their own culture, such as the idea of 'corporate culture.' Schuhmann provides a hierarchy of diversity within national cultures, drawing upon Hofstede's layers of culture (2010):
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"Diversity within National Cultures" (Schuhmann, 2014: 71)

This diagram above provides a great image of how diversity can occur within a national culture. While the diagram might be overly simplistic in showing a set hierarchical order, the general idea that all of these subcultures exist is important to highlight. For some individuals and groups, sub-cultural affinities/differences between generations might play a larger role in the ease with which exchange can occur, and in other contexts, sub-cultural affinities/differences surrounding regions or social class or any other factor may be more important. Further, different sub-cultural elements might be more or less relevant in different "sub-structures" of projects, such as a project's phase or current location.

Thus, policies designing collaborative urban planning projects should be careful not to only focus on what one might most quickly think of regarding cultural affinities and differences, such as whether a nation is from the global North or global South, but also to carefully pay attention to other cultural affinities and differences, such as employment. Planners should expand the idea of context beyond that of geographical context, and to acknowledge the many other aspects that make up the specificity of a project's context, including dimensions such as the positionality of
different team members. This recalls Robinson's point about "ordinary" cities (2006), which can be applied to this argument in considering how there are not only "ordinary" cities, but also "ordinary" cultures. Defining cultures as "ordinary" acknowledges that all cultures are more diverse and distinct than geographical distinctions can represent, and thus categorizing them more broadly is insufficient.

Applying this theory to the practical level, for urban planners to make their city plans successful, they need to carefully consider the critical factors for implementing projects, such as team composition. In building a team, project managers need to think about the cultures and sub-cultures of team members, and how these individuals will interact. Project design might sometimes consider these factors, but there should be time and space for them to be more fully and formally explored. Team composition is readily talked about in the business community and private sector, but not as much in planning. Hackman et al. discuss team effectiveness and composition, explaining that a good mix of team members includes people who bring different skills and assets, but they are not "so different that they risk having difficulty communicating and coordinating with one another" (2000: 115). When building cross-cultural teams, urban planners need to honestly reflect upon what cultural and sub-cultural differences may exist that could inhibit communication and coordination. Effective tools like reflective practice discussions can be used to address such challenges, and, if deemed to be a worthwhile investment, resources should be specifically dedicated to addressing such challenges. There should be a precedence set for managers and administrators that sometimes a partnership may not be worthwhile for a specific project based on cultural differences, and this should be an acceptable, valid reason within the field for not moving forward with a partnership. Sometimes there are resources available to address challenges such as different languages and work styles, but when these resources are not available, pursuing a project with such challenges should not be viewed as a valuable use of limited resources. There could be reticence to using cultural factors such as work styles as reasoning for why not to build a partnership in fear of discrimination. Such concerns are valid and need attention. Ultimately, by considering culture as a factor in building partnerships, the aim is not to ostracize places, but to connect them better with partners. Managers and administrators should not use culture as an excuse to completely turn away from challenging projects, but more as a way to consider and explore alternative partnerships that could be more effective.

Ultimately, even a conversation about sub-cultures might be too oversimplistic. Sandercock pushes for an understanding of multicultural cities, and proposes that planning "need[s] to develop a new kind of multicultural literacy" such that planning practices, ideologies, and policies can plan for heterogenous publics, "acknowledging and nurturing the full diversity of all of the different social
groups in the multicultural city” (1998: 30). The notion of sub-cultures is helpful for creating a more constructive conversation about intercultural collaboration, so that the discussion can remain focused and relevant to project members and components, and not overly broad and vague. Yet the conversation should never stop there, as a danger for oversimplification still exists. Sandercock’s call for planning for heterogenous publics can be applied to urban planning project management in recognizing that no team member comes from a homogenous public, and that each individual has a unique position within their city, organization, and project. Beginning and ending conversations about culture in urban planning projects with the idea of multicultural cities can help address many of the barriers identified in earlier chapters in regards to discussing culture, such as fear of discrimination, stereotyping, and bias. Once a framework of individuality and diversity has been established, then hopefully conversations about shared values and behaviors in cultures and sub-cultures can be used as tools, not binding ideas, in addressing the benefits and limitations of cross-cultural collaboration.

An important reality: the luxury of choosing partners with cultural affinities

While this thesis argues for trying to build partnerships where there are cultural affinities of some sort, it would be foolish to not recognize that trying to establish such partnerships can be realistically difficult. Cris Rangel, who works for the Republic of Mozambique’s Ministry of State Administration on the World Bank Climate Change project, and Maria Salazar González, who works for the Spanish development corporation AECID, explained from their experiences that a reality of urban development work in Mozambique, as well as other countries at a similar point in development, is that there is often a limited number of national professionals who can work on projects (July 2, 2013). The Royal Academy of Engineering completed a study in 2013 reporting the lack of engineers with sufficient skills and experiences in sub-Saharan Africa (Douglas, 2013), and from the qualitative findings in this research, this situation with engineers across sub-Saharan Africa likely represents a trend in Mozambique with engineering and related disciplines such as architecture. Thus, the energy and resources of outside countries without strong cultural affinities to Mozambique is often used, as foreigners that Mozambicans can work with who have cultural affinities created by shared experiences and do not have major language barriers are limited. Sometimes individuals who do not initially have cultural affinities with Mozambique end up collaborating on urban development projects, because these individuals often have experience working in other developing countries, as well as time and the luxury of prioritizing work outside of one’s home country. For example, in a trilateral project between Mozambique, Malawi, and Zambia, a consultant came from Germany to train the domestic-based trainers how to teach their national
peers (ANAMM technicians: July 13, 2013). While it might have been ideal for an individual with training experience from Mozambique to lead this training, such an individual might not have been available because of high demand for local experts. Ultimately, while promoting partnerships with cultural affinities in the cases discussed in this thesis is preferred, this is at times a luxury. The critical discerning question for establishing partnerships is when should the factor of establishing partnerships with cultural affinities be a defining decision in whether or not the partnership should exist, because sometimes there might not be the option of establishing a partnership with a country with cultural affinities due to limited resources and knowledge in how to address a problem. This research suggests that the factor of shared language should be seriously considered, while maybe the factor of a shared level of development might not be as critical.

Host countries choosing partners based on cultural affinities can also become a luxury because of power and politics. In the Chamanculo-C project, an ideal of this trilateral project with Brazilian partners was that knowledge transfer could occur with Brazil’s experiences in Alagados. Yet, even countries such as Brazil that have developed a larger domestic professional base do not always have the breadth of capacity, or the interest, to provide a more ideal partnership where more cultural affinities exist. And Brazil’s involvement with partnerships, just like any other country, can largely be drive by its own political-economic interests. For example, the way procurement has been set up with the funding for the Chamanculo-C project does not require that Brazilian technicians are part of the technical exchange. Luis Nhaca explained that different procurement clauses exist for different funding sources within the project; the Municipality of Maputo does the execution of the funding from the Italian government and Cities Alliance, while the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABD: Agência Brasileira de cooperação) executes how these funds can be used (July 31, 2013). A conversation with Rogerio Nuvunga, the Supervisor of Urban and Environmental Issues for the Municipality of Maputo’s Department of Urban Planning and Environment, indicated that Brazil hired technical consultants from a Portuguese company, Plural, to work on the physical planning portion of the project starting in July 2013 (July 17, 2013). An interesting nuance is that it seems that the finances the Brazilian Cooperation Agency used to hire technical consultants for this planning portion of the project largely came from UNDP (UNDP Jobs post, 2013). The fact that Brazil is positioned as a power broker in deciding how funds will be utilized adds an interesting nuance to the discussion of power dynamics, aid and learning. This case shows that emerging powers from the global South, such as Brazil, may be in more of a political position to make decisions about the importance of cultural affinities between partners within a project than relatively less developed countries like Mozambique. This case shows that for places where a collaborative project is occurring, such as Maputo, choosing
partners with cultural affinities, or based on other qualifications for the matter, may be a luxury depending on who is in control of the funding. This case illustrates how looking at power differences with aid between strictly two divisions of global North versus global South may be insufficient; as Robinson advocates, such dichotomies can be misleading (2006).

*The enduring reality of finance*

An important reality is that financing is central to project implementation. Thus, in the current global economic context, even countries without cultural affinities are often critical in establishing partnerships for projects in countries with less resources. Exchange between countries takes money, and often poorer countries do not have the means to prioritize travel and exchange. Thus, the involvement of the global North is often what makes exchange possible between countries with cultural affinities. Such examples even occur with a rapidly developing country like Brazil. For example, the August 2013 short term exchange between six Brazilian municipalities and eight Mozambican cities, which will cover topics including participatory budgeting, requalification, and land cadastres, was funded by the European Union, the Government of Norway, Cities Alliance, and the Barcelona Cooperation Agency (Cherewa: July 19, 2013; UCLG 2014). While Brazil is a more defined giver for some projects in Mozambique, for this project, funding is being provided for Brazil to participate, as Brazil is also one of the targeted recipients. Such arrangements with the majority of funding being provided by the global North may actually help to enable better knowledge exchange between Brazil and Mozambique, as both countries are equally givers and recipients of this knowledge exchange effort.

Chadreque Lucas Massingue repeatedly stated how the Barcelona-Maputo partnership has been the most successful out of all of Maputo's other partnerships. Massingue showed paperwork documenting at least 21 different municipality-municipality partnerships that Maputo is part of. Many of the other cities Maputo has municipality-municipality partnerships with include other cities from the global South, and a couple of these are from Africa, including Mbabane in Swaziland and Durban in South Africa (July 31, 2013). One could hypothesize that these other municipality-municipality partnerships might have more shared experiences and cultural affinities that would create more enabling environments for exchange. Yet Massingue explained that the reality is that many of these partnerships are formal political exchanges, and not much genuine knowledge exchange occurs (July 31, 2013). Barcelona is quite unique in that it has such an extensive department dedicated to active municipal-municipal partnerships. Such a department cannot be developed without a city having financial means where it can prioritize helping other cities. This example of the successful Barcelona-Maputo partnership
emphasizes how in a global economy where a great deal of disparity exists, policies may need to focus on establishing partnerships based on other cultural affinities, such as employment and organization-type.

Ultimately, this discussion—that how much cultural affinities of one type or another should be a factor in determining the partners in a collaborative project depends on context and a number of different factors such as financing—reinforces Sen’s notion of development as freedom (1999). Host partners should have a choice in choosing partners based on a number of different factors, not just culture, as the act of the host partner having choice as agency is a principal means of development. Urban planners in all places should have the freedom to consider whether a project’s context and goals means cultural diversity will add or detract value to the project based on the specificities of the project. International organizations that want to follow Sen’s theory need to remember such ideas as they work to facilitate the establishment of partnerships working on urban development.

A turn towards learning: deepening knowledge exchange and peer-learning initiatives

These interviews nuanced when culture matters based on how collaborative development projects are considered to be successful or not. Considering the learning-centered approach to development advocated for by Sabel and Reddy (2007), when success is marked more by learning, then cultural differences may be less of an inhibitor to creating an enabling environment for exchange, because one of the project’s objectives is learning to appreciate and adapt different cultural aspects of partners. Such a focus on learning can be powerful for promoting balanced power dynamics not only through South-South cooperation efforts, but also through North-South cooperation efforts, as learning is collective. Thus, in order for international development and urban planning to take advantage of a wide range of partnerships, a more central area for the field to focus on should be learning. This focus on learning, as well as consideration of Sen’s notion of development as freedom (1999), will allow international urban planners to advocate for and embrace cultural diversities within projects. Cultural differences can be valuable in cooperation so long as partners can learn to appreciate each other’s cultural heritage and adopt to a mutually created new cultural space for everyone. However, creating such spaces takes time, so to accelerate the learning that can occur with cross-cultural collaboration, intentional discussions, including reflective practice, should occur. This research suggests that more time should be spent by the international urban development field in considering what types of programming and policies can facilitate culture-centered practices.

Building partnerships around knowledge exchange and peer-learning exchange is a key opportunity in deepening cross-cultural collaboration efforts. To effectively deepen such efforts, instead of project designers restricting themselves
to only looking to build partnerships between places with the more outwardly visible cultural affinities, such as those with shared histories or levels of development, project designers might need to focus on trying to build successful partnerships by identifying those who might relate based on other “sub-cultures,” like employment, such as in the case of the municipal market managers in the Barcelona-Maputo partnership. For identifying different “sub-cultures,” simple categories and diagrams, such as the one previously referenced, can be a helpful tool for busy project designers to more easily identify, consider, and clearly defend less-mainstream “peer-to-peer” learning arrangements. Less mainstream “peer-to-peer” learning arrangements might be those based more on employment or city-size, and less on nations. Larger “peer-to-peer” knowledge exchange efforts right now within the development field tend to focus at the national level; for example, the World Bank’s South-South Knowledge Exchange program tends to highlight the national cultural level, profiling collaborations such as the “Tanzania and India Exchange” and the “Honduras, Nicaragua, and Colombia Exchange” (World Bank Institute, 2013). Such knowledge-exchange efforts are greatly valuable, and can be enhanced by building partnerships based more on critical “sub-cultural” affinities, because as this thesis showed, cultural affinity with nations being from the South does not always matter for project implementation. Initiatives within international development and urban planning need to heed the appeal of Josep Roig, the Secretary General of UCLG (United Cities and Local Governments), as UCLG “call[s] upon the international community, networks and partners, to exchange knowledge and solutions based on evidence between global intermediary cities” (emphasis added, 2014). As Roig suggests, even looking at the affinity of being a city is not focused enough; project designers need to be more specific, looking at factors such as city scale. In deciding what sub-cultural aspects to prioritize in building partnerships, major international organizations should give agency to recipients such as the city of Maputo in determining what kinds of collaboration projects need different kinds of partners. Major international organizations can develop frameworks for a variety of partnership types to enable more nuanced thinking about the different factors that should be considered when establishing collaborative projects. Hopefully, a more open framework can enable those at all levels and scales of international development and urban planning to have a voice in building future partnerships. Ultimately, an approach in establishing partnerships that more carefully considers the many nuances of cultural affinities can take collaborative initiatives, including but not limited to peer-learning and knowledge exchange, within international development to a deeper level in promoting reflective practice that embrace diversity in a way that leads to deeper exchange.
Recommendations for International Organizations Supporting International Cooperation at the Urban Development Level: Ways to Address Culture in Creating More Enabling Environments for Exchange

- Acknowledge that how much culture matters in creating enabling environments for exchange depends on the context; sometimes national culture matters for creating such environments, while other times it matters less than other factors.
  - Developing peer-to-peer learning means carefully considering the multiple layers of culture. Consider how culture matters beyond the macro scale, such as global South versus global North. Consider how culture matters at scales such as employment and organization-type, which may promote different types of collaboration such as city-to-city partnership.
- Make space in planning practice for explicit discussion of what types of cross-cultural partnerships will create enabling environments for exchange.
  - Culture needs to be considered at the project management level in designing and implementing collaborative urban planning projects.
  - Reflective practice should be used as a tool for considering when, how, and how much culture matters to a potential or existing project.
  - Culture should be considered when establishing partnerships. Acknowledgement of cultural affinities and differences should be a reasonable reason for deciding whether the goals of a partnership might feasibly be achievable, and thus whether a project is worthy of resources.
  - Culture is an important topic worthwhile of planning resources. At the project scale, the amount of resources dedicated to this topic should vary with the project's context. Culture should also be part of training planning practitioners, especially those who will work cross-culturally.
- When possible, establish cross-cultural partnerships where national culture has less of an impact on impeding project implementation and learning exchange. These types of partnerships may have a smaller number of partners, a smaller scale, and more flexible timelines and deliverables.
- Develop strategies to effectively address how cultural differences can enable and/or inhibit a project. Such strategies might include:
  - Focusing on tools for improving cross-cultural communication and trust.
  - When developing partnerships with strong cultural differences, remove project pressures such as short timeframes and strict deliverables, and establishing learning as an explicit project priority.
- Contextualize strategies for addressing culture. Develop different strategies for addressing culture depending on the employment-type of the practitioner, especially if the practitioner may have less experience working cross-culturally or greater reserve in talking about culture.
- Ultimately, consider culture as just one of the many factors adding to the complexity of international development and urban planning, understanding that the design of each collaborative planning project must be unique, responding to the specific project context.
Bibliography


Carolini, G. (forthcoming b) *Valuing Possibility: South-South Cooperation and Participatory Budgeting in Maputo, Mozambique*. Book manuscript in progress.


Special Unit for South-South Cooperation, United Nations Development Programme. (2009). Enhancing South-South and triangular cooperation: Study of the current situation and existing good practices in policy, institutions, and operation of South-South and triangular cooperation. United Nations Development Programme, New York.


