



Lund University

Institution of Sociology

LUND
UNIVERSITY

The Cultural Aspect of Knowledge Transfer between Sweden and Uganda/Tanzania



LUND
UNIVERSITY

Author: Sofie Ulfhielm
Master thesis: SOCM04,

30hp, Spring 2014
Supervisor: Magnus Karlsson

Abstract

Author: Sofie Ulfhielm

Title: The cultural aspect of knowledge transfer between Sweden and Uganda/Tanzania

Master thesis SOCM04

30 hp

Supervisor: Magnus Karlsson

Institution of Sociology, spring 2014

Background: Because it is common for organizations to exist across national boundaries, the knowledge management involves dealing with transferring knowledge across cross-cultural teams, which can be a challenge. According to many different studies, knowledge production is “socially, culturally and historically situated”. Therefore, it might be problematic if the knowledge created by a certain group of people, at a certain time and place, is to be passed on to other groups of people that weren’t present at the same time and place when the knowledge was created by the first group. Then how could one share knowledge with others whom don’t understand the context in which the knowledge was initially created?

Aim: This research aims is to examine the culture’s influence on knowledge transfer between a Swedish and a Ugandan and a Tanzanian culture by looking at the effects of an educational project, such as Sida's “Child Rights, Classroom and School Management Programme”.

This thesis is based on the problem of transferring knowledge across different cultures. It is a qualitative research, which takes place in Uganda and Tanzania, consisting of six interviews with participants from two batches in the Sida program, two observations and one workshop. The point of departure were two questions: 1) What cultural aspects affect the knowledge transfer within the Sida:s “Child Rights, Classroom and School Management Program”? and 2) How do the culture aspects affect the process of transferring knowledge between different cultures? The theories used to answer these questions are Hofstede’s cultural index, as well as a model which looks at knowledge flow as a function of five different factors. The research findings shows that knowledge transfer can be hindered when the knowledge is based on cultural values which are different from the receiving culture, and that people thus can be resistant towards absorbing this knowledge and thus embrace change. The sender (the participants from the Sida program) thus have to package and adjust the knowledge so that it fits the receiver’s cultural values and beliefs in order to facilitate knowledge transfer. This is achieved by taking baby steps, and adjusting the knowledge slowly.

Keywords: *Knowledge transfer, cultural aspect, cultural difference, change*

Acknowledgement

This thesis is based on research done in Kampala, Uganda, and Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania. It has been an interesting and rewarding time, and I feel that I have gained a deeper understanding of the knowledge transfer process, and what cultural aspects which are important to consider.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank my supervisor Magnus Karlsson and the informants for their participation and contribution. They made this research possible. I would also like to thank Agneta Wångdahl Flinck for introducing me to the Sida program and helping out with preparation prior and during the trip in Uganda and Tanzania. Lastly, I would also like to thank my friend and travel partner Andreea Girdea for all the help and support during this time. A big thank you to all of you!

Sofie Ulfhielm

Lund 2014-06-05

Content

- [Abstract.....2](#)
- [Acknowledgement.....3](#)
- [1. Introduction.....6](#)
 - [1.1.Child Rights, Classroom and School Management program.....7](#)
 - [1.1.2. Batch Uganda.....8](#)
 - [1.1.3. Batch Tanzania.....8](#)
 - [1.2. Purpose and research question.....9](#)
 - [1.2.1. Aim9](#)
 - [1.2.2. Research questions9](#)
 - [1.3. Delimitations.....9](#)
 - [1.4. Disposition of the paper.....9](#)
- [2. Previous research.....9](#)
 - [2.1. Knowledge specific, organization specific, person specific and culture specific factors affecting knowledge transfer.....10](#)
 - [2.1.1. Knowledge specific influences.....10](#)
 - [2.1.2. Organization specific influences11](#)
 - [2.1.3. Person specific influences.....11](#)
 - [2.1.4. Culture specific influences.....12](#)
 - [2.2. Frameworks linking culture and knowledge13](#)
- [3. Theoretical review.....15](#)
 - [3.1. Hofstede’s cultural index15](#)
 - [3.2. Communication process18](#)
- [4. Method.....21](#)
 - [4.1. Interviews.....21](#)
 - [4.1.1. Research sample.....23](#)
 - [4.2. Observation.....24](#)
 - [4.3. Workshop/Group discussion.....25](#)
 - [4.4. Method of analysis.....26](#)
 - [4.5. Ethical considerations26](#)
- [5. Results and analysis28](#)
 - [5.1. Sender related factors affecting the knowledge transfer process.....28](#)

5.1.1. Nature of knowledge (Tacit/explicit).....	28
5.1.2. Knowledge stock and valuable knowledge.....	29
5.1.3. Motivation: willingness to share.....	31
5.1.4. Language ability and Cultural openness	32
5.1.5. Codification.....	33
5.2. Communicational factors affecting the knowledge transfer process.....	36
5.2.1. Communication channels and dialogue.....	36
5.2.2. Three levels of knowledge flow: Vertical, Horizontal, and Behavior promoting knowledge development	37
5.2.3. Interpretation.....	39
5.2.4. Relationship between sender and receiver.....	40
Corporate socialization mechanism, cultural background and cultural distance.....	40
Hofstede’s cultural index.....	42
5.3. Receiver related factors affecting the knowledge transfer process.....	45
5.3.1. Knowledge type: valuable knowledge.....	46
5.3.2. Absorptive capacity.....	46
5.3.3. Willingness to adapt.....	47
5.4. Environmental factors affecting the knowledge transfer process.....	50
6. Conclusion	53
6.1. What cultural aspects affects the knowledge transfer within the Sida:s “Child Rights, Classroom and School Management Program”?	53
6.2. How does the culture affect the process of transferring knowledge between different cultures?	54
7. Discussion.....	55
Concluding reflections.....	57
Reference list.....	58
Appendix 1.....	60
Introduction.....	60
Basic information.....	60
The program, the project and its implementation process.....	60
Introduction.....	63
Basic information.....	63
The program, the project and its implementation process.....	63

1. Introduction

In today's knowledge based society, it has become more important for organizations to focus on knowledge and knowledge management in order to be innovative, and thus competitive (Hage & Powers, 1992; Haghirian, 2003; Nonaka, 2000). Because it is common for organizations to exist across national boundaries, the knowledge management involves dealing with transferring knowledge across cross-cultural teams (Holden & Von Korfzfleisch, 2004; Leyland, 2006), which can be a challenge. According to different studies, knowledge production is "socially, culturally and historically situated" (Mørk, Aanestad, Hanseth & Grisot, 2008:2). Therefore, it might be problematic if the knowledge created by a certain group of people, at a certain time and place, is to be passed on to other groups of people that weren't present at the same time and place when the knowledge was created by the first group. How do you share knowledge with others who don't understand the context in which the knowledge was created? This is relevant for many organizations because competence development often involves picking out employees who will participate in a course for example. The employees are then supposed to come back to their work group and transfer what they have learned to fellow colleagues to be able to implement it into the daily work process.

Additionally, the process of transferring knowledge is also strongly influenced by cultural values of individual employees (Ardichvili, Maurer, Wentling & Stuedemann, 2006). In today's globalized society, competence development is about educating employees across borders. Many organizations have moved parts of the work activities overseas, such as production (Sennett, 2006), and employers have to deal with different culture, values and attitudes that affect the work that is being done on site. These values do not always go hand in hand with the organization's culture. An employee from another country might therefore experience a conflict if he or she learns the organization's culture through education, and then returns to everyday work that is being influenced by the former culture. Because culture is difficult to change (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2008), it might be problematic to implement the new culture when the rest of the work team still incorporates the old values because they were not at the same place at the same time as the employee when the new knowledge was created. The link between culture and knowledge transfer is a two-way relationship. Competence development and knowledge transfer is often about changing an organization's culture and values and thus how work is being done, in order to become more competitive (Alvesson &

Sveningsson, 2008; Leyland, 2006). Culture, on the other hand, has a major influence on the knowledge transfer process as it represents all the values and beliefs that the organizational processes relies on. All the different cultures and subcultures that exist within an organization can create resistance or motivation towards change, including knowledge transfer. The culture facilitates or hinders knowledge transfer depending on whether the change is in line with the cultural values, and if there is an open climate that welcomes change and new ways of thinking, or if the culture prevent things to be performed in a new way because the old way is safe and familiar (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2008; Ahrne & Papakostas, 2002; Granberg, 2011).

I am focusing on the latter part of a Sida program called “Child Rights, Classroom and School Management program” (see description below) because I am looking at how the participants of the Sida program transferred and implemented what they have learned in a Western context, based on Western beliefs, to their home countries where the people don’t share the same understanding of child rights.

1.1. Child Rights, Classroom and School Management program

This master’s thesis is based on a Sida (the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) project called “Child Rights, Classroom and School Management Programme”. This will be referred to as Sida program/course during the essay. The program focuses on people in developing countries who hold a position in the school system which enables them to affect change in their home country and to set up strategic reform processes on multiple action levels. Its main purpose is to “contribute to capacity development and processes of change in developing countries by offering key persons training” (Wickenberg, W. Flinck, et al. 2009:10). The program is constituted by two parts. The first one takes place in Lund, Sweden, where three individuals with a high position in the school system from ten different developing countries come together, which together forms one batch of 30 members, and participate in a training program. They get to acquire theoretical knowledge about child rights, such as the Child Right Convention and the three P’s (participation, protection and provision), as well as practical knowledge through school visits etc. During the training, they get to develop action plans and strategies for how they will implement the new knowledge, that is developed in Sweden, when they return to their home countries. The second part takes place in their home countries where they introduce and present their action plans and start the implementation process to make a change. To sum up, this program strives towards improving child rights by raising awareness about the topic and by facilitating the planning of change

processes and implementing them. I will focus on the latter part of the program by going to Kampala (Uganda) and Dar es Salaam (Tanzania) and examine one batch in each country (see descriptions of batch projects below). The reason why I am focusing on the latter part of the program is because I will look at the result of the Sida program, how the things learned in a program based on Swedish values and beliefs are implemented in a different context within the two developing countries described above.

1.1.2. Batch Uganda

The participants wanted to increase child participation in the classroom in order to see a learner enjoying school, not as a listener, but as a participant in the learning process. In order to increase child participation in the classroom, the participants also wanted to equip the teachers and the teacher trainees in skills of involving children in participation, and promoting the children's participation in the learning process. By reintroducing a method that emphasizes what have been learned in the college the teachers will be able to know and do what they are supposed to, in the way they are supposed to. The project is dealing with teaching and learning for transferring knowledge into practice on three different levels; the teacher trainees, the teachers in the field, and the children/students. The parents are also involved, to some extent, in order for the children to put into practice what they are learning both at home and in school.

1.1.3. Batch Tanzania

After conducting a SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) the participants of the examined batch in Tanzania developed a project which would implement the 3 P's (protection, provision and participation) in school in order to make friendly teaching environment. The project is about extracting an environment which nurtures the relationship between a teacher and a child. The participants want to raise this awareness in three groups of people, which will be involved in the project. These people are teachers, students and school committee, and the school committee includes both teachers and parents. The head-teacher will be the center of the training because it is the one being responsible also for over-seeing the teachers and school development issues. The goals of the project is to change the behavior of teachers regarding the way of working, the way of providing safety of children, the way they communicate, and the way they handle the classroom. The participants want to teach them through training to observe the rights of the people, and ensure that the students are fully involved in the process of teaching and sharing the knowledge and departing the knowledge in these children.

1.2. Purpose and research question

1.2.1. Aim

This research aims at examine the culture's influence on knowledge transfer between a Swedish and a Ugandan as well as a Tanzanian culture by looking at the effects of an educational project, such as Sida:s "Child Rights, Classroom and School Management Programme".

1.2.2. Research questions

- What cultural aspects affect the knowledge transfer within the Sida:s "Child Rights, Classroom and School Management Program"?
- How do the culture aspects affect the process of transferring knowledge between different cultures?

1.3. Delimitations

This research is limited to focus on one batch in Uganda and and one batch in Tanzania. I further limit my focus by only looking at the participants' perspective. This research would have been too extensive and thus overwhelming if I included other perspectives as well. I also believe that the participant's perspective can give an interesting point of view as they have insight to the program as well as to the context where they are implementing the knowledge.

1.4. Disposition of the paper

The thesis first addresses what has been done empirically regarding knowledge transfer under the section with previous research, which follows by a presentation of relevant theories and models in a theoretical review. This leads up to a methodological chapter, where the method for this research is discussed. The result is then presented and analyzed according to relevant theories, which follows by a concluding chapter where the research findings is summed up and the research questions are being answered. The thesis is then completed with a discussion.

2. Previous research

In the following chapter, a general review of what has been empirically examined about knowledge transfer will be given through a presentation of previous research that deals with different cultural influencing factors on knowledge transfer that are important to consider.

2.1. Knowledge specific, organization specific, person specific and culture specific factors affecting knowledge transfer

The research done by Haghirian (2003) gives an extensive overview on how culture can be an obstacle in knowledge transfer processes, and it is highly relevant because it deals with many central elements within the subject of this thesis. According to Haghirian (2003), it becomes important to look at different organizational and individual elements in a context in which knowledge transfer takes place, and how the different factors influences the process.

Therefore, she deals with a number of factors that influence both the knowledge transfer process as well as the success of knowledge implementation. These are;

- 1) *Knowledge specific influences,*
- 2) *Organization specific influences,*
- 3) *Person specific influences,*
- 4) *Culture specific influences.*

2.1.1. Knowledge specific influences

Factors related to the actual knowledge being transferred are considered influential to the knowledge transfer and implementation process. Several authors, who bases their research on Polany's theories about the distinction between explicit and tacit knowledge, claims that the success of the knowledge transfer can vary depending on the nature of knowledge (Chen etc, 2010; Ardichvili etc, 2006; Donate & Guadamillas, 2010; De Long & Fahey, 2000; Leyland, 2006; Haghirian, 2003). If the knowledge is *explicit*, then it is fairly simple to formulate it by the use of symbols and therefore relatively easy to transfer by using information technology. If *tacit knowledge* is to be transferred however, it has to be codified in order to be accessible to other units, which in turn makes it more understandable and can therefore be implemented in a more successful way at the receiver's unit. There are different ways of sharing tacit knowledge, such as social interactions between the organization's employees, routines and learning-by-doing etc. Codification involves the "ability to transform tacit capabilities into a comprehensive code, understood by a large number of people" (Haghirian, 2003:3).

Codification is an important part in the knowledge transfer process because knowledge and information can only be communicated to other people when the knowledge has been codified, and the way knowledge is packaged influences the way it is transferred (Haghirian, 2003).

Another knowledge-related factor which influences the success of knowledge transfer is *casual ambiguity*, which is seen as “the fundamental factor that hinders the precise replication of results from the use of knowledge” (Haghirian, 2003:4). When knowledge involves ambiguity, it can be interpreted differently by different groups or individuals (Holden & Von Kortzfleisch, 2004). Therefore it becomes more difficult to communicate it because it would imply different things in different contexts (Haghirian, 2003) which would lead to misunderstandings or misinterpretations.

2.1.2. Organization specific influences

When it comes to organization specific influences, the major factors influencing the knowledge transfer process, according to Haghirian (2003), are the organizational structure and the organization’s culture, here referred to as corporate culture. *Structural elements of organization* can hinder or facilitate communications between individuals, and therefore prevent knowledge transfer both within and across unit boundaries (ibid). In cases of a clear and strong structure, communication can occur fairly easy if it is consistent with the existing and predefined communication channels. But if knowledge transfer occurs outside these communication channels, a clear and strong organizational structure can inhibit the process. *The corporate culture*, as defined above, is seen as values and views that are either conscious or taken for granted, which affects attitudes and behaviors within an organization (Clegg, etc, 2008; Haghirian, 2003). In line with what has been stated earlier about culture, how it involves values and attitudes about reality, it therefore affects the way people react and perceive different situations (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2008), such as how knowledge is received and interpreted. Accordingly, a culture that encourages behavior which supports active flow of ideas can facilitate knowledge transfer. Hence, a knowledge oriented culture is necessary for successful knowledge transfer (Haghirian, 2003).

2.1.3. Person specific influences

Person specific influences involve factors such as organizational routines and power status. *Organizational routines* are of great importance since they make it clear what needs to be done, how it should be done and in what order, because it has been done before. This also applies to knowledge transfer and implementation since organizational routines affect the process of knowledge transfer and the success of implementation since the “more frequently a company carries out its knowledge management processes, the more routine it has in doing so” (Haghirian, 2003:5). *Power status* can also affect and be affected by knowledge transfer. Knowledge can be a useful tool when focus is on strengthening an individual with a low

position within an organization, to even out the power balance. However, if knowledge sharing is avoided in order to keep a high position in fear of losing power in the organization, then power becomes an obstacle for knowledge transfer. Power structures can thus also be affected if knowledge transfer is carried out efficiently which changes power structure by distributing knowledge (Haghirian, 2003).

2.1.4. Culture specific influences

The most central factor in this thesis, and in most of the research that has been done on the subject, is *culture specific influences* on knowledge transfer. Haghirian (2003) developed a conceptual model where she deals with different culture-related elements that affect the knowledge transfer process. These elements are linked to the *codification style* and to the *knowledge type*.

One aspect linked to the codification style is the *sender's cultural background*. Because knowledge is transferred by real human beings, and not standardized machines or technology (even if technology is sometimes used to share knowledge), the cultural and social background of the person sending the knowledge affects this process. The cultural values and attitudes of the sender have shaped how the sender acquired and made sense of the knowledge. The receiving end of the knowledge transfer, however, is often located in another region with different cultural backgrounds. This makes it difficult to transfer the knowledge since the receiving unit will have trouble understanding it in the same way as intended by the sender, which will lead to misinterpretations, and will thus have problems acquiring it. Another problem is when the cultural background of the individual who receives knowledge doesn't agree with the culture in which they work. This can affect the knowledge transfer as it becomes more complicated and thus more difficult to accomplish successful knowledge transfer (Haghirian, 2003).

Another important aspect is the ability to communicate with and understand other cultures and its language, in other words the *language ability*. The language ability is vital because it implies both the skills to interact and empathize with other cultures as well as the skills to deal with the different issues that arise due to language differences. The remaining factor that is related to the codification style is the *cultural distance*, which identifies differences and similarities amongst different cultures, and how they can be distinguished by their national characteristics. Cultural distance determines whether communication will be facilitated or hindered in cross-cultural business relationships, and therefore affects the flow of information.

In short, people with greater cultural differences, who are interacting, will have greater difficulties in communicating effectively because the knowledge has to be adjusted so that it fits into a new cultural context. It can be considered to be one of the main influences in knowledge transfer (Haghirian, 2003) since it can be an obstacle in understanding each other.

Culture also affects what is perceived as valuable and useful knowledge in an organization. This affects what kind of knowledge a unit focuses on and can become an obstacle when different units with different culture define relevant knowledge differently. (De Long & Fahey etc, 2000; Haghirian, 2003). Knowledge type can affect how knowledge is received, depending on the *sender's learning style* and *cultural openness*. Since culture affects the way we perceive reality, culture also affect our learning style and how we use and interpret knowledge in order to make sense of the reality. The ways people learn and accumulate knowledge differs and therefore people teach or transfer knowledge differently depending on where you come from and what cultural values and learning styles you are used to. This might lead to misunderstandings and miscommunications when the learning styles differ, which results in unsuccessful knowledge transfer, because the knowledge that is transferred, or the way it is transferred might not be in accordance with what the receiving culture perceive as relevant or important. In order to achieve successful knowledge transfer between different cultures, with different views on relevant and valuable knowledge, a cultural openness is of great importance. Cultural openness can be seen as “a set of abilities and cultural knowledge, primarily based on past experience, which enables a person to engage in appropriate and meaningful interactions with people of divergent national and organizational cultures” (Haghirian, 2003:11).

2.2. Frameworks linking culture and knowledge

As been pointed out through the literature, culture and knowledge is very often linked together, as culture affect knowledge-related behavior in different ways. De Long & Fahey (2000) discusses four ways in which culture affects knowledge management and thus the transfer and use of knowledge.

Firstly, both an organizations culture and its subcultures affects what is considered to be valuable and relevant knowledge, and thus which knowledge a unit needs or share. Existing subcultures often have different views and values about which knowledge is important compared to other groups in the organization which can create conflict and misunderstandings between units (De Long & Fahey, 2000). Another way in which culture affects knowledge

transfer is through mediation of different levels on knowledge. Depending on what norms that exist within the culture, knowledge is distributed differently across the organization which determines who holds what knowledge and controls what knowledge that is to be shared. In order to transfer knowledge, one must be aware of these norms about power relations (ibid).

Culture also affects knowledge transfer by creating platforms for social interaction, in which knowledge is transferred. The social rules for how to communicate in different situations are based on the values and attitudes that the organization's culture constitutes of. In this way, culture "shape how people interact and communicate, and therefore affect knowledge creation, sharing and use" (De Long & Fahey, 2000:8). The cultural influence operates on three different levels of knowledge flow; *vertical* (cultural norms determines what knowledge and information that is accepted to share with management/the head office), *horizontal* (cooperation, how well you interact and share knowledge with colleagues is shaped by cultural patterns) and *behavior promoting knowledge development* (culture affects the way we teach and share knowledge, as well as the way we deal with mistakes and learn from it) (De Long & Fahey, 2000). ‘

An additional way in which culture influences the use and transfer of knowledge is through shaping how new knowledge is created and adopted. As culture can be seen as a set of norms and attitudes hidden in the organization's walls, it shapes the relationship between different units and subcultures, and thus how knowledge is distributed and implemented, as well as the creation of new knowledge about the external environment and how this is legitimized and adopted into the organization (ibid).

3. Theoretical review

Based on the theoretical aspects that were brought up above in the previous research, some relevant theories have been selected in order to explain and understand the research findings. These theories will be presented below.

3.1. Hofstede's cultural index

Hofstede's cultural index is a model that has been used by many researches such as Leyland, (2006), Chen etc, (2009) and Ardichvili etc, (2006). The model distinguishes between different cultural dimensions in order to understand how culture can differ, and how it affects inter-subsidiary knowledge transfer efforts.

The first cultural dimension is *individualism/collectivism* (IC), where individuals are driven by their own personal interests versus the interest of the others in a collective group (Leyland, 2006), and “members of collectivistic and individualistic cultures are characterized by distinctively different ways of processing information and constructing knowledge” (Ardichvili etc, 2006:4). Therefore, the knowledge transfer can be affected by the sender's and the receiver's positions along the IC dimension (Leyland, 2006).

Individual cultures are characterized by a focus on oneself and the personal interests. This creates loose ties between individuals (Leyland, 2006). Everyone is supposed to be independent and look after themselves (Ardichvili etc, 2006; Chen etc, 2009) thus individuals in these cultures only do things that are beneficial for themselves (Leyland, 2006). When it comes to knowledge transfer in these cultures, it can create obstacles if there is a perceived lack of benefits from the process. Further, the transfer of knowledge might be hindered in an individualistic culture since “individuals tend to see each piece of information independent of its context” (Ardichvili etc, 2006:4). Thus, knowledge in a written and abstract form tends to be more accepted rather than information taken from the environment (Ardichvili etc, 2006).

Individuals in *collectivist cultures* highlight the idea of community where everyone is included, the interest of the group pervades every decision made, and everyone shares the responsibility towards the community. Knowledge is considered owned by the community and should be used in order to benefit the group as a whole (Leyland, 2006). Members of collectivistic cultures tend to try and understand information from a contextual point of view to obtain the meaning of the knowledge. Knowledge can thus be transferred successfully in

these cultures are through actions and face-to-face communication or phone-calls (Ardichvili etc, 2006).

Depending on where the sender's and receiver's units are positioned in this cultural dimension, their perspectives will affect the process of knowledge transfer. A sender in a collectivistic culture might easily share knowledge because it is for the greater good, whereas senders in individual cultures might avoid sharing of knowledge because they don't perceive it as beneficial for themselves. A receiver in a individual culture on the other hand, might be resistant to accepting new knowledge because he or she doesn't see the meaning of it, and a receiver in a collective culture can be open to new knowledge if it is in everyone's interest (Leyland, 2006).

The second cultural dimension is *power distance* (PD) which deals with the perception and acceptance of inequality in a society (Chen etc, 2009; Leyland, 2006). It is grounded in a belief of dependence and the existence of non-symmetrical relationships which can develop in organizations, especially between home office and subsidiaries but also between subsidiaries. In *small PD* organizations, knowledge transfer is facilitated because the culture base decisions on a participative approach and the individuals are often willing to discuss and allow an open exchange of new ideas. *Large PD organizations*, on the other hand, applies a traditional model of knowledge transfer that includes a top-down approach where units with less or no power are perceived as passively subordinates that only acquire knowledge. Since large PD organizations have clear structures they can both facilitate communication flow and hinder it depending on if it aligns with the culture's values or not.

Regardless of the sender's and receiver's position in the PD dimension, and whether they have different positions or not, knowledge transfer in this cultural dimension is about negotiating and compromising. This is because knowledge transfer "involves changing the way things are done and adopting new approaches that may be radical different from those currently in use" (Leyland, 2006:9). When there is a misalignment between the sender and the receiver due to major differences, they are unable to compromise which leads to resistance. Then the role of the head office to deal with this resistance increases in importance so that the goals of the knowledge transfer can be achieved by monitoring when and under what conditions knowledge transfer should occur. But unless the context, in which the knowledge is to be used, is considered during knowledge transfer, the receiver might create barriers because they don't see the meaning of acquiring the new knowledge (Leyland, 2006).

The third cultural dimension in Hofstede's cultural index is *uncertainty avoidance* (UA), which can be understood as "the degree to which the members of a society feel uncomfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity" (Chen etc, 2009:4). Besides ambiguity, UA deals with how individuals embrace change and whether they are willing to take a leap of faith into the unpredictable future. In strong UA cultures, change that involves adopting something new is perceived as risky and problematic. Individuals in these cultures are driven by formalized structures, with strict delegations and rules. They tend to avoid change and new ways of doing things by sticking to what is already known because it feels safe. To transfer knowledge within these cultures might be problematic since they are so reluctant to new knowledge and change. When it comes to weak UA cultures, individuals have a welcoming approach to change because people in these cultures are open-minded and driven by the idea of continuous improvement and better ways of doing things. This enables them to embrace change and new knowledge. In contrast to strong UA cultures, knowledge transfer can easily be achieved in a weak UA culture because they actively look for new knowledge. Knowledge transfer can be facilitated if both the sender and receiver belongs to weak UA culture, but if one or both of them belong to a strong UA culture, the knowledge transfer process will be hindered (Leyland, 2006).

The fourth and last culture dimension is *masculinity/femininity* (MF) which is about individuals' attitudes towards societal values (Chen etc, 2009; Leyland, 2006). The masculine cultures are characterized by competitiveness, with a "may best person win" approach, where focus is on ambition and results. Individuals in masculine cultures emphasize self-interest and will only participate in knowledge transfer if it is beneficial for them. If both sender and receiver belong to a masculine culture, a mutual gain will occur because both parts are so conscious about winning. In feminine cultures, however, focus is to resolve differences through compromise and negotiation, and feminine cultures are characterized by a belief in mutual profit through cooperation. Thus, knowledge transfer in feminist cultures involves processes of negotiation which focuses on overcoming differences and finding new ways for successful knowledge transfer (Leyland, 2006).

To sum up Hofstede's cultural index;

"the quality of relationship between subsidiaries, and between subsidiaries and home offices, has major implications for knowledge transfer. This is the case irrespective of which dimension of the cultural index is under consideration. If relationships are perceived to be

poor, then significant resistance to change will occur, even if subsidiaries realize that they can benefit from knowledge transfer” (Leyland, 2006:15).

Thus, the relationship between the sender and the receiver and how their cultural dimensions differ is important to consider because it affects how the knowledge that is being transferred is received by the receivers. If the sender belongs to a different culture than the receiver, then the receivers will feel a resistance towards the knowledge.

3.2. Communication process

Gupta & Govindarajan (2000) have focused on knowledge transfer by looking at knowledge flow as a function of five different factors. This model becomes important to look at in order to understand what elements knowledge transfer consists of and how these can affect the process.

- *Value of source unit’s knowledge stock*
- *Motivational disposition of the source unit*
- *Existence and richness of transmission channels*
- *Motivational disposition of the target unit*
- *Absorptive capacity of the target unit*

Considering the process of communication which involves a message being sent from a sender to a receiver, the first influential factor is the *value of source unit’s knowledge stock*. The knowledge flow is depending on the amount of knowledge a sender has; if the sender doesn’t have any knowledge in stock, then the knowledge flow will be limited. But the knowledge stock doesn’t only affect the quantity of knowledge being transferred; it is also dependent on the level of value. It is important for subsidiaries to have knowledge that is considered valuable to other units, in order to increase the attractiveness, and thus the knowledge flow. Further the *motivational disposition of the source unit* is an important factor to consider. If an organizational unit possesses unique and valuable knowledge, it might lead to a lack of motivation to pass that valuable knowledge on in fear of losing the power within the organization that comes with the monopoly of this knowledge. This means that some units will have low motivation to share knowledge and thus keep the information to themselves which will hinder the knowledge flow (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000).

Another influential factor is the *existence and richness of transmission channels*, which means that knowledge flows live and die with the existence of transmission channels. Thus, knowledge flows is also affected by the richness/bandwidth of communication links in these channels. It can be regarding elements such as the informality, openness and density of communications, and whether the transmission channels are formal or informal. An important part which increases the communication channels is the corporate socialization mechanisms. This refers to the “organizational mechanisms which build interpersonal familiarity, personal affinity, and convergence in cognitive maps among personnel from different subsidiaries” (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000:7). When there is a close and familiar relationship between units, it will increase the openness of communication, which in turn will facilitate knowledge flow.

Some influential factors related to the receiving unit are motivational disposition and absorptive capacity of the target unit. *The motivational disposition of the target unit* involves a person’s or unit’s willingness to accept new knowledge. It can be triggered or hindered by factors such as ego-defensive mechanisms where someone is blocking information because it might imply that others are more competent. It can also be triggered/hindered by power struggles where the potential power of units is reduced by others, for example managers, by claiming that the knowledge stock in these units is not unique and valuable. This is a major barrier to the flow of knowledge in any unit. The motivation is affected by three parts; 1) unit’s inner drive, which involves a willingness to learn, 2) the lack of knowledge stock within a unit, which implies that there is a need for knowledge, and 3) demanding pressures from the organization’s headquarters (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000).

The absorptive capacity of the target unit is the remaining factor that affects knowledge flow. It is described as “the ability to recognize the value of new information, assimilate it, and apply it to commercial ends” (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000:4). Individuals or organization can differ in absorptive capacity, regardless if they are under the exact same circumstances. The difference in absorptive capacity is due to 1) the extent of prior experience in similar knowledge acquisitions that may differ between different individuals and units, and 2) homophily, which is the extent to which the receiving and sending units share similar attributes. Prior experience determines how the organization distinguishes between relevant and less relevant knowledge. It also affects the unit’s or organization’s ability to understand and absorb/take in the new relevant knowledge and how to implement it internally. Therefore it is an important factor to take into account in knowledge transfer processes. *Homophily* “is

important because when the interacting individuals share common meanings, a mutual subcultural language, and are alike in personal and social characteristics, the communication of new ideas is likely to have greater effects in terms of knowledge gain, attitude formation, and overt behavior change” (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000:4).

4. Method

For this thesis, I have conducted a qualitative research in Kampala (Uganda) and Dar es Salaam (Tanzania). Qualitative research can be described as different forms of being, doing and thinking in a setting in order to describe and explain different social phenomenon of the reality, such as social interactions. It often includes observing, listening, participating and/or communicating with a group of people to understand how they construct their reality (Mason, 2002).

This research is based on a *social constructivist approach* where, according to Gergen (1985), reality is considered to be constructed by different individual experiences and interpretations of the world. Thus, it exist many different perceptions of reality. Also knowledge is considered to be a social construction, which is created by the individual when interacting with other people. Therefore, the knowledge changes depending on time and place of the interactions, and the process of understanding is based on the perceptions of the people involved in creating the knowledge through their interactions (Fangen, 2005; Gergen, 1985). This is in line with what has been stated earlier about knowledge being “socially, culturally and historically situated” (Mørk, Aanestad, Hanseth & Grisot, 2008:2). The method philosophy within the social constructivist approach focuses on explaining a social phenomenon of reality through how it is described by the people who perceive them (Fangen, 2005). Therefore, qualitative methods are the most suitable methods for this thesis because it enables the researcher to bring out individual experience and explanations of reality (Gergen, 1985).

I have included six interviews with participants from the Sida program, two observations in classrooms as well as a workshop during a network meeting in my fieldwork. This enables me to get an understanding of how the participants work with implementing what they have learned from the program in their schools, and how the knowledge is received by the counterpart/receivers and whether people are open to new things and change.

4.1. Interviews

I have conducted a qualitative research containing of semi-structured interviews with the three participants from each batch. The purpose of the semi-structured interviews is often about obtaining descriptions of the interviewee's experience in order to interpret the meaning of the described phenomena (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Semi-structured interview involves fixed

and specific questions, but with no given answers so that the informant can associate freely and respond as personal as possible. Through qualitative interviewing the researcher gets to interview a person with first-hand knowledge about the phenomenon of which the researcher is interested in (Halvorsen 1992). One of the core features in semi-structured interviews, according to Mason (2002), is that they often appear as interactions where the researcher has a dialogue, a two-way communication, with the informant or informants either face-to-face or using other ways of communication such as telephone. Mason (2002) also mentions “conversation with a purpose” (2002:62) as a core feature. This means that the semi-structured interview has the informal style of a conversation or a discussion rather than a formal format with strict questions and answers, but still remaining the purpose of gathering information which the researcher is looking for. Another core feature is that these interviews often are topic-centered and are used when the researcher has certain themes, topics or stories that the researcher wants the informant to talk about. These topics are often approached in a fluid and flexible way during the interview. Semi-structured interviews are also based on the perspective that knowledge is situated, and the purpose of the interview is to “ensure that the relevant contexts are brought into focus so that situated knowledge can be produced” (Mason, 2002:62).

Interviews might not always be unproblematic and free from complications. Interviews focus on people’s subjective descriptions of reality, which implies that you are relying on people’s answers and believe that what they are saying is true. Since interviews involve dealing with subjective human beings, they might answer in a certain way which is considered socially acceptable and thus puts them in a better position. I believe, however, as a researcher that the people I interviewed in Uganda and Tanzania are well educated, which increases their credibility.

By using this method I will be able to understand what actions that has been taken, how they have gone about to approach the people in the schools, and what responses that has been given. I have used an interview guide during the interviews, which is based on relevant theories about knowledge transfer and culture in order to formulate questions that will help answer the research questions. Accordingly, the interview guide is also based on the research questions. The interview guide is divided into four parts with questions about different themes (see Appendix 1), which then were based on different sub-questions and an opportunity for follow-up questions. This technique gives the informant the opportunity to develop their own answers which give a deeper understanding. The first part of the interview guide is an

introduction where I presented myself and the purpose of the interview, and informed about confidentiality etc. The second part consisted of questions regarding *basic information*. This enabled me to get a good picture of who the informant is, and thus worked as good warm up questions for the informant. Questions about *the program* were then dealt with in the third part, which represents the beginning of the knowledge transfer process and what knowledge that is being transferred. This lead up to the last part with questions about the batch's *project and its implementation process*, which also was the main part. Here I could get a deeper understanding of how the knowledge was packaged in the communication process and how it the knowledge was received in the end of the knowledge transfer process.

Leading questions may influence what is being said and how the informant expresses him- or herself (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Although, leading questions enables the researcher to obtain hard to get information that might not otherwise have emerged (ibid). The leading questions have been avoided as far as possible, but have also consciously been used to some extent in order to clarify what was said. Apart from the interview guide I also made sure to make room for further discussion if any unexpected subject that would be of interest would come up.

The interviews were conducted at different places in Kampala (Uganda) and Dar Es Salaam (Tanzania). The choice of places was chosen based on privacy possibilities, but also conveniences and where the informants would feel most comfortable and relaxed. Three of the interviews were held in offices, two interviews were held at dining place and one interview was conducted in the place where I stayed during that time. All the interviews were recorded and took between 40 to 60 minutes, although one interview took about two hours. After the interviews were conducted, I went through the recording and transcribed the material, which were then analyzed in order to get an overall view of the interviews.

4.1.1. Research sample

My focus for this research will be on one batch in Uganda and one batch in Tanzania; hence the informants for this research are the participants of these batches. Like mentioned above, the Sida program aims to people with a leading position within the school system, therefore all the informants are working within the school system in each country. A further presentation of the batch projects is given in the background (see chapter 1.1).

4.2. Observation

My qualitative research also involves observations where the researcher could “immerse him- or herself in a research setting so that they can experience and observe at first hand a range of dimensions in and of that setting”(Mason, 2002:84). By using observations, a researcher can study human behavior, social actions, interactions and relationships. Observation is a relevant method in this research because it is based on the *ontological perspective* that human behavior, interaction and the way people interpret these actions in social settings are central aspects in order to understand reality. It involves an interest in “naturally occurring’ phenomena” (Mason, 2002:85) such as daily routines, conversations, and styles of behavior in certain setting etc. and looking at how these social phenomena are performed (Mason, 2002). Mason (2002) raises the issue of being able to understand reality by simply observing a foreign setting, and questions whether it is enough exposure in order to explain such naturally occurring phenomena to others (Mason, 2002). When applying this issue to my research which focuses on the cultural aspect of knowledge transfer, similar question arises; is it possible to observe a culture? After spending a lot of time in a setting then the observer will become aware of the cultural values through experiencing them. This part of the research only includes two observing occasions, but I’m convinced that it is enough experience since I was able to get a feeling of the atmosphere and notice some interesting things. Additionally, since I lived in Uganda in an African woman's home, I got to take part of some of the Ugandan culture which thus increased my understanding of the culture.

When it comes to observations it is important with *reflexivity* and being aware about your own role as a researcher which refers to how you affect the contextual dynamics through being present in the observational setting (Mason, 2002:88). During my observations, I believe that I affected the way the participants and their students/colleagues acted concerning child rights because they were aware that I was there to observe them. I was introduced together with my research aim in the beginning of the class, hence they might have thought that I was there to “monitor/supervise” and thus acted in a certain way in order to “look good”. I am also aware that I am not “a neutral interpreter of cultural information, but a kind of lens that shapes whatever light traverses it” (Lewin, 2006:42). I believe that I color my findings based on my own assumptions and previous experience from Swedish media. Because I come from a Western country such as Sweden and believe that the way I perceive child rights is the valid way, it might have affected the way I approached and interpreted the attitudes and behaviors that I saw regarding child rights. I tried to keep an open mind and a neutral perspective on

things, but it was difficult to ignore the assumptions and prejudice that I carry with me from previous experience.

My research includes observations of how the participants work with implementing what they have learned from the program in the classroom during two lessons in Uganda. The first participant held a philosophy-class for approximately two hours with around 30 students, which wasn't considered to be a big class in Uganda. The students were around 20 years and seemed to be used to the learner-centered way of teaching which the participant had implemented in his way of working. The other participant was a teacher educator who held a class about child rights with future teachers, which was a part of their curriculum. The class lasted for about three hours and involved around twelve older students. During these classes I placed myself in the other corners of the classrooms, after being introduced to the class, and took notes as I silently observed how the participants embody children's rights in their behavior as teachers and their relations to the students.

4.3. Workshop/Group discussion

I have also conducted a workshop which included some group discussions during a network meeting in Uganda, which was held in a school classroom in Kampala. Group discussions are a good method for bringing out latent preferences and collective opinions or when you want to highlight in what context in which opinions are formed. The method involves bringing together a group of people to discuss a certain topic or area of concern. An important benefit of group discussions is that participants may contradict each other, complement each other and, for example, jointly reconstruct a sequence of events (Halvorsen 1992:86). This workshop was conducted for about 30 minutes and it enabled me to get a wider understanding of how culture can affect knowledge transfer through letting a group of people who have participated in the program and conducted own project implementation share their own experience and perceptions of knowledge transfer and the cultural aspect of it. During the workshop I asked the participants to form two groups and within each group discuss what cultural aspects are important to consider during knowledge transfer, and how you can transfer knowledge from Sweden to Uganda so that it fits the Ugandan culture. They got to write down the answers which I later collected. Then the answers were presented in an open discussion between the groups, where the topics were discussed further by adding some follow-up questions. I also took notes during the discussions to write down what was being said.

4.4. Method of analysis

Regarding method of analysis, a combination of holistic analysis and partial analysis were used which, according to Halvorsen (1992), is the best method for analyzing qualitative data. Partial analysis involves dividing the interview transcriptions into different statements which can be lined up and arranged. I further added the data from the observations and the workshop. The actual partial analysis was done by going through the themes and the statements and analyzed what was being said from each informant from the different countries, and getting an understanding of differences and similarities among the informants. The holistic analysis involves going through the entire data collection and forming a general idea of what the informants said, and then select the relevant quotes that characterizes the interview. By doing both a partial and an overall analysis could misleading results be avoided. I therefore believe that it is important to use both of these methods. Misleading results may imply that two informants respond equally to the same question but that the overall analysis shows the information in a different manner which can give an entirely different impression.

4.5. Ethical considerations

When it comes to qualitative interviews researcher can face special ethical difficulties, such as when asking sensitive questions where the answers would be presented publicly (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Therefore, it is important to get consent for participation from informants, ensure confidentiality and that informants are not placed in a difficult or stressful situation during the interview. It is also important that the interview transcriptions are accurate and consistent with what the informants said during the interview (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). For ethical reasons, I started the interview to clarify the purpose of the interview and what it will be used for, that the informant is confidential and that she or he could interrupt the interview at any time. Additionally, I also aimed to be as accurate as possible when transcribing the interviews to reduce the risk of misinterpretation. When designing the interview guide, I tried to act in an ethical manner by formulating questions that would not be seen or perceived as offensive. Regarding location for the interview I chose, in collaboration with the informants, meeting places where we would have privacy and not get disturbed, as well as where the informants could feel comfortable and relaxed in order to give as good answers as possible.

Regarding observation, Mason (2002) raises the issue of whether it is ethical to enter someone's world and observe it. Do we understand their reality in the same way they do just

because we are present in the same setting? I can interpret something that is happening in the observational setting based on my personal beliefs and understandings, whereas the people in that setting maybe act the way they do based on their cultural beliefs and values.

In line with the ethics during interviews, workshops/group discussions can also raise ethical issues when asking questions which will be discussed openly within the group. That means that the people involved in the group discussions aren't anonymous to each other. However, I will not take in to account their names or personal backgrounds (such as batch number, profession etc.) when analyzing their answers which gives them external anonymity. Since the people in the workshop consisted of previous (and future) participants from the Sida program, and they were all part of the Ugandan network, so they already knew each other and had a sense of cohesion and togetherness. This creates a workshop setting where the participants are comfortable and relaxed.

5. Results and analysis

In the following chapter, the empirical data that has been collected through the interviews, observations and workshop will be presented and analyzed based on relevant theories and mindsets in order to answer the research questions. The analysis and the discussion will be conducted and divided accordingly to the SENDER – COMMUNICATION – RECIEVER model that has been developed based on the reasoning behind the theories and previous research that have been examined previously. The model is illustrated in Table 1 below.

Table 1.

I have used some quotations from the interviews when presenting the data below in order to exemplify what has been said. As an everyday language was used during the interviews there were a lot of incomplete sentences etc. In order to make the quotations more understandable, I've used (...) in the presentation of results which implies that words have been deleted from the quote, because it provides a nicer flow.

5.1. Sender related factors affecting the knowledge transfer process

As the knowledge transfer process starts with the sender, it is important to look at the factors influencing the knowledge that is actually being shared by the sender. It could be factors regarding what kind of knowledge the sender has (nature of knowledge), the amount and value of the knowledge (knowledge stock), and the sender's motivation and willingness to share knowledge. Other influencing factors are the sender's ability to communicate with and understand other cultures (language ability and cultural openness) and how the sender chooses to adjust and package the knowledge (codification).

5.1.1. Nature of knowledge (Tacit/explicit)

When it comes to what kind of knowledge the informants chose to share with people in the home countries, most of the informants both in Uganda and Tanzania brought up theoretical knowledge such as the Child Rights Convention (CRC) and the three P's; *participation, provision and protection.*

Another one was to do with the methodology... many ways and technologies that can increase participation. And those are the ones I want to adapt myself to increase participation of my students... Because even with a board you can increase participation...

Methods of teaching that had a right based approach were also discussed during the workshop in Uganda among the participants. According to another informant from Uganda, the school

visits and the exposure that they get during the course plays a major part in learning those methods and ways of promoting child rights.

The program helped me to reflect on some of the policies, and the legal position of our country... And it also helped me to look at what the Swede positions are, we had a lot of school visits and interaction with the teachers and had a comparison of the good things of what they are doing and what we can do as a country, first as an individual, and then as an institution and maybe as a country, later on to champion the rights of the child.

The literature such as books and materials on child rights and management was also considered to play a major part, by one informant from Tanzania when it comes to the theoretical part of the learning outcome. Access to these books was considered a good reference point when working with child rights back home. In other words, the informants emphasized a lot of *explicit knowledge* such as theories and methods which they would share and try to implement in their own national contexts. This might be due to the cultural values and perspectives that pervade the contents of the Sida course in Sweden, which are different from the culture in Uganda and Tanzania. Therefore, the informants might have chosen to embrace the explicit knowledge which is less dominated by cultural values, and thus easier to share. According to Haghirian (2003), explicit knowledge is easy to transfer since it is about abstract and visible knowledge which can be formulated through using symbols. Therefore, it should be fairly easy for the informants to transfer the knowledge to people in their home countries, since it is about sharing theories which are explainable. However, since these theories are based on different values and perceptions/perspectives it demands a change of values in order for the African people to absorb and embody the knowledge successfully.

5.1.2. Knowledge stock and valuable knowledge

Regarding the *knowledge stock*, the informants from both Uganda and Tanzania expressed how much they learned during the course. Additionally, the informants emphasized a lot of different learning outcomes from the Sida course which shows that they have absorbed a big amount of knowledge, and thus have a big knowledge stock. Whether the knowledge was considered valuable or not was a less discussed topic. Only one informant from Tanzania expressed what value the knowledge had to him, and pointed at the source of information in Sweden as *valuable knowledge*.

Actually, in Lund we met with the trainers who are highly competent in the issue of child rights. Of course they have source of information which is valuable for me.

But according to the way all of the informants talked about the learning outcomes from the course in Sweden during the interview, there is still an undertone of interest and a belief in the things that they have learned. This shows that they sympathize with the new knowledge and that they want to apply it in every part of their lives. For example, some of the informants brought up private occasions such as private dinner parties, interactions with colleagues and students at work, and big business meetings as forums where they took the opportunity to share the knowledge that they have learned during the course in order to increase child rights and participation.

I have started with child rights even before I went to Sweden so, I have already fallen in love with promoting them. So my colleagues when I went to Sweden, was like “huh, you’ve gone and add more to these children’s rights?” So they know, usually in a party setting, if people are making a budget for a party, I normally say “where are the children? Where are the children in this party?” So when you write a card for example and say “don’t bring children”, sometimes I say “when are they going to enjoy and know about parties if we keep them away? Why don’t you just put up a table for children?”.

By also emphasizing learning about the role as a change agent, the informants show that they believe what they have learned, and see it as a mission in life to spread the knowledge, and therefore feel that the knowledge about child rights is valuable and worth taking every opportunity possible to promote. In addition, since people tend to absorb only information that is considered valuable and relevant to them, the different learning outcomes that the informants brought up can be considered valuable, otherwise they wouldn’t have assimilated in the first place. When looking at how the knowledge stock affects the knowledge transfer process, it is easy to come to the conclusion that the existence of the knowledge flow is dependent of the amount of knowledge that the sender has. The knowledge flow will be limited when there isn’t much knowledge to be shared (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000). Since the informants claimed to have a lot of knowledge to share from the course in Sweden, the knowledge transfer should be fairly easy. Although, the knowledge transfer process is also affected by the level of value of the knowledge. This means that the knowledge flow is dependent on the attractiveness of the knowledge, because the process isn’t successful unless the sender feels that the knowledge is worth sharing and unless there is a receiver at the other end who wants to receive the knowledge. Hence, it becomes important to have knowledge which is considered valuable and relevant for both sender and receiver (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000).

Similar to an organization with its culture and subcultures, what the sender considers being valuable and relevant knowledge, and thus which knowledge the sender chooses to share, isn't always in accordance with the receiving cultures view. The receiver might have different views and values about which knowledge is important and needed compared to the sender, which can create conflict and misunderstandings (De Long & Fahey, 2000; Haghirian, 2003). Therefore, culture affects what kind of knowledge the sender focuses on and can become an obstacle when sender and receiver with different cultural values define relevant knowledge differently. Since the informants have acquired new cultural values through the Sida program, they have different values compared to the local people in Uganda and Tanzania. This might complicate the knowledge transfer process and thus become a hindrance if the local people in Uganda and Tanzania don't perceive the knowledge as relevant and understand its value.

Informants from both Uganda and Tanzania mentioned that they, together with the other two batch members, conducted analysis in their home countries when they returned after the course in Sweden in order to get an understanding of the home context and what knowledge where considered valuable and needed by the local people. This helped them in choosing what knowledge to share and how to package it in order for it to fit the cultural values and beliefs. The importance of conducting analysis was also brought up during the workshop in Uganda and the participants believed that it is crucial in order to transfer the knowledge successfully, in a way that fits the Ugandan culture.

5.1.3. Motivation: willingness to share

The informant's *motivation* and *willingness to share the knowledge* can be considered high since there was a sense of excitement among the informants during the interviews about being a change agent and spreading the knowledge about child rights to their communities. Further, since they already work with children and therefore have a passion for children and child rights, even before participating in the program, it shows that they are very willing to transfer the knowledge into their work and to other people in order to promote child rights.

The sender's willingness to share information is a major impact on the knowledge transfer process because it affects what the sender chooses to share with others as well as to what extent. If the sender lacks motivation to share valuable knowledge due to fear of losing *power* through having monopoly on this knowledge, it will hinder the knowledge flow since they will keep the knowledge to themselves (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000). This is in line with Haghirian (2003) calls *power status*. According to her, knowledge transfer can either be used

to even out the power balance through sharing knowledge, or to keep a high position by avoiding knowledge sharing due to fear of losing power. Thus, power status affects knowledge transfer through motivating the sender if and how to distribute the knowledge (Haghirian, 2003). According to the informants, although the knowledge seems to be considered good and valuable, there seem to be no fear of losing power which affects their motivation to share the knowledge. Since they see themselves as change agents on a mission to do good, they are on the contrary very conscious about spreading the knowledge to others in order to reduce the gap in the power structures (for example the power relationship between teacher and student). Therefore, their willingness to share knowledge affects the knowledge transfer process in a positive way and thus facilitates knowledge transfer.

The willingness to share and how knowledge is distributed can be affected by the cultural background of the sender. Depending on what cultural norms that the sender possess, he or she will distribute the knowledge differently which determines who holds what knowledge and controls what knowledge that is to be shared. In order to transfer knowledge, it is important to be aware of these norms about power relations (De Long & Fahey, 2000). By looking at who they chose to focus on and include in their projects, the informants are sharing knowledge across different levels and include different actors and stakeholders such as ministries, councils, teachers, teacher trainees, parents and students/children themselves. This shows that the informants' cultural norms allows an openness and inclusiveness when it comes to sharing knowledge, and that it doesn't exist any power relations which hinders the distribution of knowledge and thus affects the knowledge transfer.

5.1.4. Language ability and Cultural openness

The knowledge transfer can only be successful if the sender is able to communicate the message to the receiver fully. This requires *language ability*, which is the ability to communicate with and understand other cultures and its language, as well as a *cultural openness*, which is seen as cultural abilities and knowledge. These abilities are important because it enables the sender to interact and empathize with other cultures in a meaningful way as well to deal with the different issues that arise due to language differences (Haghirian, 2003). The informants can be perceived as insiders who have the new knowledge with the Western perspective, as well as the experience from the home countries with the national cultural perspectives. Therefore, they might have developed the appropriate language ability as well as cultural openness needed in order to transfer the knowledge. One informant from Uganda even talked about the benefits of working within the system:

it was easier to adopt, to affect. I'm a teacher trainer, I know the business... So we're working within the system. And because we're working within the system... when we bring in something new, they adopt, they want to do it because they know that it is for their good and it is something that can maybe give them better skill and market as teachers.

However, what the informants brought up as a problem though when it comes to the language aspect, is that both Uganda and Tanzania has multiple cultures within their national culture, which all have their own language. This hinders the knowledge transfer since it becomes more difficult to communicate the knowledge in a way/language which the local people will understand. One of the groups during the workshop in Uganda talked about the cultural issue and the importance of using appropriate language to the learner in order for them to understand the knowledge. The other group also mentioned the importance of knowing who you are talking to and adjust the language accordingly depending on age, status and gender. Thus, you have to read the group to know what they accept.

5.1.5. Codification

“It is how you package it, not just take it [the Western thing] from Sweden and apply it in Uganda. You have to know the culture and the context” (Participant from Uganda)

Just like the quote above, and as noted during the observations, you need to adjust and adapt the knowledge in order to transfer knowledge from one point to another. To package the message and adjust it in the right way is important when introducing new knowledge to people with other backgrounds than yours. If the knowledge doesn't fit with the values and beliefs in the receiving culture, then the knowledge transfer might backfire and only add resistance. *Codification* is thus a central part in the knowledge transfer process because knowledge and information can only be communicated to other people when the knowledge has been codified, and the way knowledge is packaged influences the way it is transferred (Haghirian, 2003). This is something that the informants realized as a crucial part in order for their projects to be successful. Many of the informants talked about the cultural issue, and how to approach that through not adapting the knowledge wholesale, but compromising about the values and meeting halfway. It could for example be about the perception of child labor, and agreeing that it is good for a child to work, but bringing it to a level which doesn't harm the child. The issue of child labor, meeting halfway, and the importance of making a compromise between the Ugandan culture and child rights as a Western phenomenon was also brought up by the students during the observations in one of the classes. The students got to act out a debate where they discussed that the child has some rights, but only to the extent that it's within the national policies and norms. They discussed for example that the child could

have the right to express themselves and dress freely, as long as they don't walk around in provocative clothes such as short skirts (according to the mini-skirt-law in Uganda) and want to marry a person with the same sex (the anti-homosexuality-bill in Uganda).

The informants also emphasized the value of putting things in perspective when changing cultural values. One informant from Uganda talked about for example the right to dress freely, when there are certain cultural norms in Uganda about how to dress appropriately depending on if the child is a girl or a boy. According to the informant, a way to get the local people on board on every aspect of child rights is to tell them about the reality and what the alternatives are, put them against each other, and let the parents realize which option is better.

There are freedoms, like dressing, then those are very very tense grounds. You don't quickly sail over them... Many parents in the rural area wouldn't like their girl children to quickly dress in trousers. That is something that they don't want to see... they say now "you see, the freedom of children that you are advocating for is really the ones that bring all these changes in our culture. You see now the women are putting on trousers"... You are trying to tell them the reality, and say that someone can put on a mini-skirt, and another one is putting on a trouser. Which is more decent? I will try to do that...we are sailing on different kinds of understandings.

These cultural norms which limits a child was brought up during the observation of one of the informant's classes as well. When talking about child rights within the African culture, people perceive rights such as "right to play" as a waste of time and that it is negatively associated with freedom, which is considered a destructive behavior. In order to get the local people to absorb the knowledge about child rights, it is important to associate rights with words that are considered more positive such as "entitlements", instead of freedoms.

Apart from adjusting the knowledge through the adaptation, making compromises, and putting things in perspective, the informants also used other ways to package the knowledge when approaching the local people in order to create a common understanding of child rights. The informants emphasized, for example, the importance of taking *baby steps* and doing small things at once. According to them, small steps are crucial when approaching people with new ways of thinking because it is about dealing with people's cultural beliefs and mind-sets, which can't be changed overnight. Even if you tried, it would be an overload and too much information for the recipients to handle that it would cross over into a negative attitude and resistance towards the new knowledge.

you can influence change by first of all... working out little things for yourself... you have to do things small, and then you have to first influence, the leadership of change, you have to work with each of the forces that are out there, slowly until you can win them... Instead of pointing out, they can all move and point with you, and work together... I think from the training in Sweden I thought, it trained us to understand that becoming a change agent might require you to recalculate, and do simple steps, and try to change people around you slowly, moving them to yourself, until you can all speak in the same language.

To gradually accomplish change by using small steps was also discussed during the workshop in Uganda as the participants emphasized the importance of sensitization and being sensitive towards different cultures to be able to bring people on board on the new knowledge. They further emphasized how the knowledge transfer process is affected by the way knowledge is packaged and presented and how the local people is approached. According to the participants, the cultural norms determine what is acceptable and thus discussable, and what things aren't agreeable and not able to negotiate on. Therefore, it is important to tailor the knowledge by selecting what is appropriate and acceptable according to the cultural norms.

Another way of approaching people with new knowledge from a different culture is through *exposure* and telling *sunshine stories* about working with child rights. This will, according to the informants, make it easier for people to adapt something new if they see that it is successful, and maybe even start using the methods themselves. The informants further believes that exposure is of great importance when dealing with child rights, especially participation in the classroom, because it becomes an eye-opener to see how you can do things differently and still be successful and achieve your goals.

To be able to improve learning participation in the classroom we need exposure. Like going to Sweden was an eye-opener.

The informants also emphasizes the importance of *case studies* which, according to them, is crucial in order to change people's mind set accomplish change because it would help people to think differently and adapt to new changes. One informant from Uganda also points at the issue of resources, and mean that giving example of sunshine stories and case studies will help people in Uganda to realize that change doesn't always have to be expensive.

In line with the importance of communicating with people (teachers, parents...) in order for them to transfer the knowledge and accomplish change, the informants also perceived *training and education* as important parts to bring people on board with the new knowledge and change. For example the batch in Uganda included training for teachers and teacher

trainees (the ones who educate future teachers) so that they can promote and implement child rights in their work. They are also having meetings with the school management committee and the parents-teacher association in order to transfer what they have learned in Sweden to bring them on board as well, so that they can spread the knowledge. Even the batch in Tanzania included trainings in their project in order to transfer what they have learned in Sweden, and a part of this is to prepare training manuals which can be used in the future as well (sustainability).

5.2. Communicational factors affecting the knowledge transfer process

As the main part of the knowledge transfer process can be considered to be the actual communication process where the knowledge is being shared, it becomes important to look at the factors influencing the communication between the sender and the receiver. The communication is further the central part for this thesis, as it can be considered sociological relevant to look at how people communicate and interact with each other. It could be factors regarding existing platforms and forums for communicating (communication channels), the way the knowledge is communicated (dialogue) and the different levels of communication (three levels of knowledge flow). Other important aspects of communication are how the message can be interpreted (interpretation) and the different backgrounds of the sender and the receiver and how they interact with each other (relationship between sender and receiver).

5.2.1. Communication channels and dialogue

Along with the sender's ability to communicate and interact with the receiver, regardless of cultural differences, it is important with existing *communication channels* and forums in order to transfer knowledge. This means that knowledge flow lives and dies with the existence of transmission channels, and is also affected by the richness/bandwidth of communication links in these channels (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000). According to the informants, there were existing communication channels where they could share the knowledge. For example, some of the informants brought up private occasions such as private dinner parties, interactions with colleagues and students at work, and big business meetings as different platforms and forums where they took the opportunity to share the knowledge that they have learned during the course in order to increase child rights and participation.

And also, when we are going to the meetings... last week I was in Ngorogoro, after I came back from Zambia, I had the opportunity to talk about child rights, because there were so many stakeholders present, representatives from many organizations, I also talked about child

rights... and we expect after sometime, this will be spread to other schools outside Dar Es Salaam. So we have the opportunity now to try now to make sure that the knowledge goes beyond Dar Es Salaam.

Additionally, when transferring knowledge, it is crucial to make sure you communicate it in the right way, so that the knowledge is received properly (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000). This is something that most of the informants acknowledged through emphasizing different kinds of meetings and consultations with parents, teachers, and school management committees as well as talking to colleagues etc. Hence, the informants have shown the importance of having a dialogue with people where they can explain and discuss the new knowledge to get a better understanding of it, and thus makes people more open to receive the new knowledge.

So it's a dialogue, it's a training, it's questioning, it is also using a lot of lobbying with the leaders, that this is what has to be done if we want to see our children further.

One informant from Uganda even described the positive responses which they got when explaining some of the values which they learned from the Sida course in Sweden.

in fact, they were quite surprised to find that the cultures are almost similar, only that in one way or another the way they are passed over, the ways they are implemented... Like when we took the through the 3 P's, and told them what the 3 P's mean, for example... in fact, they were quite impressed and realized that they had been seeing it the wrong way...

The importance of having a dialogue was also brought up during the workshop in Uganda. The participants believe that it is important to communicate the new Western knowledge in the right way if knowledge transfer is to occur. Because every culture has its own beliefs, it is important to take the receiving culture's beliefs into account by letting people participate and speak up. By having a dialogue and a "two-way-conversation" the participants get to listen to the local people and understand their cultural beliefs and thus know how to approach them in the most appropriate way.

5.2.2. Three levels of knowledge flow: Vertical, Horizontal, and Behavior promoting knowledge development

As been mentioned earlier, culture creates platforms for social interaction, and the social rules on how people interact and communicate on these platforms are based on the different cultural values and attitudes. Culture thus also shapes and affects the way people interpret and share knowledge, which is active on three different levels of knowledge flow. The knowledge flow operates on a *vertical level*, such as between management and subordinates, where the cultural norms determines what knowledge and information that is accepted to share with

management/the head office (De Long & Fahey, 2000). The informants emphasized the importance of including different ministries and community leaders in their project, and talked about the way they transferred the knowledge to them through different meetings. The informants experienced these meetings as useful platforms since it allowed them to explain child rights to the leaders in a way which would appeal to the leaders, which in turn would make them absorb the knowledge easier.

The knowledge flow also operates on a *horizontal level*, which deals with how cultural patterns shape how well you interact and share knowledge with colleagues (De Long & Fahey, 2000). Even though the colleagues weren't the central aim in the informants' projects, they still were considered as important stakeholders to talk to in order to spread the knowledge onwards. Unless they shared the knowledge with the colleagues, the knowledge and the promoting of child rights wouldn't be a sustainable part of the workplace, since the informants probably wouldn't be able to always be present at the workplace to promote child rights. According to the informants, there seem to be an open relationship with the colleagues, and they are open towards the new knowledge that the informants have introduced, since the colleagues now come to them for consultation and advice, and ask them to share what they have learned during the Sida course.

They are so much appreciative. And as such, it is now making them do their work at ease, and they are able to approach me when they find problems, they come and ask and discuss at that level, and you find that they are very much appreciative. And it is giving them another good attitude towards their work... They have some consultancy that they would like to make, that kind of thing... It has improved our relationship with the teachers, and most especially with the teachers and the community around.

Further, the knowledge flow operates on a level of *behavior promoting knowledge development* where culture affects the way we teach and share knowledge, as well as the way we deal with mistakes and learn from it (De Long & Fahey, 2000). As been mentioned before, the informants emphasized their role as a change agent, a role which they identified themselves with and embraced fully. This affects the way the informants chose to transfer the knowledge, as well as to what extent. Because the informants identified themselves with the role as a change agent, they also perceive the mission as meaningful, and thus took every opportunity possible to share what they have learned about child rights. This affected the knowledge transfer process in a positive way, and thus facilitated the knowledge transfer. They further chose to share the knowledge to everyone, including the management/leaders, colleagues, teachers, parents, and students/children, because they considered it to be of great

importance to implement the knowledge on every level in the society. One of the informants further encouraged her students, during the observations in the classroom, to be advocates and change agents themselves when it comes to promoting child rights. This can be seen as a behavior promoting knowledge development since the informant takes it a step further and transfer not only the knowledge about child rights but also the role of a change agent promoting child rights to the students, which then can spread the knowledge onwards.

5.2.3. Interpretation

When communicating with other people, it can very easily lead to misinterpretations and misunderstandings. This is mainly due to the fact that different people, with different perspectives on reality, often interpret things differently. The way we interpret a message can be affected by the concept of casual ambiguity. *Casual ambiguity* influences the knowledge transfer process because this means that the knowledge can be interpreted differently by different people which hinder the receiver from understanding it in the same way as intended by the sender. Therefore, when the knowledge involves ambiguity, it can hinder the knowledge transfer and complicate the process (Haghirian, 2003; Holden & Von Kortzfleisch, 2004). Although the informants chose to implement explicit and abstract knowledge about child rights, this could still be perceived differently by the local people. In fact, one of the informants from Uganda brought up the issue of interpretations and that the local people understood child rights differently which made it problematic to transfer the knowledge that the informants learned during the Sida course.

By the way, it is quite interesting to learn that when we went out to the field and we met the parents, and other stakeholders like... we have a school management committee... So when we met them, and explained to them some of the values that we had learned from Sweden in comparison to ours here at home, in fact, they were quite surprised to find that the cultures are almost similar, only that in one way or another the way they are passed over, the ways they are implemented... Like when we took the through the 3 P's, and told them what the 3 P's mean, for example... You know, at first they had that thinking that this child rights is a declaration of the West, and it is coming to spoil their children. They thought that children's rights meant giving a lot of powers to children, to do what they want, at whatever time, whatever cost.

According to the informant, the local people were quite impressed when they explained what child rights actually meant, and the local people realized that they had been seeing it the wrong way and that the community was misguided on child rights. So once the local people got educated on child rights, they were able to appreciate it and wanted to spread the knowledge further.

5.2.4. Relationship between sender and receiver

Additionally, when people interpret things differently, it has also to do with the fact that they are unique individuals with different backgrounds and different ways of understanding.

Therefore, it becomes important to highlight/emphasize the sender and receiver's background as well as the relationship between them in order to understand how they can communicate in the best possible way. The relationship between the sender and receiver can be understood by using the concept of corporate socialization mechanism, cultural background, cultural distance and Hofstede's cultural index.

Corporate socialization mechanism, cultural background and cultural distance

The influencing factors regarding the communication channels can be such as openness and density of communications, as well as formal or informal relationship between the sender and the receiver. The relationship between the sender and receiver, also referred to as the *corporate socialization mechanisms*, is an important influential factor because when there is a close and familiar relationship between sender and receiver, it will increase the openness of communication, which in turn will facilitate knowledge flow (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000). The relationship between the sender and the receiver is determined by the *cultural backgrounds of sender and receiver*, as well as the *cultural distance* between them. This can affect the knowledge transfer as it can facilitate or hinder successful knowledge transfer depending on if the sender and the receiver have different understandings of the knowledge due to different cultural backgrounds and if there is a big cultural distance between their cultures due to greater cultural differences and less cultural similarities (Haghirian, 2003). In short, people with greater cultural differences, who are interacting, will have greater difficulties in communicating effectively because the knowledge has to be adjusted so that it fits into a new cultural context.

Although the informants didn't describe their relationship with the people they shared the knowledge with, the African culture seems to be characterized by warmth, joy and respect, which also includes an openness towards other people. This affected the knowledge transfer process in a positive way since it facilitated the sharing of knowledge. The relationship between the informants/participants (sender) and the local people (receiver) was all the more clear according to the observations in the classrooms, where it can be considered to be close and interactive. By taking a participatory approach in the classroom, the teachers (participants) were asking the students questions which they elaborated on further and thus encouraged the students to think independently and be reflective, and to speak up and thus

contribute to the learning process. In addition, the students themselves didn't seem to hesitate to speak their mind and participate in the discussion. Hence it was a positive atmosphere in the classroom where the teachers and the students interacted with each other and the teachers places themselves on the same level as the students rather than being in a authoritative position. This facilitated the knowledge transfer between the teacher and the students since there is a close relationship between them, which increases the openness of communication.

Because the informants belong to the same Ugandan/Tanzanian culture as the local people, there was a close cultural distance between them even though they had different understanding of the new knowledge. It was thus easy for them to adjust the knowledge in an "African" way which affected how the people received the knowledge. The issue of cultural distance was further discussed during the workshop in Uganda where the participants talked about the importance of being able to understand the cultural values, norms, beliefs and customs if knowledge transfer processes is to exist. If you're not able to approach and present the knowledge in a way which fits these cultural norms and values, due to a long cultural distance, the knowledge transfer might backfire because there will be a resistance towards the knowledge. The participants also talked about the taboos that exist within a culture, things you never discuss or talk about, which are important to consider when transferring knowledge. If the knowledge touches on issues of taboo which are sensitive to talk about, then the receivers, the local people, will not listen.

Informants from both Uganda and Tanzania also discussed the issue of culture distance, and believed that it is important to change the mind-sets of people so that there is one united culture with a close cultural distance, which promotes children's rights. A way to accomplish that is through get everyone to talk in the same language and have the same understanding of child rights. One of the informants describes the issue of cultural distance as follows:

... you can really destroy distance... you have to first influence... work with each of the forces that are out there, slowly until you can win them, ... Instead of pointing out, they can all move and point with you, and work together... do simple steps, and try to change people around you slowly, moving them to yourself, until you can all speak in the same language.... being influential, mind influential, and having different power, knowledge power.

This is something that was brought up during the workshop in Uganda amongst the participants in the network meeting as well. According to them, they all have the same understanding of child rights through participating in the Sida program. Therefore they now speak in the same language which is colored by the values and terms that pervades the

program. Hence, they need to collaborate to promote child rights in the society in order to get everyone to talk and understand that language.

Hofstede's cultural index

Even though the informants and the local people have the same cultural background and traditional beliefs and ways of doing things, there is still a gap in their cultural values and way of understandings. This is due to the informants' participation in the Sida program which gave them new cultural values and a Western perspective on child rights, in addition to the actual knowledge that the program generated, compared to the local people which didn't participate in the Sida program. Their cultural differences can be described using *Hofstede's cultural index*, which is a model that distinguishes between different cultural dimensions in order to understand how culture can differ, and how the quality of the relationship between the sender and receiver affects knowledge transfer efforts between them (Leyland, 2006; Chen etc, 2009; Ardichvili etc, 2006).

Hofstede differentiates between individualistic and collectivistic cultures in the first cultural dimension, *individualism/collectivism* (IC). This dimension is characterized by whether individuals are driven by their own personal interests or the interest of the others in a collective group (Leyland, 2006). These members have thus distinctively different ways of interpret and conceive knowledge (Ardichvili etc, 2006). Whereas people in *individualistic cultures* are tend to be independent and only do things that are beneficial for themselves, which created loose ties between individuals, and thus perceive knowledge as abstract and independent from its context, people in collectivistic cultures are characterized by the opposite behavior (Ardichvili etc, 2006; Chen etc, 2009; Leyland, 2006).

Collectivist cultures highlight the idea of community where everyone is included and shares the responsibility in making decisions in favor of the community. In these cultures, knowledge is considered owned by the community and should be used in order to benefit the group as a whole, and the people tend to try and understand knowledge from a contextual point of view to obtain the meaning of the knowledge (Ardichvili etc, 2006; Leyland, 2006). The way people in these cultures perceive themselves in relation to others, as well as how they conceive pieces of information, affects the knowledge transfer process between and within these cultures. If the knowledge is in a written and abstract form it might be easier to transfer it to people in individualistic cultures, whereas knowledge might be more successfully transferred to people in collectivistic cultures through actions and face-to-face communication

or phone-calls (Ardichvili etc, 2006). Therefore, the knowledge transfer can be affected by the sender's and the receiver's positions along the IC dimension (Leyland, 2006). One thing that was brought up by informants from both Uganda and Tanzania is the role of a change agent, which involved being an ambassador for child rights, and taking every opportunity given to talk about children's rights in order for people to understand the importance and start being ambassadors themselves. This shows that the informants belongs to a collectivistic culture because they see their role as a change agent as a mission to share the knowledge for the benefit/best interest of the community, rather than sharing because of any personal gain. One of the informants explains the role of a change agent as follows:

...and also to see my role that I have to play in helping the teachers, mainly the teachers, understand that children have to be provided with lots of what they need to grow up, and they have to be protected as children, and also be given the opportunity to participate in many of the things that affects them. So, in a whole, the training in Lund helped me to position myself into... It helped me to understand what role I have to play as an individual and a teacher trainer into helping the teachers to introduce/reproduce and understand their role into delivery of education and the protection of the children.

Even the local people can be considered to belong to a collectivist culture, since the African culture (both Uganda and Tanzania) is characterized by a sense of belonging and inclusiveness in the community, where people have a close family relationship to each other and share responsibility to take care of the community. Since both the informants (the sender) and the local people (the receiver) belong to a collectivistic culture, their position affects the process of knowledge transfer in a positive way. Because a sender from a collectivistic culture might easily share knowledge because it is for the greater good and a receiver in a collective culture can be open to new knowledge if it in everyone's interest, their positions in this cultural dimension thus facilitates the transfer of knowledge (Leyland, 2006:7). However, the knowledge needs to be conceived important for the community in order for the local people to want to receive the knowledge. Hence, the local people might perceive the knowledge in a different way compared to the informants, which affects the way the knowledge is received, and thus affects the knowledge transfer.

When it comes to the second cultural dimension in Hofstede's cultural index, *power distance* (PD), it deals with the power relations between sender and receiver, and the perception of acceptance versus inequality in a society (Chen etc, 2009; Leyland, 2006). This automatically affects the communication and the knowledge transfer between the sender and receiver. If it concerns *small PD cultures*, knowledge transfer is facilitated because the culture takes on a

participative approach and the individuals are often willing to discuss and take in new aspects and elements which allow an open exchange of ideas. *Large PD cultures*, on the other hand, applies a traditional top-down approach where individuals with less or no power are perceived as passive receivers of knowledge. Thus might large PD cultures hinder the knowledge transfer process depending on whether the knowledge aligns with the culture's values or not. According to this PD perspective, knowledge transfer "involves changing the way things are done and adopting new approaches that may be radical different from those currently in use" (Leyland, 2006:9). Thus, knowledge transfer in this cultural dimension is about negotiating and compromising, regardless of what position the sender and receiver has. But when the sender and receiver are unable to negotiate due major differences, the knowledge transfer is affected negatively because it creates a resistance which becomes a hindrance in the knowledge transfer process (Leyland, 2006).

As mentioned earlier about the power relations between the informants and the local people, regarding the willingness to share, it doesn't seem to exist a power-issue since the informants are conscious about spreading the knowledge to others in order to reduce the gap in the power structures. Additionally, the informants emphasized a lot about increasing the participation among the children as well as different stakeholders in order to transfer the knowledge. This shows that they have a participative approach where they negotiate with the local people about how to implement the knowledge in the home countries. Increasing the participation was further mentioned during the workshop in Uganda, where the participants talked about facilitating the knowledge transfer through including the learners (local people) in different activities to let them perform what they've learned. They would begin with practice by letting the learner speak and express him- or herself and then follow-up by monitoring and coaching. This activity was used during one of the observations in the classroom, where the teacher (the informant) let the students become active participants in the learning process by performing a role play as well as a debate about adopting the child rights fully within the Ugandan culture. This enabled the students to reflect on children's rights in relation to the Ugandan context and thus becomes aware of what cultural difficulties that arises.

The power relations between the sender and the receiver are linked to the willingness to share and acquire knowledge. If the sender perceives the knowledge as valuable and unique, then the sender might avoid sharing since he or she believes that obtaining the unique knowledge will put him or her in a more powerful position. Likewise, if the receiver perceives the knowledge to be unique and valuable, then the receiver might be more willing to accept and

acquire such knowledge since it would give him or her more power and influence. Thus, the way the sender and receiver perceives and interprets the knowledge, affects whether the knowledge transfer is successful or not.

The last culture dimension is *masculinity/femininity* (MF) which is about individuals' attitudes towards societal values (Chen etc, 2009; Leyland, 2006). The masculine cultures are characterized by competitiveness, with focus on ambition and results. Thus, individuals in masculine cultures emphasize self-interest, and will only participate in knowledge transfer if it is beneficial for them. Knowledge transfer within a masculine culture is facilitated because both parts are conscious about winning. In feminine cultures, however, knowledge transfer is achieved through compromise and negotiation, and feminine cultures are characterized by a belief in mutual profit through cooperation. Thus, knowledge transfer in feminist cultures involves finding new ways for successful knowledge transfer (Leyland, 2006), which can be seen as beneficial when implementing change. Even though the local people are considered to belong to a collectivistic culture where focus is on group-cohesion, they also seem to belong to a masculine culture.

The informants can be considered belonging to a feministic culture since they seem willing to negotiate when it comes to child rights in order to get the local people on board so that they can have the same view and understanding of child rights. Although this can seem like a good option in order to facilitate the knowledge transfer when one part (the receiver) is focused on winning, this might still be problematic. A successful knowledge transfer will occur due to the local people's focus on achieving results and the informants' willingness to compromise, but it will be on the expense of the informants' belief in mutual gain since the receiving part (the local people) will be the only ones gaining.

5.3. Receiver related factors affecting the knowledge transfer process

Because the knowledge transfer process isn't completed until someone actually receives the knowledge, it is important to highlight the factors influencing whether the receiver acquires the knowledge or not. This is determined by the value of the knowledge (knowledge type), the receiver's ability to acquire new knowledge (absorptive capacity), as well as the receiver's attitude towards the new knowledge and the motivation to absorb/acquire it (willingness to adapt).

5.3.1. Knowledge type: valuable knowledge

As been mentioned above the knowledge flow is dependent on whether the knowledge is conceived as valuable and relevant or not by the sender as well as the receiver. The receiver will be resistant towards acquiring knowledge that he or she doesn't consider to be valuable. What is considered to be valuable knowledge is affected by the culture attitudes, which in turn determines which knowledge the receiver feel is needed and thus wants to absorb (De Long & Fahey, 2000). Thus, the knowledge transfer process isn't completed until the receiving end, the local people, has acquired the knowledge and this is only possible if they consider the knowledge to be valuable and relevant. According to the informants, the attitudes among the local people are positive, which shows that they consider the knowledge valuable and relevant.

Actually on the knowledge itself, children rights, people are very anxious to hear that. Most of them who we talk to, we are doing that, yeah there is the need to have that knowledge. Even though, in the implementation process, they say that there is some kind of problem. But the knowledge itself, they are very convenient.

This shows that the local people not only considers the knowledge to be relevant and valuable, but also that there is a need for this knowledge which facilitates the knowledge transfer as well as increases the usage of the knowledge once it is acquire by the local people.

5.3.2. Absorptive capacity

When it comes to the receiver related factors affecting knowledge transfer it becomes important to highlight the receiver's *absorptive capacity* which is the ability to identify the value of new information, understand it, and apply it in everyday life (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000). An individual's absorptive capacity is based on *prior experience* in similar knowledge acquisitions and homophily, which is the extent to which the sender and receiver share similar attributes (ibid). In line with an individual's prior experience, which affects the absorptive capacity, *organizational routines* are also a major impact on how well a person can acquire new knowledge. Organizational routines are developed through previous experience of doing something multiple times, hence the routines help make clear what needs to be done, how it should be done and it what order. This also applies to knowledge transfer and implementation since the more experience and routine one has in implementing something new, the more it facilitates the knowledge transfer process (Haghirian, 2003). Regarding the local people's absorptive capacity, according to the informants in Tanzania, the local people are exposed to cultural differences due to the many existing cultures in Tanzania. Therefore they are used to new values, and can quickly adjust to changes. According to the informants in Uganda

however, introducing new knowledge about child rights to the local people in Uganda was challenging because it involved something that they were not used to, and thus felt uncomfortable which resulted in a fear of adapting to the new change.

The local people's absorptive capacity is also affected by their similarity to the informants. Because they share similar cultural background, they might have a similar understanding on how to communicate and interact, which facilitates the knowledge transfer process. However, the difference in perception due to the participation in the program might be an obstacle for the local people when acquiring the knowledge.

5.3.3. Willingness to adapt

Another cultural dimension in Hofstede's cultural index is *uncertainty avoidance* (UA), which can be understood as "the degree to which the members of a society feel uncomfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity" (Chen etc, 2009:4). UA further deals with individuals' willingness to embrace change and trust in the unknown. Individuals in strong UA cultures perceive change as risky and problematic and are more comfortable with formalized structures, strict delegations and rules. As a result, they tend to avoid change and new ways of doing things. Thus, to transfer knowledge within these cultures that are so reluctant to new knowledge, can be very problematic, which might lead to enforced change. People in weak UA cultures, however, have a welcoming approach to change because they are open-minded and driven by the idea of continuous improvement and better ways of doing things. This enables them to embrace change and new knowledge, which allows them to absorb new knowledge. Knowledge transfer can thus be facilitated if both the sender and receiver belongs to weak UA culture then but if one or both of them belong to a strong UA culture, the knowledge transfer process will be hindered (Leyland, 2006).

UA cultures can also be linked to a person's willingness to accept new knowledge, *the motivational disposition of the target unit*. A person's willingness to acquire new knowledge is based on by factors such as ego-defensive mechanisms which hinder someone to absorb information because it might show signs of that person's lack of knowledge. The motivation is affected by the receiver's willingness to learn, the lack of knowledge stock which implies that there is a need for knowledge, and demanding pressures from the organization's headquarters (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000). When returning to their home countries with the new knowledge, all the informants has the impression that the local people and people within the schools, in general has a positive attitude towards the new knowledge, and are open to

change. They did see some cultural restriction where some people are a bit hesitant to embrace the change to a full extent because it touches on the value and beliefs, and it's about changing the mind-set that they have. Especially the teachers seem to be open to acquire new knowledge about child rights.

Teachers are more receptive. They always want a better skill of helping their children. We found that easier, because when you go to schools they are always opening up the doors for you. They want to listen and they want to try... when you do something, they admire and they think that it would be good.

In other words, people have a positive perception of the knowledge on child rights that the informants are implementing from the Sida course. They believe that it is a good thing, and that it is needed for their children to grow into good citizens and human beings. This shows that there is a willingness and motivation among the local people to absorb the knowledge that the informants are sharing, but that the transfer is prevented by the possibility to use the knowledge to accomplish change and the lack of resources. According to them, the issue lies in lack of knowledge and understanding, and believes that by going through and explaining child rights to the people, and implementing parts of which are suitable for the African culture, would help them transfer the knowledge and make the locals absorb the knowledge in a successful way.

Actually, people have positive attitude towards the project because child rights is an issue of every person in the community. ... they have certain perceptions concerning child rights, they maybe think that when you beat the children, it is when you violate the child, but other issues like early pregnancy, not providing for their children... they were not thinking that this also is a kind of child violation. Now, when we are elaborating is when they come to realize that oh, this is a good thing.

However, some of the informants still experienced a resistance among people when sharing the knowledge, and that they received suspicious reactions from people in their surroundings. This shows that the local people in Ugandan and Tanzania belong to a strong UA culture, according to Hofstede's cultural index. The informants explained this resistance by pointing at people's fears, and claimed that they are afraid to lose their cultural values.

Parents want their children to advance, to change, but they fear, they have fear of losing their culture. That is, on the general, what I can quickly summarize... So when you tell them that children can talk, culture in a way... because of wanting to preserve authority, as a parent, authority over this child, as a mother a child has to kneel and greet in some of the cultures. So they fear that if you give them choice and freedom they might choose not to kneel or greet me. So there is a fear... they fear the children will stop respecting them, they fear – the parents

fear – that children will cease to see and respect authority. So those are things that are strongly coming up in anybody, whether church leaders, whether parents – just an individual parent, whether these leaders, local council leaders I talked about, all of them have that fear. So that's where culture comes in.

In line with people's fears, the informants from both Uganda and Tanzania believe that the resistance, and that local people are reluctant, is due to familiarity – that the Western values are foreign and alien – and that they thus feel uncomfortable. The new knowledge is perceived as something that belongs to the Western culture where the norms and habits fits the life of white people. By transferring this knowledge to Africa brings changes in behavior that the local people are not used to, and thus are suspicious towards. The informants therefore experience some challenge in getting the local people to accept these changes in behavior, and realize that it is a development towards something better. The resistance and fear of losing their culture was also showcased during the observations in one of the classes, where the students get to act out a role play. The play illustrates how Ugandan culture is suppressing the children's rights because they fear that something negative will come out of it. The students seem to agree that this is happening and supports these cultural values and beliefs. The play also shows that parents are ignorant which, according to the class (teacher and students), is due to people's anxiety and that they don't know what the rights really are. According to the class, as well as the informants, people in Uganda tend to think that the children are spoilt with rights, which also was the headlines on one of the articles that was put up in the classroom by the students.

A informant from Uganda talked about the responses she got from local people who think the children are spoilt with rights, and also emphasized the fears among the local leaders and the parents, for example.

They look at you and think that you are somehow putting the children a bit too high. And sometimes, when you talk about children... I am so passionate about children, because sometimes I say that they are scientist, that they investigate us. And my colleague says "you use so big words for these children" ... "you are fuzzing with the kids, and you are spoiling kids, you are the one who try to bring these Western culture, having to put the child in front of time and floating, we are floating the child ahead of us".

The resistance might also have to do with the people identifying themselves with their cultural beliefs, that it is tradition and something that have been a part of them during generations. They take pride in the way they live and perceive reality, and want to preserve it and pass it on to their children, because it is a way to survive and make ends meet in life. It is also a

matter of habits, which are a natural part of people's lives, hence habits becomes difficult to change. The African pride showed in the classroom during one of the observations, when the class started with the national anthem and presentation of the Ugandan flag. The teacher (informant) talked about the different symbols in the flag and that they represent, such as brotherhood, the sun, the Black continent (Africa), and independence, which are things that symbolize a strong connection to the national culture, tradition and pride. An interesting aspect from the observations in the classroom is that, despite the people's fears when it comes to implementing the Western values because it is foreign, people still seem to look up to Western people as if the Westerners were superior to them since those countries are richer and a lot more developed.

The local people's attitude towards the new knowledge from the Western culture affects the knowledge transfer process by creating some obstacles through their resistance that hinders the process. The informants are however optimistic and believe that they with time and involvement through dialogue can change the local people's attitudes and thus facilitate knowledge transfer.

5.4. Environmental factors affecting the knowledge transfer process

Besides the influencing factors related to the sender, receiver as well as the communication, there are also surrounding factors in the environment which affects the knowledge transfer process. It could be factors such as national and organizational culture, religion, existing platforms for knowledge sharing, and resources in the environment.

Since culture is often seen as unconscious values and views, culture also affects people's attitudes and behaviors on how they perceive reality in order to make it understandable (Alvesson & Sveningsson 2008; Clegg, et al., 2008; Haghirian, 2003). Further, the national and organizational culture that a person belongs to is based on the existing norms on what behavior is considered to be socially acceptable, which shapes how a person creates, adopts, shares, receives and interprets new knowledge. Knowledge transfer is thus affected by what cultural values and norms that a person believes in to be able to make sense of the reality (De Long & Fahey, 2000; Haghirian, 2003). It is not only the individual's own cultural values and norms that affect the knowledge transfer. Also the norms and values of people in the surrounding environment affects how a person deals with knowledge transfer, regardless of whether it is sending or receiving knowledge, through peer pressure, pressure from higher power etc. Additionally, culture shapes the relationship between different sending and receiving units, and thus how

knowledge is distributed and implemented, as well as how external knowledge is legitimized and adopted (De Long & Fahey, 2000). Cultural norms and values, whether it would be the national or organizational culture, which encourages active flow of ideas can thus facilitate knowledge transfer (Haghirian, 2003).

The informants brought up the cultural differences as an obstacle in the knowledge transfer process, not only the different national cultures between Sweden and Uganda/Tanzania, but also the different subcultures that existed within each country. Informants from both Uganda and Tanzania talked a lot about the 54 different cultures in Uganda and the 126 different cultures in Tanzania. This not only made an impact on what was perceived as valuable and relevant knowledge to share and absorb, but also hindered the communication of this knowledge since it created misunderstandings and confusion. As culture also shapes people's behavior and way of thinking and doing, it is hidden deep in people's minds; it is hard to change. The informants realized that they had to change the mind-set of the local people, and thus the culture, in order to transfer what they have learned during the Sida course. This is something that most of the informants perceived as a major challenge. Therefore the informants further experienced the Ugandan/Tanzanian culture as a hindrance in the knowledge transfer process.

But having grown into that background in a long time, of respect and distance to elders and all that... of course, you cannot overcome it so quickly... when you learn when you are an adult, then you are trying to change... You are trained to adjust, but you've lived in this system for so long that it is a bit difficult for you to learn to live in a different culture, or adapt new skills and new tricks.

The informants further emphasized environmental challenges such as conflicts between schools, communities and church/religion. Because the African culture shapes how people act and behave in different situations through certain values and norms on what is considered acceptable/appropriate behavior, it thus becomes an integrated part of their lives. These norms and values are so deeply rooted in the community, and have a strong connection to the traditional values and religious beliefs. Therefore, it creates a conflict when people in the community act according to these norms while children get to learn new values in school which are based on the Western culture. The informants talked, for example, about corporal punishment and argued that it affects the way the child is being brought up when religion and traditional values advocates punishment as a good way to train the children into a good

manner, whereas the schools teaches the children that punishment is wrong and against their rights.

All of the informants expressed a lot of physical challenges when implementing their projects in the home country. It concerned mostly financial resources and the provision of food. But it could also be regarding transport, since they often had to travel long distances in roads which often were occupied with cars in traffic jam, and a lack of learning materials.

The major challenges was... The basic challenges has been financial. We are implementing a project which we are founding ourselves, which has always been difficult. People have not initiated change because they always look for outside foundlings. But the best case, we are transporting ourselves, we are paying the meals for the teachers... Because when we bring teachers together, you can't keep them a whole day without a meal. So we pull the resources together... Because simple things like this can be, sort of, a catch point that when somebody who has had something to eat can listen longer than if he had not.

The possibility to provide food was a hinder in the knowledge transfer process through affecting the local people's concentration, and thus their motivation/willingness to learn. They also emphasized the importance to be able to provide with learning and training materials when sharing knowledge, in order for the receiver to acquire and understand the knowledge.

Thus, the informants experienced some environmental constrains which affected the transfer of knowledge. Even though they embraced the role of being a change agent fully, and were highly motivated to share the knowledge and believed that they could change the attitude of people, they still faced a lack of resources due to poverty and poor infrastructure. This limited them in the actions they wanted to do which thus hindered the knowledge transfer.

6. Conclusion

This thesis have been dealing with knowledge transfer and the culture aspect of the process where relevant theories as well as empirical data gathered from interview, observations and workshops have been presented and discussed in relation to each other based on a sender-communication-receiver model (see table 1 in chapter 6: Result and analysis). The research questions which this thesis aims at answering are as follows:

- What cultural aspects affects the knowledge transfer within the Sida:s “Child Rights, Classroom and School Management Program”?
- How does the culture affect the process of transferring knowledge between different cultures?

6.1. What cultural aspects affects the knowledge transfer within the Sida:s “Child Rights, Classroom and School Management Program”?

The findings in this research regarding cultural aspects that affect the knowledge transfer process within the Sida program, and are thus important to consider, can be summed up by highlighting the relationship between the sender and the receiver and how they interpret and perceive things differently. This is due to the *sender and receiver's cultural background*, and their *cultural distance*. There is a big cultural distance between the informants and the local people in Uganda and Tanzania because the informants had embraced new Western values and beliefs regarding child rights through participation in the program. The local people, on the other hand, still believe in the traditional cultural values and norms because it feels safe and familiar. When there is a big cultural distance, people thus have a tendency to be reluctant to embrace change and adopt the new values because sticking to old cultural values and norms feels safe and familiar, which might hinder the transfer of knowledge and the implementation of change. But because the informants have the same cultural background as the local people, they have a close relationship which increases the openness of communication. Additionally, the informants have an inside understanding of the existing norms and values since they belong to the same Ugandan/Tanzanian culture as the local people, and thus know how to approach the local people in order to transfer the knowledge. This shows that it is of great importance to be aware who you are talking to, who the receiver is, and thus package and adjusting the knowledge so that it fits the receiving culture's norms and values.

6.2. How does the culture affect the process of transferring knowledge between different cultures?

The aspects that were brought up above as important cultural influences can affect the knowledge transfer in different ways. Depending on the sender's and the receiver's cultural background, they will understand and interpret the knowledge differently, which thus affects the knowledge transfer. The research findings show that a big gap between the sender's and the receiver's cultural background will hinder knowledge transfer. In this research there was a big cultural difference between the informants and the local people, because the informants had acquired the new Western values during the Sida course, whereas the local people still had a strong connection to the traditional cultural values. Thus the local people are reluctant to absorb the new knowledge because it implies new ways of doing things which they are not used to. Therefore the big cultural distance hinders the knowledge transfer as people with greater cultural differences, who are interacting, will have greater difficulties in communicating effectively. Another important aspect is the sender and receiver's motivation to share and acquire knowledge. Even though the informants were willing to share the knowledge, the local people had a lack of motivation since it didn't align with their cultural beliefs, and hence was foreign and alien. This hindered thus the transfer of knowledge. Therefore, in order to facilitate knowledge transfer across different cultures, the knowledge needs to be codified and adjusted to fit into the new cultural context,

The sender's ability to package and communicate the knowledge in a clear way, further affects knowledge transfer. Due to the similarity in the informants' and the local people's cultural backgrounds, as they belong to the same Ugandan/Tanzanian culture, the informants knew how adjust the knowledge and work within the system. This enabled them to package the knowledge and communicate it in a clear and appropriate way in order for the local people to absorb it and thus accomplish change. According to the informants, different communication platforms and forums such as training and consultation meetings were useful in order to educate the people about child rights and thus facilitate knowledge transfer. But as change takes time, and don't happen overnight, the informants realized that it is important to adapt the knowledge slowly by take baby steps as well as making small compromises in order to transfer the knowledge and accomplish change.

7. Discussion

One interesting aspect when it comes to knowledge transfer, what has been showing in this research, is what role the culture has in society during processes of change. According to the way the informants have been talking about implementing the knowledge from the Sida program and what responses they have got from the local people, there is a tendency to stick to the traditional values and beliefs. As stated in the introduction of this thesis, the cultural values and beliefs can often create a resistance to change and new values, because the old values feels safe and familiar. This can be seen among the local people as the informants talked about the attitude among the people as well as what challenges they faced as they implemented the new knowledge. Additionally, as been mentioned earlier, the local people are less motivated to adapt to the new knowledge from a Western culture and embrace change because it's not agreeing with the African beliefs and way of life. Thus, culture plays a major role in society during processes of change as it becomes a solid foundation for the local people to rely on whenever new perspectives and ways of doing things are introduced to the society. This can in turn create a negative reaction towards the change and thus affects the people's ability to adapt to the new knowledge because the old traditional way of life seem safe and familiar, which limits people's perceptions on reality and how to do things differently in order to improve.

Nevertheless, the old traditions and cultural values are still of great importance, according to me, because it create a sense of cohesion among the people in the community, which will affect society in a positive way as it decreases the risk of war and violence. This will, in line with Gupta & Govindarajan's (2000) thoughts, facilitate the transfer of knowledge within the community if there is an open and familiar relationship between people. In addition, I believe that it is important for the individual to feel that he or she belongs to a group and is included as a part of the society in order to develop to its full potential. This in turn might increase the individual's willingness to share the knowledge that he or she posses to other people, which can be linked to the reasoning behind the characteristics of a collectivistic culture in Hofstede's cultural index (see Ardichvili etc, 2006; Leyland, 2006). Although, it is important to keep in mind that Western cultural values isn't always considered better values just because those countries are more developed. Maybe the old ways of live are better compared to the modern lifestyle? Thus it is important to respect the African values and understand why they might be reluctant to change and keep to their traditions.

In line with this, it is also interesting with the African pride, considering the fact that the informants talked about the issue of 54 different cultures in Uganda and 126 different cultures in Tanzania, which led to difficulties in reaching a common understanding. The informants brought up on multiple occasions African traditions, the African way of life, being African and the African culture. This raises a number of interesting questions. For example, why is it so difficult to bring in new things in these different cultures and thus develop as nations? I believe that it is due to the African history, which involves a lot of suppression and sufferings which the African countries experienced due to poverty. Their lack of resources and how the society is built up financially, politically and socially is a part of the African culture, and thus how the African people live and how they make ends meet. This might have resulted in the people in Africa starting to rely on the African bond in order to deal with these sufferings, and thus made a stronger cohesion as well as a stronger resistance towards other countries outside Africa; it became a division between “us” (the African people) and “them” (countries outside Africa, especially Western countries). Thus, the African tradition and culture is of great importance to the people and are very deeply ingrained in people’s lives. The strong connection to the culture and the distinction between “us” and “them” also affects knowledge transfer, since people in Africa tend to feel a resistance towards anything that is considered foreign which hinders the transfer of knowledge to these countries. Thus, the culture also affects any initiation of development and change by inhibiting the culture to embrace and adapt to anything new, which can become problematic considering that Africa consists of developing countries which are in the process of improvement and moving towards a better society.

Another interesting aspect is the concept of knowledge transfer, which also was brought up by one of the informants. It can be considered to be more suitable to use the term *knowledge sharing*, because knowledge transfer assumes that the other side is empty and that the sender imports something to that side. But in most cases, both sides often already have existing knowledge stock. I agree with this point of view as I believe that the receiving side of the knowledge transfer isn’t empty of knowledge, but that the sender through sharing knowledge can add to the receiver’s knowledge stock. Thus, the new knowledge combined with the previous knowledge creates an added value and an enriched understanding of reality. With this perspective it becomes important to be aware of who you are talking to and take into account the receiver’s knowledge base when sharing knowledge. This is something that has been brought up in the theoretical background of knowledge transfer as well, which shows

that it is a relevant aspect that is important to consider. However, I believe that it is important to highlight that the term knowledge sharing isn't always a better term to use compared to knowledge transfer per se. According to my point of view, these are two different terms with two different meanings. Thus they are appropriate to use in different situations and contexts.

Concluding reflections

As been showed in this research, it is crucial in knowledge transfer processes to know who is receiving the knowledge. This research examined mainly the sender's perspective and the communication and interaction between sender and receiver. Therefore, it would be an interesting focus for future research to study what aspects that are important from the receiver's perspective, in order to transfer knowledge successfully. It is thus important to be aware of the soft and subjective aspects which affect how an individual acts and reacts in different situations, and thus whether the individual fully absorbs the knowledge as intended by the sender.

Another interesting aspect for future research is looking at personality traits in knowledge transfer. Because there are so many different cultures involved in this kind of knowledge transfer, it becomes important to consider what kind of individual is best when it comes to facilitating knowledge transfer across different cultures; what kind of personality is most likely to share knowledge in a successful way and what kind of personality is most likely to absorb new knowledge successfully. Additionally, when looking at knowledge transfer it is important to discuss the possibility to actually transfer knowledge to someone else and make sure that it is received in the right way.

Reference list

- Ahrne, Göran & Papakostas, Apostolis (2002). *Organisationer, samhälle och globalisering: tröghetens mekanismer och förnyelsens förutsättningar*. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Alvesson, Mats & Sveningsson, Stefan (2008). *Förändringsarbete i organisationer: om att utveckla företagskulturer*. 1. uppl. Malmö: Liber
- Ardichvili, Alexandre, Maurer, Martin, Li, Wei, Wentling, Tim, & Stuedemann, Reed (2006): *Cultural influence on knowledge sharing through online communities of practice*. Journal of knowledge management, Vol. 10, No. 1, 2006.
- Chen, Jihong, Y.T Sun, Peter, & McQueen, Robert J. (2010): *The impact of national cultures on structured knowledge transfer*. Journal of knowledge management. Vol. 14, No. 2, 2010.
- De Long, David W. & Fahey, Liam (2000): *Diagnosing cultural barriers to knowledge management*. Academy of management executive, Vol. 14, No. 4, 2000.
- Donate, Mario J. & Guadamillas, Fátima (2010): The effect of organizational culture on knowledge management practices and innovation. Knowledge and Process Management, Vol. 17, No. 2, 2010.
- Fangen, Katrine (2005). *Deltagande observation*. 1. uppl. Malmö: Liber ekonomi
- Gergen, K. J. (1985). "The social constructionist movement in modern psychology". American Psychologist, 40, pp.266-275
- Granberg, Otto (2011). *PAOU: personaladministration, HRM och organisationsutveckling*. 8., [rev. och utök.] utg. Stockholm: Natur och kultur.
- Gupta, Anil K, Govindarajan, Vijay (2000): *Knowledge flows within multinational corporations*. Strategic Management Journal, Vol. 21 No. 4, 2000
- Hage, Jerald & Powers, Charles H. (1992). *Post-industrial lives: roles and relationships in the 21st century*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage
- Haghirian, Parissa (2003). *Does culture really matter? Cultural influences on the knowledge transfer process within multinational corporations*. Proceedings of the 11th European Conference on Information Systems, 2003.
- Halvorsen, Knut (1992). *Samhällsvetenskaplig metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Holden, Nigel J. & Von Korfleisch, Harald F.O. (2004): *Why cross-cultural knowledge transfer is a form of translation in more ways than you think*. Knowledge and Process Management, Vol. 11 No. 2, 2004
- Kvale, Steinar & Brinkmann, Svend (2009). *Den kvalitativa forskningsintervjun*. 2. uppl. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Lewin, Ellen (red.) (2006). *Feminist anthropology: a reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell

Leyland, Lucas M. (2006): *The role of culture on knowledge transfer: the case of the multinational corporation*. The Learning Organization, Vol. 13, No. 3, 2006.

Mason, Jennifer (2002). *Qualitative researching*. 2. ed. London: Sage

Mørk, Bjørn Erik, Aanestad, Margunn, Hanseth, Ole & Grisot, Miria (2008): *Conflicting Epistemic Cultures and Obstacles for Learning across Communities of Practice*. Knowledge and Process Management, Vol. 15 No. 1, 2008.

Nonaka, Ikujiro (2000). *The knowledge-Creating Company*. Harvard business review, 162-171.

Sennett, Richard (2006). *The culture of the new capitalism*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Wickenberg, W. Flinck, etc. (red.) (2009). *Taking child rights seriously: reflections on five years of an international training programme*. Stockholm: Sida

Appendix 1

Interview guide Batch 18 (Uganda)

Introduction

- Present myself and the purpose of the interview
- Inform about confidentiality and the opportunity to take part of the essay when it is finished/completed.
- Inform that the informant can pause or interrupt the interview at any time if he or she gets uncomfortable or if it feels difficult/tough.
- Inform about the interview being recorded in order to present it as accurate to reality as possible in the essay, and that the recording will only be used by me, and for no other purposes than the essay.
- Finally: get approval/confirmation from the informant to continue.

Basic information

Tell me about your work:

- What is your profession? What position do you have?
- What task/duties as well as responsibilities do you have?
- What are the possibilities of being a change agent in your work?

How much did you know about the CR-program before applying?

Why did choose to participate in the program? What were your initial feelings towards it?

Tell me about your general impression from the program.

The program, the project and its implementation process

1. What does Child Rights mean to you? Then and now?
 - Has your perspective on this, and how you work with it, changed since the program? If so, in what way?
2. Can you tell me about the program?
 - How was it organized and structured?
 - What new knowledge and cultural values did you take with you from the program in Lund? Compared to before participating in the program?
 - What did you find interesting and important for the situation in Uganda?

- What was your approach/attitude towards the new values? How did you embrace/embody them?
3. Can you describe the project?
 - What are the goals and purposes? What did you want to achieve with the project and why?
 - What activities does it include? Who are involved?
 - Which cultural values from Sweden made an impact on you? How did you incorporate the cultural values that you gained from the program into the project?
 - How would you describe your own role within the project as a source of knowledge and cultural values?
 4. Has the new knowledge and cultural values been adjusted in the project to make it more accessible to people in the African context? If so, how?
 - How are you working with the implementation? After the program? Now?
 - How did you present the project to the schools and the teachers (non-participants)?
 5. When transferring what you've learned in Sweden, what challenges did you have to face? What was easy to incorporate in the local African context?
 - Do the challenges remain in today's implementation process? Any new challenges? What has become easier?
 - Could you tell me about any cultural difficulties (misunderstandings or resistance towards the project etc.)?
 - Any physical constraints when working with Child Rights in Uganda (limits due to number of students compared to size of classroom etc.)?
 6. How do you perceive the locals attitude towards the project, and the change that it involves? How much do people engage in it?
 - Do people find the project, and the new values that it implies, valuable and worth investing in?
 - What were the attitudes towards the new change amongst the teachers and other non-participants during the implementation? Attitudes today?
 - According to you, where in the process of implementation are you now? Are there any opportunities to continue working with the project after the end of the program? Will you at one point be finished, or is this project a life-long

learning process? Will schools in Kampala/Uganda continue to work on the project even after the 2-year program?

7. Has the project, and the participation in the program, affected you personally? In what way? How does it show?
 - The way you think and act?
 - The way other people treat and interact with you?
 - Regarding your work? More responsibilities?
8. Anything you would like to add?

Thank you!

Interview guide Batch 19 (Tanzania)

Introduction

- Present myself and the purpose of the interview
- Inform about confidentiality and the opportunity to take part of the essay when it is finished/completed.
- Inform that the informant can pause or interrupt the interview at any time if he or she gets uncomfortable or if it feels difficult/tough.
- Inform about the interview being recorded in order to present it as accurate to reality as possible in the essay, and that the recording will only be used by me, and for no other purposes than the essay.
- Finally: get approval/confirmation from the informant to continue.

Basic information

Tell me about your work:

- What is your profession? What position do you have?
- What task/duties as well as responsibilities do you have?
- What are the possibilities of being a change agent in your work?

Why did you choose to participate in the program?

The program, the project and its implementation process

1. Can you tell me about the program?
 - What new knowledge and cultural values did you take with you from the program in Lund?
 - What knowledge did you find important to share in Tanzania (colleagues etc)?
2. Can you describe the project?
 - What are the goals and purposes? What did you want to achieve with the project and why?
 - What activities does it include? Who are involved?
 - How did you incorporate the cultural values that you gained from the program into the project?
 - Has the action plan (aka your project) helped you to transfer what you've learned in Sweden to the Tanzanian context? How? In what way?
3. Has the new knowledge and cultural values been adjusted in the project to make it more accessible to people in the African context? If so, how?

- How are you working with the implementation? After the program? Now?
 - How did you present the project to the schools and the teachers (non-participants)?
4. When transferring what you've learned in Sweden, what challenges did you have to face? What was easy to incorporate in the local Tanzanian context?
 - Do the challenges remain in today's implementation process? Any new challenges? What has become easier?
 - Could you tell me about any cultural difficulties (misunderstandings or resistance towards the project etc.)?
 - Any physical constraints when working with Child Rights in Tanzania (limits due to number of students compared to size of classroom etc.)?
 5. How do you perceive the attitudes towards the implementation and the changes amongst the teachers and other non-participants? How much do people engage in it?
 - Do people find the project, and the new values that it implies, valuable and worth investing in?
 - According to you, where in the process of implementation are you now? Are there any opportunities to continue working with the project after the end of the program? Will you at one point be finished, or is this project a life-long learning process? Will schools in Dar Es Salaam/Tanzania continue to work on the project even after the 2-year program?
 6. Has the project, and the participation in the program, affected you personally? In what way? How does it show?
 - The way you think and act?
 - The way other people treat and interact with you?
 - Regarding your work? More responsibilities?
 7. Anything you would like to add?

Thank you!