be, lengthy) planning, and that management commitment be equal between the two sides. ⁹⁶ Careful preparing of the groundwork, both substantive and interpersonal, was also stressed by a review of the record of Western joint ventures in the former Soviet Union: "The most successful JVs...have understood from the outset that the development of a trusting relationship across barriers of language, culture, education, and world view requires a generous investment of time and attention.... Most at least took the time to build personal relationships between their top managers and the Russians." ⁹⁷

A study by Gary Hamel argued that the real purpose of joint ventures is internal capacity-building on both sides. 98 He suggests that there is a competitive "race to learn" new skills and techniques from the other partner, while seeking to limit in some ways the other's access to one's own technology. Yet some degree of "transparency" must be present if one's firm is to attract partners and thereby realize its own learning goals. Hamel found that the main determinant of transparency was the social context; work-teams with accepting attitudes to outsiders and tasks whose nature requires "regular and intensive intermingling of the staff" of the partner-firms were associated with greater learning on both sides.⁹⁹ The second main determinant of learning success was "receptivity", the willingness and abilities of each partner to learn. Hamel found the ultimate reason for the literature's common finding that Japanese firms increase their learning more from JVs than do Western firms in a remark of a Japanese interviewee: "We had the attitude of

^{96.} Lyons, Michael Paul, "Joint Ventures as Strategic Choice: A Literature Review," Long Range Planning, Vol. 24, No. 4, 1991, p. 141.

^{97.} Laurence, Paul and Vlachoutsicos, C., "Joint Ventures in Russia: Put the Locals in Charge," *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, 1993, p. 49.

^{98.} Hamel, Gary, op. cit.

^{99.} Ibid., p. 96.