

**Intercultural Communication, City Planning, and Diversity
in Winnipeg, Manitoba**

By

Johanna Washchyshyn

A Practicum Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies

University of Manitoba

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of

Master of City Planning

Faculty of Architecture
Department of City Planning
University of Manitoba

Copyright © 2013 Johanna Washchyshyn

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	4
ABSTRACT.....	5
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	6
1.1 PREAMBLE	6
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	12
1.3 PURPOSE AND SCOPE	15
1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF RESEARCH	16
1.5 ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS.....	18
1.6 OUTLINE OF CHAPTERS	20
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY	21
2.1 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	21
2.2 SAMPLING	22
2.3 STORYTELLING AS A RESEARCH METHOD	24
2.4 SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS.....	25
2.5 WORLD CAFÉ-INSPIRED FOCUS GROUP	27
2.6 ANALYSIS – READING THE DATA.....	31
2.7 METHODOLOGY LIMITATIONS.....	32
CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW	35
3.1 INTRODUCTION	35
3.2 CONCEPTUALIZING CULTURE AND COMMUNICATION: AN EVOLUTIONARY TRAJECTORY THROUGH URBAN THEORY AND PLANNING PRACTICE	38
3.2.1 <i>Monoculturalism and the modern city</i>	38
3.2.2 <i>Ethnocultural multiculturalism in the postmodern city</i>	40
3.2.3 <i>Interculturalism in the post-postmodern city?</i>	44
3.3 INTERCULTURAL CITY-MAKING: WHERE DOES PLANNING FIT, AND WHAT ROLES DO PLANNERS PLAY?	46
3.4 INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCIES AND DIVERSITY AS CHANGE	49
3.5 THE THREE C’S AND PLANNING PRACTICE.....	52
3.6 INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION FOR PROFESSIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE	57
CHAPTER 4: THE WINNIPEG CONTEXT.....	60
4.1 IMMIGRATION: ENHANCING OUR CULTURAL MIX	62
4.2 A GROWING ABORIGINAL CULTURE: RESPECTING INDIGENOUS ROOTS.....	66
4.3 CULTURE ON DISPLAY FOR CONSUMPTION: CELEBRATING OUR CULTURAL ASSETS...	68
4.4 A CULTURE OF UNCONVENTIONAL PLANNING INITIATIVES: LEADING EDGES OF THE MAINSTREAM IN WINNIPEG?	69
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS	73
5.1 PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS.....	73
5.2 FINDINGS FROM THE INTERVIEWS	73
5.2.1 <i>The pursuit of a planner in the making</i>	74
5.2.2 <i>Practicing communicative planning</i>	77
5.2.3 <i>Collective challenges and opportunities for planning with diversity</i>	79
5.2.4 <i>Intercultural planning in Winnipeg</i>	91
5.3 FINDINGS FROM THE FOCUS GROUP	96

5.3.1	<i>Reflections on the role of communication in planning</i>	97
5.3.2	<i>Understanding and navigating ‘cultures’ and ‘worlds’ in practice.....</i>	100
5.3.3	<i>‘Planning’ is diverse and collectively misunderstood.....</i>	104
5.3.4	<i>Planning in a changing culture and social structure</i>	107
5.4	POINTERS FOR PLANNING PRACTICE AND PRAXIS.....	108
5.4.1	<i>Developing opportunities for dialogue in planning processes in Winnipeg: Designing spaces for intercultural city-making and placemaking.....</i>	108
5.4.2	<i>Promoting the importance of the planning process.....</i>	109
5.4.3	<i>Accentuating intercultural awareness.....</i>	112
5.4.4	<i>Engaging people at the emotional level.....</i>	115
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS		117
6.1	REVISITING THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	118
6.2	LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	128
6.3	CONCLUSION.....	130
REFERENCES CITED		133
APPENDIX I: RESEARCH SUMMARY		140
APPENDIX II: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDELINES.....		146
APPENDIX III: WORLD CAFÉ-INSPIRED FOCUS GROUP GUIDELINES		149
APPENDIX IV: SAMPLE CONSENT FORM		153

Acknowledgements

Thank you to the volunteers who took the time to make this project possible. I am especially thankful for the invaluable guidance of my Advisor and Committee. Financial support received from the University of Manitoba Graduate Fellowship and the Department of City Planning is acknowledged and much appreciated.

Abstract

Intercultural communication addresses some of the apparent challenges that surface from interactions among diverse people. The concept stretches beyond language and dialect barriers and includes the ways in which culture influences how people understand, create and respond to communication depending on where they are from, their life experiences, social structure, ethnicity, religion, education, occupation, and so on. This research acknowledges that *culture* is a broad and difficult to define concept because it influences individuals and groups in different ways, especially in an era of globalization. Through an exploration of literature, semi-structured interviews and a focus group, and applying the concept of intercultural communication to active planning practice, the research examines how a sample of Winnipeg planners learn and practice such intercultural communication. Their perspectives on this practice are then considered in the context of collaboration, where it is concluded that intercultural communication competencies can directly foster collaboration – a relatively complex level of communication. The practice has potential benefits for the many diverse publics that now need to be better served through planning processes. Intercultural communication is an important practice of planners in culturally diverse cities such as Winnipeg because planners often find themselves in intermediary ‘bridging’ roles among diverse cultures. It is confirmed that intercultural communication requires a necessary set of competencies, values and skills that must influence one’s planning practice.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Preamble

This exploratory research project is an effort to integrate a sincere appreciation for cultural diversity and a curiosity about city life, with the application of planning as city-making. This context builds on Landry's (2006) idea that "city-making" involves so much more than formulae; city-making is the art of urban integration. It involves the making of meaningful *place* rather than the organization of generic *space*. The research revolves around the inter-relationship of intercultural communication, city planning and cultural diversity. Planning is here envisioned as the avenue for city-making through the practice of intercultural communication, and as a vehicle for positively and actively embracing diversity within the intercultural complexity.

This research reflects a curiosity as to how people can not only co-habit and co-exist, but also 'co-labour' – *collaborate* – in the globalizing cities of the twenty-first century. It seems that extra-ordinary communication has become essential to better address diversity. The ways in which communication takes place – be it globally, 24/7, online, via multimedia, multi-lingually, inter-professionally, through public forums and protests – are evolving and developing as individuals, information, communication and *culture* have globalized. All this communication has also generated unprecedented levels of exposure, commentary, observation, and visualization in relation to both local and global issues. *How can we not only cooperate with one another, but also collaborate through a deeper*

understanding of others' perspectives, to work towards more effective collective action?

Part of this research involves investigating a distinction of the 'Three C's' – cooperation, coordination and communication – as compared to *collaboration*. Firstly, 'communication' is much like 'culture' in that it is difficult to settle on a concise definition. As a discipline, Craig (1999) reflects on the various theories of communication that inter-relate, while at the same time challenge each other: "Communication theory, in this view, is a coherent field of metadiscursive practice, a field of discourse about discourse with implications for the practice of communication" (p.120). For the purposes of this research, a definition of communication from the sociocultural communication tradition will be referenced as follows: communication is "*a symbolic process that produces and reproduces shared sociocultural patterns*" (Craig, 1999, p.144). The sociocultural communication tradition "focuses on patterns of interaction between people rather than on individual characteristics" (Littlejohn & Foss, 2008, p.43). Therefore, communication in this sense is an active exchange that influences – and is influenced by – the social and cultural environment. According to Craig (1999), the problem with communication in this tradition is that "conflicts, misunderstandings, and difficulties in coordination increase when social conditions afford a scarcity of shared rituals, rules, and expectations among members" (p.145). When culture is influenced by diversity, communication in this

sociocultural tradition becomes more challenging – perhaps requiring a changed communication practice amidst cultural diversity.

Furthermore, Denise (1999) references communication as how people understand one another through the broadest array of human interactions and experiences, and where the problems of communication generally lie with a *lack* of communication (rather than a lack of *listening*). In contrast, collaboration involves a more creative process, where something *new* emerges rather than a mere exchange of information. Interestingly, Denise (1999) observes: “If we use this rigor to define collaboration, we will use the word much less frequently to describe what we do” (p.3). As this research project aims to explore intercultural communication as a way of viewing, practicing and understanding the communication exchanges among different people, intercultural communication is regarded as a competency arena – potentially a set of competencies – that can ultimately underpin the achievement of collaborative planning processes.

The term ‘culture’ in the context of this research has been accorded a comparatively broad definition, beyond ethnicity, race, or country of origin. Culture in this context defines different distinctions within individuals as well as among collectives. Hofstede (2012) summarizes: “[Culture] is always a collective phenomenon, but it can be connected to different collectives. Within each collective there is a variety of individuals” (p.20). To integrate this definition of culture with the phenomena of communication, Jackson (2008) elaborates:

To talk about communication as a cultural practice, or of culture as unintelligible without recourse to the manner in which it must get communicated, is to demand a substantive engagement with the inescapable associations between those two constructs: *culture*, what is learned as opposed to hardwired, shared through verbal and non-verbal interaction, and passed along from generation to generation; *communication*, variously understood as the transmission of information, as mediations at the kernel of subjectivity and sociality, or as the intersubjective grounding for any and all claims to psychology or social reality. (*added emphasis*; p.665)

Therefore, the concepts are inherently interrelated, as others have also suggested (Craig, 1999; Shuter, 2008). The varied collectives that all people are affiliated with can be thought of as cultures with diverse communication needs: the literal embodiment of ‘intercultural’ communication.

Planning, as a professional practice, is essentially communicative. Witty (2002) elaborates on the planning profession in Canada:

Often [planners] are caught in the middle of debates over which we have little or no control. But others are calling us to assume a leadership role; a role that facilitates dialogues, stimulates debate, generates knowledge, offers alternatives and encourages collaboration. (p.5)

Planning values information, knowledge and action, but privileges their integration, ideally manifesting in the form of collaboration with a high level of “multiple publics” (Sandercock, 1998, p.197) participation. The ‘multiplicities’ in play are increasingly cultural in constitution, and the operative milieu for practice is becoming *intercultural*. The earlier confines of cultural homogeneity no longer pertain because diversity abounds and demands new practices, new capacities, new sensibilities, and new skills. *What does this mean for the profession of planning,*

for the education of planners, for the development of professionals in the increasingly diversifying and globalizing cities of Canada?

This research has also been approached as a personal self-development and professional learning opportunity for the researcher, mainly through exploring the professional practice of planners in Winnipeg. Winnipeg is a city seeking to embrace its diversity creatively through initiatives such as enhanced immigration, popular cultural events and festivals, and strategic directions of government policy and programming. The culture of city planning in Winnipeg is investigated through some of its practitioners who work at ‘bridging cultures’ via communication in their planning practice. Planners are considered potential agents of intercultural communication, dedicated to embracing diversity creatively and collaboratively.

The research explores a planning professionalism where practitioners work to support explicitly communicative approaches, through enhanced forms of communication, in hopes of truly collaborative action for collective benefit. The research engages particular Winnipeggers, formally educated in some form of urban/regional planning, who have experience working in a ‘planning-as-communication-bridging’ capacity. The research explores how their planning education has influenced their planning practice, gathered from experience working as communication bridges across diverse, broadly defined cultures. The terminology of ‘other-than-conventional’ planning has been used throughout to distinguish the unique communicative roles and organizations that particular

planners may find themselves in, which is different than the more conventional aspects of planning as fundamentally land-use and regulation. These planners are operating at the intersection of intercultural communication, city planning and diversity in Winnipeg – the core considerations of this research.

This research explores intercultural communication as a key competency for today's city planners in globalizing cities of diversity, with the Winnipeg setting providing the main context. The following lines of inquiry have been pursued: *How do we plan – in, for, and with – such hitherto unprecedented cultural diversity? How do we plan 'in-between' – in the interstices, amongst a multiplicity of cultures, inter-culturally? What worldview is needed to better 'welcome the world' to our cities? What capacities need to be developed, for commensurate notions of planning professionalism and a more global citizenship to evolve?*

This research suggests that the collaboration of multiple publics in this cultural milieu requires enhanced intercultural communication competencies that must be learned and cultivated through practice. It is hypothesized that by achieving an enhanced capacity and competency for intercultural communication, planners will be much better positioned to engage in more authentic collaborative processes that are more aligned with the emerging intercultural reality. Their city planning may evolve into intercultural city-making, where cities such as Winnipeg can truly 'welcome the world' into their midst.

1.2 Problem statement and research questions

The research takes place in a particular city context, Winnipeg, Manitoba: a city where culture is prized and celebrated through government directions on immigration, marketing of culture, and sponsored celebratory events and festivals. Winnipeg is at the centre of a multicultural Canada, where both city and nation are experiencing significant change due to a renewed burst of immigration with a host of ramifications. For instance, “In 2010, Canada welcomed 280,681 new permanent residents, an 11.3 per cent increase over 2009” (Manitoba, 2011, p.5). Of all immigrants to Canada in 2010, Manitoba was host to 5.6 per cent, compared to the provinces with larger urban centres: Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia and Alberta with 42.1, 19.2, 15.7, and 11.6 per cent respectively. Whereas only 2.7 per cent of immigrants were hosted in Saskatchewan, and less than a percentage point in all other provinces (Manitoba, 2011). More specifically, Winnipeg became home to over 12,200 immigrants in 2010, an increase from just over 9,900 in 2009 and about 8,000 in 2008. Comparatively, the country’s largest cities (Toronto, Montreal, Calgary, Mississauga and Vancouver) rank higher in the number of new permanent residents through the immigration process, ranging from over 13,000 to 32,000 in these cities in 2010 (Manitoba, 2011).

Furthermore, a recent national newspaper article reports that ninety-seven per cent of new Canadians, as well as long-time residents, agree that immigrants should accept and adopt Canadian values upon arrival into Canadian society (Chase, 2011). This has spurred debates about societal integration and Canada’s

multiculturalism policies: just because these policies exist, *is our social project called 'multiculturalism' really working? Is there more to multiculturalism than mere tolerance? Is more than multiculturalism called for? What are the implications for planning practice, especially in an ethnoculturally diverse city such as Winnipeg, with increasingly diversified communities, publics, and workforces? Anticipating the need for planning processes that are appropriately communicative and collaborative, how might the capacity for diversity be more creatively embraced and, in particular, operationalized in professional planning practices?* In this research, it is hypothesized that intercultural communication represents a particularly informative linking of planning theory and planning practice, to help planners bridge cultures, to better enable collaboration in what might be regarded as 'other-than-conventional' forms of professional planning practice.

According to Wood and Landry (2008), in their book *The Intercultural City*, urban cultural diversity is key for achieving innovation *economically*, through increased global awareness and flexibility, and *creatively*, through diverse perspectives. The authors identify this as the "diversity advantage" (2008, p.41) and propose that the diversity advantage can only be operationalized in intercultural cities: cities that value the capacity for cultural diversity and intercultural exchange, and that harness these conjunctions as a positive source of creativity and innovation for global city competitiveness.

As a city that celebrates its cultural diversity, in the centre of a multicultural Canada, *to what degree is Winnipeg an intercultural city that successfully operationalizes cultural diversity and thereby enhances its profile as a global urban centre?* It is hypothesized that Winnipeg city planners are potential enabling agents who contribute to Winnipeg's emergence as an intercultural city. *What then are the competencies and capacities that planners will need to learn and acquire, to fully realize an Intercultural Winnipeg?*

The key research questions informing the study are:

- *Intercultural: What is intercultural?* How do cities and citizens (and therefore, city planners) learn what it means to become intercultural? How must we (re)conceptualize 'culture' in order to become more intercultural? What are the key themes that Canadian city planning professionals can learn from the 'intercultural' literature? How might the concept be best mobilized in theoretical terms and made operable in practical terms?
- *Intercultural Communication: What is significant about intercultural communication?* How can planners learn, and therefore operationalize, key aspects of intercultural communication – in order to better engage diverse publics in planning processes, to ideally gain the 'diversity advantage', to help make Winnipeg an intercultural city? What are the opportunities and challenges of such practice?
- *Intercultural Collaboration and Planning: What are the implications for intercultural collaborative planning* as a field of professional practice, and

what might this entail – in terms of new competencies, capacities and sensibilities – for planners seeking to operationalize intercultural communication through more collaborative processes? What potential does the notion of *interculturalism* (rather than multiculturalism) merit as the necessary venue for authentic collaboration?

Throughout this research, “becoming intercultural” (Kim, 2001, p.193) is experimented with as a framework to potentially operationalize more collaborative planning through intercultural communication. This framework requires the re-conceptualization of conventional concepts around such terms as *cultural*, *diversity*, and *planning*, pursued through a targeted review of the literature. *How might these notions be usefully re-conceptualized in planning theory, to better inform an intercultural planning praxis for cities such as Winnipeg?*

1.3 Purpose and scope

This research takes the form of a practicum, where the problem statement is pursued via a literature review, and complemented by semi-structured interviews with a sample of Winnipeg planners involved in culture-bridging communicative planning practices. Preliminary research findings were tested and refined through a focus group inspired by the World Café technique. The World Café generates casual group conversations, and aims to bring different people and different opinions literally ‘to the table’, with the aim of a “culture of dialogue” (Schieffer, Isaacs & Gyllenpalm, 2004b, p.6). The World Café was also viewed as an

opportunity not only to present the preliminary research findings to practitioners, but also as a way to generate findings based on their collective experiences in the Winnipeg setting. The World Café method was also experimented with as a method for practitioners to engage in intercultural communication. Finally, through a report of the results, key themes are identified and recommendations made for further inquiry and planning practice.

1.4 Significance of research

This research attempts to fill a gap in the planning literature relating communication and collaboration with cultural diversity, through consulting planning professionals working in the globalizing Canadian city of Winnipeg. The research attempts to tease out a perceived evolutionary trajectory in the general field – from an early focus on a *de facto* monoculturalism, to more recent concerns with a *status quo* around multiculturalism, to an apparent emerging paradigm around interculturalism, as operative settings for approaching communication. It is hypothesized that ‘becoming intercultural’ is associated with a holistic stance, that can be learned and shared, through competencies and capacities, acquired by – and requiring – ongoing in-depth reflective practice, ideally with a global or world-centric worldview. As Abdallah-Preteille (2006) suggests, “The questioning of one’s identity in relation to others is an integral part of the intercultural approach” (p.476-477).

For planners within ever-diversifying Canadian cities, aiming ideally to be holistic, collaborative and inter-disciplinary, it becomes important to develop not only cross-cultural, multicultural and inter-disciplinary/inter-professional sensitivities, but also intercultural communication competencies. Integrating diversity in planning practices can be achieved through the learned capacity to communicate interculturally, in the hope of better collaborative processes, to help realize intercultural cities and the associated diversity advantage. This research builds on ideas around the “multiple-publics” (Sandercock, 1998, p.197) that now need to be better served, through uniting multiple perspectives in a more holistic manner, in order to operationalize an intercultural communication approach to diversity in planning. The practice of intercultural communication is envisaged as the medium for a praxis of collaborative planning, creatively embracing diversity in contexts such as Winnipeg at the present time.

The current Winnipeg context is also significant for statistical reasons. As of late, “migration has been the primary factor for the increase in Winnipeg’s population” (Winnipeg, 2012, p.2). The city has therefore been experiencing substantial demographic shifts in recent years influencing the cultural aspects of the city in general: in 2011, Winnipeg was host to over 13,000 immigrants and over 68,000 Aboriginal people in the region (Winnipeg, 2012). Winnipeg’s census metropolitan area (CMA) growth rate is low – 5.1 per cent in 2011 from 2006, compared to the average among all Canadian CMAs of 7.4 per cent (Statistics Canada, 2011). As a result, the city relies on increased immigration and in-

migration, and fewer people migrating from the city (Winnipeg, 2012). The age composition of Winnipeg residents is also changing, with different cultural groups now occupying certain cohorts. For example, in 2010, immigrants comprised a substantial portion of the workforce age group, with the average age of Winnipeg immigrants being 28 years, while the general population being slightly older at 37.7 years (Winnipeg, 2012). In comparison, the median age of Aboriginal Winnipeggers is even less, 25.7 years in the 2006 Census (United Way of Winnipeg, 2010). Winnipeg's Aboriginal population is also the largest and fastest growing of all Canadian cities at 10 per cent of the city's total population, compared to 9 per cent in Saskatoon, 2 per cent in Calgary, 1 per cent in Toronto and 0.5 per cent in Montreal (Winnipeg, 2012). With these statistics – evidencing only some types of diversity in culture and age – it is imperative that as Winnipeg continues to diversify in different ways, planners too need to diversify their sensibilities and capacities accordingly.

1.5 Assumptions and limitations

This research project is limited in time, scope and form, as it is a major degree project for partial fulfillment of the Master's degree requirement of the University of Manitoba's City Planning program.

The research is subjective: it was conducted in English and privileges an inherent North American perspective. However, major themes influencing this research were the critical awareness of individual subjectivity and the realization

that culture does not connote group homogeneity. Privileged participation and discourse also have the potential to create imbalances of power in this type of research. Healey (2006) mentions how communicative and collaborative planning may create power inequalities through discourse: “Our problem is that some discourses have come to dominate our public arenas. This leads to cultural domination rather than inter-cultural communication” (p.67). Tsuda (2008) also alludes to the dominance of English as the main and foremost language of international communication; it can be interpreted by some as a hegemonic structure of colonialism forced upon non-English speakers. If we are hoping to move beyond postmodernist paradigms in urban planning, this global positioning of English as a dominant and colonial language must be acknowledged. In the Canadian context however, English is broadly accepted as a common language; nonetheless, the critique has to be acknowledged and included in any effort to transcend this limitation.

Furthermore, the sampling of research participants was not random; they were intentionally selected through snowball sampling (Morgan, 2008) to achieve a specific data set comprising individuals with experience in the topics under investigation. One aim has been to discover how practitioners with a planning education have come to practise in culture-bridging planning realms, practicing intercultural communication on a daily basis, potentially without labeling it as such. This intentional sampling of participants is acknowledged as a possible limitation of the research, in terms of more widespread application of results.

This is not a linguistics or communications project focused on specific elements of language; there is already extensive research on language, inter-ethnic communication and cross-cultural communication. This research explores the specific capacity for planners to learn, accept and work within the paradigm of interculturalism, while practicing intercultural communication in planning, in pursuit of more authentic collaboration that embraces diversity. The purpose here is to engage a broader definition of culture, in hopes of learning about and operationalizing intercultural communication competencies in planning practitioners, to facilitate better collaboration, to positively embrace diversity in Winnipeg.

1.6 Outline of chapters

This first chapter has provided an introduction, the context, the limitations, and the framework of the research. Chapter Two outlines the methodology of the research. Chapter Three reports on the outcome of the first research method, the literature review. Chapter Four details the rationale of the Winnipeg context for the research. The fifth chapter outlines the results of the two empirical research methods pursued: semi-structured interviews and a World Café-inspired focus group. Chapter Six concludes the research with a synthesis of findings and offers recommendations for future research and planning practice. Supplemental information is available in the Appendices, such as a research summary which was distributed to participants, guidelines for interview and focus group questioning, and a sample voluntary consent form.

Chapter 2: Methodology

This research has been approached as an exploratory study (Gray, 2009) featuring an appreciative and critical review of literature, combined with empirical research gathered from interviews with a sample of practitioners, as well as a focus group session.

2.1 Literature review

The literature review has been a critical first step for this research project: it has helped identify key theories, themes, and voids relating to the proposed topic, and has indicated the path that research in this field has taken to the present time (Gray, 2009). As a research method, a literature review allows the researcher to build on previous studies, to enable the development of a framework of key themes and important lessons. Montuori (2005) also states that a literature review showcases “the motivations, the questions, and the passions” of the researcher (p.376), and “can be an opportunity for creative inquiry” (p.390). ‘Literature’ in the context of this study includes peer-reviewed academic literature, ‘gray’ literature in the form of reports and newspaper articles, documents and plans, and select ‘popular’ literature in the form of books on contemporary urban issues.

The literature review identifies competing notions of ‘culture’ in relation to planning theory. ‘Modern’ notions of a homogenous monoculturalism have shifted to more postmodern ideas about multiculturalism, and are now moving towards a potential interculturalism. The ‘Intercultural City’ concept is further

articulated to help inform the operational/action side of the research. By delving into the intercultural literature, the research helps inform current planning literature. Currently, theorists of the communicative and collaborative turn in urban planning mention, but do not define, *intercultural* in theory/paradigm terms, nor do they elaborate upon intercultural communication as a necessary capacity, meriting more conscious operationalization in planning practice.

There is also limited literature regarding interculturalism in the Canadian planning context: much of the potentially relevant literature comes from elsewhere. This is interesting because, as a nation, Canada might be expected to be at the forefront of such socio-cultural innovation. However, the different contexts from country to country are not inconsequential.

2.2 Sampling

Research participants were selected through a snowball sampling method, where the researcher identified key participants who then recommended others (Gray, 2009). Snowball sampling was used to solicit participants who, in the opinion of the researcher and advisory committee, have comparatively unique experiences with likewise roles in particularly exceptional organizations. In this case, the participants were identified as mainly practising outside the so-called planning ‘mainstream’ of land-use regulation, being engaged in what was initially thought of as ‘unconventional’ forms of planning. As the research progressed, the ‘unconventional’ characterization appeared to merit reframing as ‘other-than-

conventional’. The latter became the preferred framing later in the research; however, the two terms might best be regarded here as interchangeable. As snowball sampling is useful in identifying research participants in populations where lists and databases of potential participants do not formally exist (Morgan, 2008), this methodology was fitting for engaging ‘other-than-conventional’ planners in Winnipeg. The sampling is not intended to suggest that intercultural communication is not practiced in mainstream/conventional arenas such as land-use planning, regulation and development. The sampling and terminology used here aims to reflect the particularly unique and unconventional planning roles and organizations that the participating planners have found themselves in. The sampling method was successful, possibly because the requested participants had a keen interest in sharing their experiences regarding the topics under investigation.

There were two constant variables amongst participants:

- 1) a formal university planning (urban or regional) education, and
- 2) unique (and potentially unconventional) communicative planning work experience in Winnipeg (in the opinion of the researcher and Committee).

These planners were pursued because of their known unique experiences working as planners in an unconventional planning setting in Winnipeg, as well as their eagerness to share their different planning practice to broaden the definition of ‘planning’ in Winnipeg.

All participants were approached via email and requested to take part voluntarily in this study. A research summary (Appendix I) was provided at the outset of the request for participation. All participants granted informed voluntary consent by signing University of Manitoba approved ethics consent forms (Appendix IV). Participants were not reimbursed for their participation in the study. Participants were able to comment on the research findings. Those who provided feedback were pleased with the research and did not request major changes to the written part of the research.

2.3 Storytelling as a research method

All interviews commenced by having the interviewee tell the story of how they entered the planning profession and their current line of other-than-conventional planning practice. The interviewees were asked to share practice stories and experiences. As a methodology, storytelling was not intended to be the primary avenue: however, the open and conversational nature of the research allowed for many stories to be shared. In planning theory, there is a well-developed body of literature about ‘planning as storytelling’.

The communicative turn in planning theory allowed for storytelling to surface as planning moved away from a focus on “rational systematic analysis” (Healey, 2006, p.29). Leonie Sandercock (2003) indicates: “a better understanding of the work that story does, or can do, and how it does it, could produce more persuasive plans and policy documents” (p.204). Sandercock (2003) says that we

should stop pretending that there is any such thing as an objective answer to any public policy issue; we should acknowledge that all available answers are informed by subjective values. Storytelling in planning, therefore, must be used carefully as a communicative tool – as both Throgmorton (2003) and Sandercock (2003) suggest. However, Sandercock (2003) clarifies that judgments about relevant facts are just that – judgments based on value-informed notions of what is important, what matters, what is in the public interest:

There are no pure facts – there is always an author who is choosing which facts are relevant, what to describe, what to count, and in the assembling of these facts a story is shaped, an interpretation, either consciously or unconsciously, emerges. (p.197)

Critical judgment will always be necessary in deciding what importance to give to different stories, as well as what stories are appropriate in what circumstances (Sandercock, 2003). Planners will have to develop a new kind of (at least) ‘multicultural literacy’, requiring familiarity with the multiple histories of urban communities (Throgmorton, 2003, p.141). The research presented here may indicate the additional need for an even more developed ‘intercultural literacy’. Storytelling has informed this research, and therefore poses another element of awareness to consider in terms of subjectivity of analysis and interpretation.

2.4 Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews comprised the first component of primary data collected for this study. As semi-structured interviews allow for diversion within the conversation (Gray, 2009), it was felt that this would be a good way to explore

the perspectives of the planning practitioners regarding the topic. The interviews were conducted in October 2012. Each interview was conducted at a convenient time and place proposed by each interviewee. Each interview was approximately forty-five to sixty minutes in length. All interviews were voice recorded and transcribed.

Participants for the interviews were planners working in other-than-conventional planning practice, defined here as working outside of roles and organizations exclusively dedicated to land use planning and its regulation. These participants were selected as key informants because their planning practice was perceived as engaging with some aspect of intercultural communication and collaborative efforts. These planners were also selected because their planning disposition is in a mainly communicative role, often working to bridge cultures in innovative ways. These planners can also be considered as working in the interstices of the conventional planning structure within Winnipeg. For example, these planning roles include arm's-length government organizations, non-profit community service organizations, organizations whose main roles are advocacy and research, as well as private consultants who work in capacity-building roles. In all of these types of organizations there are planners working in a mainly communicative capacity, working to bridge diverse cultures, with the aim of collaboration.

The semi-structured interviews with the seven planners were pursued with the intention of gaining insight into their perspectives on planning in a culturally diverse city such as Winnipeg. Inquiries were conducted into:

1. How they found themselves formally pursuing a planning education;
2. What their perspective was regarding communication amidst cultural diversity;
3. How they felt about planning practices in Winnipeg; and
4. What they thought of the concept of interculturalism as an outlook and reference point on current planning practice in Winnipeg.

Ultimately, the semi-structured interviews were conducted to gain personal perspectives of planners in other-than-conventional practice in Winnipeg, in terms of how they felt about planning, communication and diversity, and how this might relate to the concept of interculturalism.

2.5 World Café-inspired focus group

The second component of data collection for this research involved a World Café-inspired focus group conversation session. The World Café is a method inspired by bringing different people and opinions to the table in small conversation groups of open dialogue. Firstly, the focus group methodology was pursued because group dynamics and a collaborative approach reflected the purposes of the research. Focus groups present the potential to, “bring professionals together to

discuss their common interests [and] similarly provide opportunities for storytelling previously overlooked in the literature” (Grant, 2011, p.408). Also, gathering planners to discuss intercultural communication amidst diversity in Winnipeg was considered to potentially help begin a useful conversation on different and other-than-conventional planning processes. The World Café methodology was adopted because of its casual and user-friendly nature aimed at “creating meaningful and cooperative dialogue” (Schieffer et al., 2004a, p.2). Since an aim of the research was to explore intercultural communication, this methodology was considered fitting.

Focus groups are a qualitative research method that allows participants to express their opinions on a topic in a casual group setting. Participants generally have something in common so that they are comfortable in a group setting: “An informal, supportive group of people with similar backgrounds can often put people at ease, and encourage them to express their views freely and frankly” (Khan, Anker, Patel, Barge, Sadhwani & Kohle, 1991, para.16). Khan et al. (1991) also suggest that focus groups can be used as both an “idea-generation” tool as well as a “primary data-collection method” (para.39) – both of which were attempted in this research.

Focus groups generally include the facilitation of a moderator (Khan et al., 1991; Acocella, 2012). Neither the researcher nor her colleague who organized each discussion table were trained in facilitation. This was deemed acceptable since an intention of the research was to pursue the open opinions of the

participating planners. The World Café methodology references a ‘host’ of the conversation rather than a facilitator or moderator. This terminology is more fitting for the role of the researcher.

The World Café style was an important part of the research:

- a) To create a deeper awareness among planning professionals that there are many planners working in diverse and other-than-conventional roles in Winnipeg;
- b) To present the research topic to members of the planning profession, for reflection on their practice of culture-bridging communication; and
- c) To hopefully mobilize dialogue amongst planners to influence a more intercultural planning praxis.

The ideology and philosophy of the World Café research method closely aligns with the practicum focus on intercultural communication for better collaboration, in the context of a planning practice that may enable an embrace of diversity. The World Café method recognizes the following:

...The way human beings talk with one another and engage in conversations often leads neither to a better understanding nor to improved cooperation. Rather it can cause misunderstandings and even conflict. Acknowledging this unfortunate human tendency, the pioneers of the World Café chose to closely examine our capacity to talk and listen to each other in conversation. (Schieffer et al., 2004a, p.2-3)

As planners often find themselves in positions of culture-bridging communication, this methodology allows for dialogue to take place and enables the *listening*

component. This process can lead to a professional “culture of dialogue” (Scheiffer et al., 2004b, p.6), which was sought through the research. This event had the potential to increase awareness in planners about interculturalism, and to foster learning about intercultural communication in planning practice.

Invited participants for the World Café-inspired focus group had similar backgrounds as those for the semi-structured interviews: a formal planning education and experience working in an unconventional planning setting. Fifteen Winnipeg planners were approached and eight participated in the focus group. Three of the eight focus group participants were also interviewees, as all of the interviewees were invited to participate in the focus group to discuss the topics in a group setting as well. The remaining five planners worked in a variety of sectors and represented a diverse range of professional planning practice in Winnipeg. Invitations were sent via email by the researcher directly to the invitees no less than twelve days prior to the event. The session was held in a central and neutral Winnipeg location in a meeting room at the end of a workday in November 2012. Two tables were set up in the room with four participants at each table. The participants sat voluntarily at the table of their choice. The researcher hosted one table, and a planning colleague hosted the discussion and took notes at the other table. All participants introduced themselves at the beginning of the session.

Each table was asked two broad and reflective questions to begin the conversation. The first question was discussed for a total of 20 minutes, then participants switched groups to mix up the dynamic of each table. The second

question was then presented and discussed for another 20 minutes. The session casually concluded with group conversation.

The aim of the focus group was to gather planners with unique experiences in the Winnipeg context and create a space for them to share their stories about working with diverse groups in planning processes. The intent was for the participants to openly share their experiences and insights on working amidst cultural diversity in Winnipeg, and for the researcher to candidly gain insights into their perspectives on planning processes in Winnipeg. This was also an opportunity for planners in other-than-conventional practice to share their unique – and sometimes unrecognized – contributions to the planning profession, as not all of the planners knew each other from other contexts.

With these three research methods – targeted literature review, semi-structured key informant interviews, and a World Café focus group – triangulation of data collection and analysis was achieved.

2.6 Analysis – Reading the data

All semi-structured interviews as well as the focus group session were voice recorded and transcribed. Each interview was then reviewed and coded by an open coding method to identify key themes presented in each interview. Saldana (2013) states that:

Qualitative codes are essence-capturing and essential elements of the research story that, when clustered together according to similarity and

regularity (a pattern), they actively facilitate the development of categories and thus analysis of their connections. (p.8)

As coding “is primarily an interpretive act” (Saldana, 2013, p.4), these patterns were then collated and sorted through again, so that some of the more frequent themes could be synthesized into broader topics for discussion. Likewise, the focus group session was coded for key themes and relevant key points. Once the data was gathered and organized, the key themes were then analyzed relative to the research questions. “Descriptive Coding to document and categorize the breadth of opinions stated by multiple participants” (Saldana, 2013, p.7) was pursued, and a more detailed description of the different opinions elaborated thereafter. The analysis addressed the various perspectives of the Winnipeg planning practitioners in their work to bridge cultural diversity in their professional practice.

2.7 Methodology limitations

The qualitative research methods chosen to support this research are not without limitations. Firstly, Montuori (2005) comments that a literature review is “always relative to what is available for us to read in the languages we have mastered” (p.382). Thus, the research and researcher are limited to resources that are available and understandable, yet might not be the full range of information available on the subject matter. Secondly, the snowball sampling methodology can be seen as a limitation because participants were chosen based on their interest and support for the research topic. However, because the research topic is oriented to learning about planners’ perceptions of working amidst diversity in Winnipeg,

the researcher felt that it was important to choose participants who would be open to reflection on unconventional planning subject matter. Furthermore, Acocella (2012) states that in order for a focus group to obtain “relevant information ... it is important that the people involved are interested in the topic” (p.1127).

Due to the breadth of the research topic, and the nature of semi-structured interviews and focus groups, sometimes participants became unfocused and off topic. This was not much of an issue in the interviews, potentially because of the ability of the researcher to structure the discussion if it went off topic. However, the second question period of the focus group became unfocused in one of the groups. This was interesting, especially when listening again to the recording. It can be concluded that the World Café inspiration of open discussion and reflective conversation is potentially not as successful with all audiences if a facilitator is not involved. Perhaps the combination of people needs to be more carefully planned if the methodology is to serve a research and information gathering purpose rather than just an open conversation. In these circumstances, the importance of a trained facilitator may be the crucial element specific for data collection. However, the methodology proved to be welcoming and conducive for open intercultural communication, and would be beneficial for further use and refinement in planning practice.

Focus groups more generally have a variety of limitations in relation to data collection. Research has indicated that, “a group setting is not always ideal for encouraging free expression” (Khan et al., 1991, para.18). Also, the

probability of introducing subjectivity, bias and error into the data is high. However, this was not a major concern of the researcher because the entire project is highly subjective regarding each participant's perspectives on the topic, and furthermore, the subjectivity of the researcher conducting the analysis. The nature of this study was not to be a purely objective piece of research. The literature also indicates that focus group "samples are small and purposively selected and therefore do not allow generalization to larger populations" (Khan et al., 1991, para.20). This applies to this research and is an expected consequence of the methodology. Due to the unconventional nature of the research subject area, a small and selected group of planners contributed their thoughts and stories on the topic to ensure a focus for the research.

Chapter 3: Literature Review

A review of relevant literature was conducted to help elaborate the rationale for the investigation, and frame the research questions and related research methods.

3.1 Introduction

Several urban theorists have outlined the importance of diversity in the city setting, acknowledging that new ideas emerge from the opportunities of working together – the co-labouring – of different people (see, for example: Jacobs, 1961; Sandercock, 1998, 2003; Florida, 2005; Landry, 2000; Wood & Landry, 2008).

As cities form the main stage for encounters with diversity, it is crucial to understand the dynamics of these interactions – the scripts – as well as the *actors* that help mobilize the plot: in this case, specifically those educated as planners working for ‘the public good’. However, the cultural complexity of city contexts in this unprecedented global day-and-age is intricate and vast, as van Leeuwen (2010) elaborates:

A minimal definition of the modern [i.e. contemporary] city describes it as a complex society of which the geographic area is very small in proportion to the number of inhabitants. This dense population is characterized by intense heterogeneity that stems from migrations to the city of very diverse social groups: ethnic, cultural, artistic, professional, intranational, and international groups. In the city we therefore find a high level of cultural complexity and subcultural variety within a relatively limited space.
(p.633)

Furthermore, the complexities for planners working amidst diversity represents challenging terrain; indeed “while the profession acknowledges that the increasing

diversity of human populations is a challenge for urban planning, it has yet to come to terms with what this implies in terms of attitudes, values, knowledge, and the skills needed by planners” (Rahder & Milgrom, 2004, p.33). It is the exploration of such ‘attitudes, values, knowledge, and skills’ that is of concern here, in pursuit of a better understanding of how planners can truly be city-making professionals in this global day-and-age.

In the Canadian context, a country with a history of colonialism, comprised of indigenous peoples, early settlers from Britain and Western Europe, and immigrants from every corner of the world, Canadian multiculturalism policies have both supporters and critics. The latter argue that multiculturalism emphasizes difference, discrimination, homogenization of ethnic groups, and a mere tolerance for diversity in the public sphere (Berry, 1991; Qadeer, 1997; Chan, 2003). Supporters believe that multiculturalism as public policy has proven to be beneficial, engendering relatively peaceful interactions amongst diverse peoples. Recent research compiled in Will Kymlicka’s report on Canadian multiculturalism suggests that:

- a) the ways in which integration of immigrants is practised in Canada are more successful than in other countries; and,
 - b) “multiculturalism policy plays a positive role in this process.”
- (Canada, 2010, p.7)

The author also discusses the need for “post-multicultural approaches in an era of ‘hyper-diversity’” (Canada, 2010, p.24). The present research project seeks to

bring together the supporters and critics of Canadian multiculturalism with a perspective that attempts to re-evaluate the ways by which we ‘practice’ integration, that acknowledges that there is an in-between, and potentially uncomfortable space that is created, namely, the *intercultural*.

Integration, as it refers to immigrants in the Canadian context, is broadly defined. Kymlicka defines the dimensions of integration as social, political and economic (Canada, 2010, p.7). *However, is there more to positive cultural diversity in Canadian city settings?* This research explores the possibility that there may be other critical interactions associated with cultural diversity in urban settings, especially how we collectively live and work amidst our cultural differences. In such a culturally diverse nation, Ghorayshi (2010) notes:

Integration only works when Canada both recognizes differences and extends complete equality to various ethnic groups. Celebrating diversity, but ignoring inequality, inevitably leads to the danger of entrenched segregation. (p.97)

Integration can sometimes connote conformity; it may feel close to assimilation or homogenization. However, integration can also be perceived in a way that equally values the differences involved. An approach to cultural diversity attempting to operationalize interculturalism may be viewed in terms of the creation of a “metaphorical space” (Fraser & Schalley, 2009, p.153), in which something new is created in-between cultures, beyond multiculturalism, where one can recognize that culture is embodied at many levels of being at any particular time. This interculturalism is thought to foster innovation in cities (Wood &

Landry, 2008) and is therefore beneficial for competitive, attractive, growing, and diverse cities.

This research considers the need to integrate the positive and negative aspects of Canadian multiculturalism through a positive engagement of interculturalism. It anticipates that planners can become agents of interculturalism, by developing intercultural competence through practising intercultural communication, in service of better collaborative processes to effectively harness the ‘diversity advantage’.

In hopes of more fully understanding the concepts of multiculturalism and interculturalism, the research explores the common root, *culture*, as it may be conceptualized in urban theory and planning practice. The resulting re-conceptualization leads from *monoculturalism*, through *multiculturalism*, to the context of *interculturalism*, and to pointers for the practice of intercultural communication by planners in diverse city settings. Aspects of collaboration are also explored, in hopes of elaborating the practice of intercultural communication amidst diversity, via collaborative planning processes.

3.2 Conceptualizing culture and communication: An evolutionary trajectory through urban theory and planning practice

3.2.1 Monoculturalism and the modern city

The terminology around ‘culture’ is broad and a concise generally accepted definition may be impossible. In colloquial speech, the term tends to be paired as

‘arts and culture,’ referring to displays of ethnic or national visual arts, or ‘high’ culture arenas such as the symphony, the ballet or museums. This notion of ‘arts and culture’ is also sometimes generated from peoples’ ethnic culture, and the displays of ethnic art in the form of paintings, dance, artifacts, etc. The assumption that ‘culture’ connotes a seemingly rational and homogeneous set of peoples’ artifacts and rituals can be considered to reflect a ‘monocultural’ bias.

In the city setting and within urban planning theory, the conventional planning of the modern city can be argued to reflect a monocultural ideology. Sandercock (1998) outlines the rational perspective of modern city planning’s “heroic model” in the form of five pillars: “rationality; comprehensiveness; scientific method; faith in state directed futures; and faith in planners’ ability to know what is good for people” (p.62). Modern rational planning was concerned with uniformity and order: “Urban planning within the context of modernity was inclined to treat buildings and developments as isolated and unrelated parts of the overall urban ecosystem” (Irving, 1993, p.479). Regulatory practices such as zoning even bred racialization and ghettoization in cities (Ross & Leigh, 2000). The similarity of viewpoints on culture and the city in the modern sense reflects a valuing of strict conformity and order: a ‘one size fits all’ view of planning. Planning practices were rationally implemented, suggesting that little was thought of public consultation and community participation. It can be conjectured that advocacy and participatory-type planning practices attempted to remedy some of the inequalities of rational urban planning practices (Irving, 1993, p.479).

3.2.2 *Ethnocultural multiculturalism in the postmodern city*

Partly with a view to changing the discourse around racism and stereotyping amongst different national and ethnic cultural groups, the term ‘ethnoculture’ has been deployed to reflect one’s culture in relation to ethnicity or national ancestry. It is often used in conjunction with the cultural ideologies and practices surrounding complex social structures of gender, institutions, language, religion and symbols; thus, the combination of ethnicity (ancestry) and culture (customs) (Paniagua & Taylor, 2008). While the term ethnoculture attempts to be inclusive of all factors that affect the make-up of a person, it can be argued that this term is still very focused on differences in ethnicity, and in the more traditional notions of cultural customs, in a multicultural realm of tolerance for diversity. Abdallah-Preteille (2006) suggests, “To think of cultural diversity in terms of categories and characteristics justifies the development of recruitment policies that are based on ethnicity” (2006, p.476). This alludes to a criticism of multiculturalism policies.

Canadian multiculturalism was enacted in response to the growing ethnocultural diversity of its population with a “lack of a unifying identity” (Achugbue, 2005, p.10), to help legislate tolerance, appropriate cultural rights and national identity. However, Canadian cities are now experiencing ethnocultural diversity like never before: “In 2011, 13 different ethnic origins had surpassed the 1-million mark” in Canada, where the national population reported over 200 ethnic origins (Statistics Canada, 2013a, p.4). The changing demographics in Canada are

evident and widely publicized, and the nation is now seeing the results of this changing Canada in all aspects of public life, urban planning included. John Lorinc's (2006) *The New City: How the crisis in Canada's urban centres is reshaping the nation*, is a masterful analysis of the changing face of Canadian cities. The author addresses our 'Canadian multiculturalism project': "The ubiquitous ethno-cultural diversity that... represents a daring social experiment in urban globalism that's being watched by countries around the world" (Lorinc, 2006, p.19). As Canada was the first country to nationally legislate multiculturalism, the Canadian setting seems to be a fitting place to study the long-term effects of such policy. Multiculturalism in Canada is also unique because it is incorporated and implemented at several different levels of government (Achugbue, 2005). As mentioned previously, support for public policy legislating and enabling multiculturalism has proven to be crucial for any successes associated with the social, political and economic integration of immigrants in Canada.

Multiculturalism as a policy and practice has also been critiqued for various reasons: it mainly serves the needs of immigrants; uniformity within national, ethnic, and religious groups is assumed; it can be thought by some as "just another side of racism" (Chan, 2003, p.99) and marginalization (Wood & Gilbert, 2005); mere tolerance of diversity "as a reaction to assimilation" (Chan, 2003, p.92) is all that seems necessary; while new expectations and new values that influence what is inherently 'cultural' are ignored, such as new experiences of

national democracy, modernity and feminism (Chan, 2003); and equal rights are not ensured (Berry, 1991; Qadeer, 1997). A multicultural city “has an aura of post-modernism” (Qadeer, 1997, p.493) in that we are attempting to understand one another, and embrace diversity in cities: “Postmodernist thought favours (‘privileges’) heterogeneity and difference, fragmentation and indeterminacy, and holds all universal or ‘totalizing’ discourses in utter contempt” (Irving, 1993, p.481).

Some critiques of multiculturalism push past conventional viewpoints:

Multiculturalism’s insistence on heritage and the past does not square well with a more progressive social theory of self, identity, and culture that is cognizant of the psychological duality of human beings, who look backward and forward, are committed to preserving the past and exploring the future, want to be part of the public culture and to be private and autonomous, wish to feel a sense of belonging and of individual uniqueness. (Chan, 2003, p.92-92)

Therefore, it appears we are being summoned to acknowledge a deeper meaning of ‘culture’, internally and collectively, and change the ways we relate to each other in cities. Ghorayshi (2010) elaborates:

In Canad[ian] multiculturalism, by emphasizing the unique characteristics of different cultures, has fostered separate cultural identities, each with their own art centres, places of worship, communities, and social clubs and so on. This is cause for celebration, but it is problematic, if it has not created cohesion, intercultural knowledge and intercultural connectedness. (p.97)

This is a call to move beyond multiculturalism, to recognize we are more complex cultured beings in a heterogeneous society context.

The role of multiculturalism in the city, with a focus on tolerance of immigrants’ ethnocultural makeup, is seen more as a diversity-managing, rather

than diversity-embracing, policy mechanism. It is proving to be limited in enabling the desired collaboration of a multi-faceted citizenry, negotiating a culture of diversity. Burayidi (2003) suggests that if planning processes are to be relevant with regard to multiculturalism, planners must challenge the conventional ways of 'doing planning' by reconsidering how differing notions of culture – including planning culture – relate to the surrounding environment. There is a call for educational and professional development of planners (Burayidi, 2003), and for more comprehensive cultural sensitivities and capacities (Afshar, 2001), especially to engage in more successful collaborative planning processes in multicultural cities.

In this social project of multiculturalism, how we communicate is critical. Irving (1993) suggests that advocacy and improved communication in planning was a reaction to modern methods of rationality in the urban setting:

Advocacy Planning and participatory models of planning emerged in the 1960s to counter these traditional elitist and technocratic approaches to urban planning, and they enjoyed some modest success in the 1960s and early 1970s. (p.479)

Therefore, along with a postmodern focus on heterogeneity and discourse in the multicultural city, there were improved attempts to include communication in planning processes. There is now a requirement for a competency of inclusion, an “ethnocultural empathy” (Brouwer & Boros, 2010, p.244), as well as a capacity for multiple-perspective-taking that is key to enabling true collaboration, a truer working together, and creating something new of this complex citizenry. It is proposed that new discourse is necessary to truly be inclusive of other types of

diversity – personally, collectively and professionally – along with further notions of ‘culture’. Lorinc (2006) alludes to the arising of new forms of citizenship and new kinds of communication in the current context:

Immigrants, of course, arrive with their languages, their customs, and, often, their wounds and animosities. But the vast majority also arrive with skills and a fresh perspective, and, crucially, the desire to be here. Then, having settled in fast-growing cities with very little by way of history or immutable tradition, Canada’s older and newer immigrants, and their children, are together confronted with the immense task of forging not just a collective vision of urban citizenship but also a shared language with which to describe it. (p.20)

In thinking about how to operationalize a more collective vision in diverse Canadian urban centres, Ghorayshi (2010) suggests:

We need a new vision that begins to transcend and bridge the separations that divide us, and that enables us to learn about each other and work on an inclusive, shared agenda. (p.99)

3.2.3 *Interculturalism in the post-postmodern city?*

With the critiques of multiculturalism, there has been movement toward theorizing beyond multiculturalism’s public tolerance of ethnocultural diversity. Current social and political issues in this globalizing context are better regarded as “wicked problems” (Rittel & Webber, 1973) without rational or regimented solutions; “requir[ing] a more sophisticated vision of how different spheres of interests are connected nationally, regionally and globally” (Weiming, 2008, p.330).

Therefore, we need a *cultural shift* in our globalizing urban centres: “The business-as-usual ways of doing things are fast losing their relevance, as culture in its ‘pure’ form has become more a nostalgic concept than a reality” (Kim, 2008, p.359). When diverse publics interact and co-labour, there is a necessary space

that must be created. This is the intercultural, where people can find the capacity to meet in the middle, and create something new amidst their differences.

According to Kim (2008), an “intercultural identity” (p.364) is where we are challenged to see beyond culture as ethnicity and, therefore, beyond multiculturalism: “*Intercultural personhood* [is] a constructive way of being a member of our increasingly integrated communities, both local and global” (original emphasis; p. 360). Kim (2001) observes that gaining the capacity to learn to become intercultural will enable more in the way of cooperation and the potential for more innovative co-labouring.

Kim (2008) states that becoming intercultural is an exercise in personal growth and awareness: “The term *intercultural* is employed here to reflect the boundary-crossing nature of such development in identity” (Kim, 2001, p.65). It is partly through attempts to mobilize Kim’s theories of *becoming intercultural* in the context of professional planning practice – to make the theories operational – that the perceptions and work of other-than-conventional planners and their intercultural communication is explored.

Intercultural personhood is a theory of humanity: “Just as cultural identity links a person to a specific culture, intercultural identity links a person to more than one culture and, ultimately, to humanity itself” (p.191-192); “...becoming intercultural [is] gradual ... so as to attain a greater perspective on the more inclusive whole” (Kim, 2001, p.193). To operationalize intercultural aspects in city life alludes to a world-centric perspective for global citizenship and human

rights: “Such a global mind-set can result only from competent communication among peoples from diverse cultures” (Chen & Starosta, 2008, p.215).

The challenge for developing an intercultural competence and capacity is that it is reflective of a distinct value system, one in which an individual has the willingness to acknowledge difference as well as conflict. Becoming intercultural is a process of “self-reinvention” (Kim, 2001, p.70); one’s value system must allow for personal growth and change in order to embrace interculturalism as a form of transcending and including different types of diversity. Moreover, interculturalism is a *process* (Wood, Landry & Bloomfield, 2006) that occurs within the collective. This should be a goal in the global city setting for citizens and for those working with and for diverse publics – i.e. urban planners. As the roots of planning are communicative in practice (Innes, 1998), with ideal processes leading to collaboration, planners learning and practising intercultural communication could potentially lead enhanced processes, and ultimately interculturalism in practice, which may realize the potential ‘diversity advantage’ of intercultural cities.

3.3 Intercultural city-making: Where does planning fit, and what roles do planners play?

As interculturalism is a collectively learned capacity for integrating one’s own cultural perspectives with those of others, and ranges beyond mere multiculturalism in the city setting, what exactly *is* an Intercultural City, and what role do planners play in the making of such cities? Wood et al. (2006) argue for:

A diversity advantage for cities, which can be achieved through *intercultural exchange and innovation*. To unlock this advantage will require new skills and aptitudes on the part of professionals, such as *cultural literacy and competence*. (original emphasis, p.viii)

This echoes recommendations for better cross-cultural training for planners through their education (Afshar, 2001; Burayidi, 2003), as well as Sandercock's (1998) recommendation for "literacies" (p.225). The authors further comment on the required 'literacy' of planners for an intercultural reality:

'The intercultural city' will be one in which cultural literacy is widespread so people can understand and empathise with another's view of the world. This may be an ideal concept, but the road towards it begins with the agents and the processes that make our cities. If city institutions, policy makers, planners and professional practitioners could begin to re-conceive their role 'through an intercultural lens', the ideal could become a reality. (Wood et al., 2006, p.21)

Therefore, it is a skill-set in planners, a "process called intercultural competence" (Wood et al., 2006, p.65) that must be operationalized through planning practices to enable interculturalism, for a potential Intercultural City which positively embraces the advantages of diversity.

How would an 'Intercultural Planner' perceive diversity and culture in an Intercultural City? Wood and Landry (2008) elaborate:

Culture is the sum of those things that define us as individuals and as members of our group and, therefore, that which distinguishes us from others. Alternatively, to think and behave with cultural awareness is to establish a means of understanding and interacting with others that may transcend perceived barriers. We may never fully know what it means to be someone other than ourselves, but if we can understand what factors and influences have made them see the world in the way they do, and we can also reflect upon how our own personal and group behaviours have been formed, we have the basis of a form of empathy upon which relationships can be built. (p. 39-40)

This coincides with what Kim (2001) and Abdallah-Preteille (2006) suggested earlier: becoming intercultural requires self-development. In this case, it is not only the planners' themselves, but also the professional planning culture that must develop, in order to transcend conventional perceptions of culture and diversity in the city, and work toward an intercultural identity. Likewise, if planners can be agents of intercultural identity-building, the diverse citizenry may be affected also. It is important to note that, "the intercultural challenge is that both sides need to adapt ... Often, though, it is assumed that the outsider assimilates as the host essentially wants to stay the same" (Wood & Landry, 2008, p.49). As previously outlined, we can no longer continue going about our 'business-as-usual' ways of doing things. Since Canadian cities are constantly diversifying, we need to find new practices for our citizenry.

Wood and Landry (2008) wrote *The Intercultural City* in the European context, where there is not the same history of immigration and multiculturalism as is seen in Canada, which is an important distinction. In the Canadian city context, planning theorist Leonie Sandercock (2004) has attempted to re-conceptualize and re-theorize multiculturalism in the direction of interculturalism. She has suggested eight bases for a theory of interculturalism:

- (1) Humans are cultural beings: we cannot escape nor avoid the socially constructed cultural world which we each shape and are shaped by.
- (2) Culture is dynamic: we each negotiate our place within the complexities of the cultures we embody.

- (3) If cities are to embrace cultural diversity, we each must learn and grow with a positive outlook, and communicate interculturally.
- (4) Interculturalism includes the practice of political rights to difference and the city.
- (5) Difference, as a right of interculturalism, requires constant renegotiation.
- (6) This constant renegotiation requires an involved citizenry and political system.
- (7) Interculturalism does not ignore social phenomena such as ethnicity, race and religion, but rather implies a collective culture of a politically empowered citizenry.
- (8) Inequality of power, politics and economics must be addressed in order to find a collective identity to reduce intolerance (Sandercock, 2004).

The challenge will now be to create a functioning interculturalism in the current Canadian cities of diversity. The literature suggests that this can be accomplished through learning intercultural competence and intercultural communication.

3.4 Intercultural competencies and diversity as change

As cities, neighbourhoods, families and workforces have globalized, diverse peoples are challenged to work together for common goals. Berthoin Antal & Friedman (2008) suggest that a changed practice is necessary when working in culturally diverse settings:

Cultural competence is in essence the ability to generate appropriate strategies of action unconsciously, but *intercultural* competence is the

ability to consciously explore one's ways of thinking and acting so as to actively construct an appropriate strategy (p.365).

Schools are also grounds for intercultural learning, and the literature on intercultural education suggests that experiences of cultural diversity can enable certain intercultural competencies:

Cultural dissonance was seen to be both the means and the medium of intercultural learning, in that students had to learn from and through this in order to negotiate the minefield of cross-cultural personal interaction. Those who were successful in this respect showed the personal qualities of individual cognitive skills, empathy and reflection, and self-confidence. (Allan, 2003, p.89)

Allan (2003) further mentions that: "...Since the elements of culture are symbolic, they allow ambiguous interpretations which can result in confusion or conflict" (Allan, 2003, p.92). Conflict and misunderstandings are obvious, but we are challenged to change the discourse of cultural conflict to opportunities for collaboration and learning: "Intercultural competence requires in-depth knowledge of oneself, conflict resolution skills and optimism in one's outlook" (Patel et al., 2011, p.52).

This co-labouring can be aided by learning, recognizing and practising intercultural competencies. Messner and Schäfer (2012) suggest twelve key intercultural competencies to aid in working amidst culturally diverse teams:

1. Self-awareness: consciousness about one's self (the way one looks) and about one's reputation elsewhere
2. Appropriateness: has knowledge of the socially appropriate communicative behaviour

3. Self-confidence: holds a realistic and positive confidence in own judgments, abilities and powers
4. Effectiveness: is able to bring about an effect
5. Motivation for success: has a strong orientation towards pragmatism and useful action
6. Changing perspective: tries to understand actions and reactions of others from their point of view
7. Empathy: shows interest in others and shares emotions
8. Open-mindedness: is open towards new ideas and experiences; functions effectively with people of other world views
9. Communication ability: fully appreciates what others are saying and thinks consequentially prior to answering
10. Tolerance: is free from bigotry and prejudice, accepts and advocates diversity
11. Sensitivity: is sensitive to the importance of differences and to the point of view of other people
12. Flexibility: having a type of mental elasticity allowing [one] to be part of and yet apart from another milieu (Messner & Schäfer, 2012, p. 193).

These competencies can then be categorized in terms of cognitive, affective and behavioural (Messner & Schäfer, 2012, p. 193; Lloyd & Härtel, 2010, p.847); intercultural competency can therefore be regarded as an integrated practice.

Furthermore, intercultural competency can reflect the positive aspects of cultural diversity as change. McDaniel, Samovar and Porter (2012) discuss change in relation to cultural diversity:

... When applied to culture, change can be quite frightening. People's lives are guided by their cultural perspectives, and when their worldview, beliefs, and values come under assault through social change, they can feel threatened and resort to extreme measures to maintain the status quo. (p.8)

However, the authors go on to offer: "A knowledge of intercultural communication, and the ability to use it effectively, can help bridge cultural differences, mitigate problems, and assist in achieving more harmonious, productive relations" (McDaniel et al., 2012, p.8). Diversity through the viewpoint of change can be softened, and potentially embraced, if the desire and outlook to acquire intercultural competency through genuine experiences is enabled. Finally, Patel et al. (2011) speaks to the necessity of intercultural communication in this current era of globalization:

Intercultural communication involves interaction with people from different cultural backgrounds. The cultural flow in the form of migration, media, finance, technology and ideology has quickened the pace of globalization. The process of globalization is therefore forcing us as global citizens to rethink our intercultural communication strategies to bridge cultural differences and address our common concerns by building a global community. (p.38)

3.5 The three C's and planning practice

In discussions around communication and collaboration in planning, it is important to address the role of these concepts in the context of people working together.

The three C's requiring discussion are: coordination, cooperation, and

communication, which are particularly pertinent in relation to collaboration. Witty (2002) says:

By its very nature, planning is prone to have a collaborative structure;
Collaboration with the interests, usually including the publics;
Collaboration with decision-makers; Collaboration with colleagues; and
Collaboration with other disciplines. (p.19)

As planning should ideally attempt to embrace public participation and collaboration – which would ideally lead to better-informed and more engaged outcomes – a better distinction between the C’s in current planning practice may indicate particular gaps and the need for different practices. *In the constantly changing urban centres of Canada, and Winnipeg in particular, how well are planners reaching out across cultural divides? Are planning processes truly collaborative, or merely coordinative or cooperative?*

Collaboration, as defined by the New Oxford American Dictionary (2005), implies “the action of working with someone to produce or create something; or, traitorous cooperation with an enemy.” Collaboration, therefore, implies that there are differences and conflicts that need to be addressed, so that something new can be created. Misty Goosen (2009), in her article *Cooperation, Coordination, Collaboration: Asking the Hard Questions*, suggests that collaboration is the necessary means of bringing together diverse interests, especially when the latter definition (i.e., the ‘traitorous cooperation’ aspect) is considered in the mix. As communication is the necessary means of bringing perspectives and cultures together, collaboration must be achieved through communication, along with cooperation and coordination. Thus, collaboration, especially across cultures,

leads to a deeper awareness of the diversity that surrounds us (Maginn, 2007): a deeper self-awareness and a broader ‘we’-awareness. It is through this sensitivity and ultimate competency/capacity for the appreciation of our similarities through our differences and conflicts, that collaboration can be realized, to reach better outcomes through open and informed processes embracing diverse perspectives.

Collaboration in planning processes is ultimately an outcome of communication amongst and amidst various cultural values. Patsy Healey (2006), in her leading edge book, *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*, speaks to planning’s turn to communicative and interactive processes that are no longer value-neutral, that are more accepting of differences, and where several “recognitions” on the part of the planner prevail. These recognitions are complex:

- dependence on the knowledge of experts is reflective of rational processes – all knowledges are “socially constructed”;
- “communication of knowledge and reasoning take many forms”;
- we are social beings, who learn from interaction;
- “in contemporary life, people have diverse interests and expectations”;
- the management of “co-existence in shared spaces” needs to realize the diverse and complex ‘stakes’ of a place;
- through new ways of consensus-building we can “build cultures”; and,

- “planning work... has a capacity to challenge and change these relations” because practices influence society and vice versa. (Healey, 2006, p.29-30)

It is through collaboration, continual learning and changing ideologies regarding our cities that *practices* and *processes* can evolve through planning. Reeves (2005) believes that “behavioural change will not necessarily effect a change in attitude but a change in attitude towards people who are different is more likely to lead to a change in behaviour” (p.185). Hopefully, the willingness and attitude to embrace diversity can lead to behavioural change – providing a rationale for the practice of intercultural communication in collaborative planning processes.

Healey draws on the work of Habermas’ (1993) renowned theory of communicative action and communicative ethics to support her argument that open and equal communication is an ethical commitment of planning praxis:

We must construct our ways of validating claims, identifying priorities, and developing strategies for collective action *through interaction*, through debate. These debates too are social constructions. It is this idea that underpins Habermas’ *theory of communicative action* with its *communicative ethics*. This focus on how political communities communicate in public arenas, how participants exchange ideas, sort out what is valid, work out what is important, and assess proposed courses of action. In this conception, planning becomes a process of interactive collective reasoning, carried out in the medium of language, in discourse. Habermas argues that it is through our communicative efforts that cultures and structures are formed and transformed... It is through ‘open’ conversation among diverse peoples, through argument based on the available information, he claims, that we can arrive at ‘truths’ and ‘values’. If based on principles of honesty, sincerity, and openness, to people’s views and to available knowledge, then these truths and values can transcend the relativism of different perspectives. (as cited in Healey, 2006, p. 53)

This research argues that the ‘open’ conversation alluded to above requires intercultural communication competence in our complex world. The ‘values’ that we aim to embody are layers of development; the ‘truths’ we strive for are always contested and partial, and we need to gain comfort in that: “The challenge then for collective action is to find ways of intercultural dialogue through which we can reflect on what we mean and understand... in forms which offer respect to our individual and cultural differences” (Healey, 2006, p.55).

Furthermore, Healey’s (2006) theory of collaborative and communicative action planning alludes to *webs*, *nodes* and *arenas*, amidst which we are all connected through relationships: “The focal points of these relational webs act as nodes which provide the *arenas* where systems of meaning, ways of acting and ways of valuing are learned, transmitted and sometimes transformed” (Healey, 2006, p.58). In line with earlier critiques of multiculturalism and conventional perceptions of culture, there becomes apparent an increasing push toward a new type of collaboration in this constantly diversifying *arena*: “an additional ‘layer’ of cultural formation” (Healey, 2006, p.64). It is through the evolution of discourse – the ways in which we *understand*, *interpret*, *value* and *practice* our communication patterns and systems – that is the ultimate change agent for the planning profession. Healey (2006) poses the following questions in relation to planning’s discourses:

If we ‘live’ and form our lifeworlds in different cultural communities, within which we develop different ‘languages’ and different ‘systems of valuing’, how do we get to talk to each other about matters of common

concern? And, when we get to talking across these divides, how do we get to decide what is right? (p.63)

In sum, the practice of collaborative planning requires the embrace of a new competency when it comes to conflict and communication, perhaps intercultural communication: "...a complex space shared by interacting cultures, where meanings exist as different positions along the same continua" (Patel et al., 2011, p.9).

Collaboration, which planning might be expected to champion, requires the careful meshing and negotiating of the three C's – cooperation, coordination, and communication. As the most difficult of these can be argued to be communication – and communication defines a key arena of expertise of planning professionals in this global day-and-age – a new form of communication is indicated as essential for effective planning professionals, one which may lead to enhanced collaboration and collaborative processes.

3.6 Intercultural communication for professional planning practice

Intercultural communication seems to serve as a natural nexus of culture, planning and professional development for city-making with diversity. Communication has evolved in relation to the operative macro-cultural context – from mono, to multi, to inter-cultural. The intercultural interest of this research is pursued through a conceptualization of planning as 'bridging cultures' via communication in planning practice and discourse. Furthermore, there is limited research on this topic more generally in the Canadian context. Moreover, Chen and Starosta

(2008) have pointed to a need for a more integrated approach to intercultural communication competence:

... The application of studies in intercultural communication competence has been confined mainly to the intercultural adaptation process of sojourning in a new culture. We suggest that the scope of intercultural communication cannot be divorced from the full scope of the communication environment of the global civic culture, which can be conceptualized as having interpersonal, group, organizational, national, and supranational levels. (p. 228)

Thus, intercultural communication can be operationalized in professional planning practices, so that the paradigm of interculturalism can become meaningful for publics, organizations, and diverse cultures more generally, and become part of a more common practice/praxis. “The continuous new learning that takes place in the individual occurs in and through *communication* ... the central pillar of all human learning” (original emphasis; Kim, 2001, p.47). It is through communication that the capacity and competence to become intercultural will be learned and shared, and vice versa.

Ultimately, in the continually diversifying urban centres of the twenty-first century, “in order to live meaningfully and productively in this world, individuals must develop their intercultural communication competence” (Chen & Starosta, 2008, p.215). Since *becoming intercultural* is a personal growth capacity, it may be realized through intercultural communication competence, which Chen and Starosta (2008) define as follows:

... Intercultural communication competence can be conceived of as the ability to negotiate the interactants’ multiple identities in a specific environment. This definition emphasizes that competent persons must know not only how to interact effectively and appropriately with people and (the) environment, but also how to fulfill their own communication

goals by respecting and affirming the multilevel cultural identities of those with whom they interact. (p.219)

It becomes evident that intercultural competence is a learned capacity, and is commended through this research as part of the professional development of planners seeking to realize more successful collaboration in culturally diverse settings.

Recall Healey's (2006) theories surrounding collaborative planning in cities of diversity:

If we can learn more about the dialogical processes of inter-cultural communication, we may be able to build consensuses which have multi-cultural reach, making sense and giving voice to the different culturally-constructed claims for attention which arise in a place. Through this, we not only transform how we think about our claims, and even alter the cultural referents in our various relational webs. We also make new discourses, with the capacity to re-shape and frame, that is, to structure, the abstract systems which constrain our lifeworlds. (p.68)

If we cannot communicate with one another, and change the ways we inter-relate in our urban environments, we will continue to aid and abet disintegration and dysfunction, rather than the working together necessary to achieve true collaboration. This touches on a key rationale for this research: to make a contribution to the urban planning literature to promote a fuller understanding of intercultural communication as 'bridging diverse cultures', to foster better collaboration at the heart of urban planning practice, in increasingly culturally-diverse Canadian cities.

Chapter 4: The Winnipeg Context

The literature on interculturalism is grounded here in one particular diversifying city context, Winnipeg, Manitoba: a city that continues to experience cultural shifts in many different ways. Winnipeg's 'inner city has' already been showcased as fertile ground for research on diversity and interculturalism (see Ghorayshi, 2010). Since this research explores new ideas for planning practice amidst cultural diversity, with a particular interest in the practice of intercultural communication, Winnipeg is viewed as an appropriate setting for such research.

The research is grounded in Winnipeg for various key reasons. Canada's history is rich in ethnic diversity: "In 2011, Canada had a foreign-born population of about 6,775,800 people...[representing] 20.6% of the total population, the highest proportion among the G8 countries" (Statistics Canada, 2013a, p.4). Nationally, "more than three-quarters of the immigrants who reported coming to Canada before 1971 (78.3%) were from Europe" (Statistics Canada, 2013a, p.7). Conversely, the top ten countries of birth for newcomers to Canada in 2011 were from Philippines, China, India, United States, Pakistan, the United Kingdom, Iran, South Korea, Columbia and Mexico (Statistics Canada, 2013a, p.8). Therefore, over time, the source countries for immigrants to Canada have changed and globalized.

Provincially, Manitoba's current population growth relies on immigration. Through government programs such as the Provincial Nominee Program (PNP), Manitoba has become host to a surge of newcomers to Canada: over 15,000 in

2010 (Manitoba, 2011, p.2). More specifically, the province is highly dependent on the immigration of young skilled workers. Trends indicate that the median age of immigrants to Manitoba was 28 years, in comparison with the median age of Manitobans of 37.7 years (Winnipeg, 2012). “In 2010, among immigrants aged 25 years and over, 76 per cent of principal applicants and 59 per cent of dependants had post-secondary education and solid expertise in professional and technical fields” (Manitoba, 2011, p.21). The immigrants that are coming to Manitoba in general are young, skilled workers contributing to the province’s workforce: the co-labouring of diverse peoples, therefore, is all the more evident. More specific to Winnipeg, the city’s “immigration was 5th highest of Canadian cities in 2011” surpassed only by Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver and Calgary (Winnipeg, 2013, p.3). Therefore, Winnipeg’s population makeup is certainly affected by the immigration policy directives of the Province.

Not only is Winnipeg rich in ethnic diversity due to immigration, but the city also has a very large and growing Aboriginal population, adding to the complex mix of cultural diversity in the urban setting. Compared to other Canadian cities, Winnipeg has the highest percentage of urban Aboriginal peoples at ten per cent, compared to nine per cent in Saskatoon, five per cent in Edmonton, one per cent in Hamilton, and only one half of a percent in Montreal (Winnipeg, 2012). Like the immigrant population, Aboriginal people in Winnipeg are young: “The 2006 Census indicated that Aboriginal people in Winnipeg were young, with a median age of 25.7 years compared to 38.8 years for the general population”

(United Way of Winnipeg, 2010, p.9). In terms of demographics, it is important for Winnipeg to plan for the future with diversity awareness in mind.

Culture and diversity, in the context of this research, is explored through the communicative practices of planning professionals in Winnipeg. A cultural shift within the planning profession has attempted to better engage and embrace comparatively unconventional planning initiatives, mainly with a communicative and collaborative focus. Some planners in Winnipeg find themselves in relatively ‘other-than-conventional’ roles in organizations that aim for better integration of culture and diversity within their practices. It is through the perspectives of these planners that insights into the inter-relationships between planning and cultural diversity are explored.

The meshing of four cultural realms – ethnocultural diversity, Aboriginal cultural implications, marketing and city branding via ‘arts and culture’, and an other-than-conventional planning culture – sets the broad context for Winnipeg as an informant for this research, and these realms are elaborated below.

4.1 Immigration: Enhancing our cultural mix

In Manitoba, the Provincial Government is largely responsible for the immigration process through the Provincial Nominee Program. This program aims to:

- i) attract a newcomer workforce – Economic Class
- ii) unite families that are dispersed internationally – Family Class
- iii) support refugees – Refugee Class

The main goal of the Province's involvement with this immigration program is to "attract and retain a greater share of immigrants" nationally, and to attract "nominees [that] have the skills, education and work experience to make an immediate economic contribution to communities across our province" (Manitoba, 2011, p.9). Therefore, a major strategic role of government is related to diversifying the population and workforce.

The PNP is unique and successful, representing the leading edge of such programming for other Canadian provinces and their immigration strategizing. In the case of Winnipeg: "With the success of the Provincial Nominee Program, which began in 1999, Winnipeg's immigration has quadrupled and 2011 saw over 13,000 immigrants arrive in the City" (Winnipeg, 2012, p.2). Upon arrival, 77.6 per cent of new residents to Manitoba settle in Winnipeg, the sixth most popular Canadian destination for newcomers for a second year in a row in 2010 (Manitoba, 2011). The top ten source countries for newcomers to Winnipeg in 2010 were as follows: Philippines, India, China, Israel, Korea, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Eritrea, USA, and Vietnam (Winnipeg, 2013). These immigrants are now adding to the population of first-, second-, and third-generation Canadians in Winnipeg – a city, workforce and culture *already* rich in ethnic heritage. As a nation historically settled by Europeans, this diversified newcomer population brings challenging implications for the management of urban life. *With the desire to substantially boost population through immigration, what are the implications for planning amidst diversifying diversity? Are the policies that attract a newcomer workforce*

integrated with those which aid in the settlement and integration process, housing, skill development, urban and community planning?

It has been noted that immigrants are more likely to settle in the largest urban areas of Canada (Statistics Canada, 2013a). The Canadian Chamber of Commerce (2009) reports that, “More recent arrivals are also heading for a new set of ‘emerging gateways’ – smaller metropolitan areas” (p.1): these are the smaller CMAs of Calgary, Ottawa-Gatineau, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Hamilton and London (p.5). In 2011, Calgary, Edmonton and Winnipeg were host to 70,700, 50,000 and 45,300 newcomers respectively (Statistics Canada, 2013a). Furthermore, “The share of newcomers in both Winnipeg and Calgary in 2011 was almost twice their share of Canada’s total population” (Statistics Canada, 2013a, p.11). These settlement patterns are important for urban planning as the urban centres in Canada are attracting a significant number of newcomers, facing a diverse range of unique and context-specific challenges.

Newcomers to Winnipeg face vast settlement challenges. According to 2006 Statistics Canada Census data, the Winnipeg neighbourhoods with the highest number of recent immigrants are: Logan-C.P.R. (31.7%), Central Park (24.5%), West Alexander (18.0%), China Town (17.4%), Spence (15.0%), and Daniel McIntyre (11.8%). These are statistically lower income inner city neighbourhoods, where the average household incomes in the 2006 Census ranged from \$22,341 to \$42,084, much below the \$63,023 average household income for the City of Winnipeg (Statistics Canada, 2006). The housing in these

neighbourhoods is generally of an older stock, which may also require more time and resources to maintain. Immigrants may find themselves in challenging situations once in Winnipeg, and this research suggests that planners have the opportunity to be influential in various aspects of the settlement and integration process:

In short, immigration is bringing change to communities and is putting considerable stress on our cities' social and physical infrastructure, including public transit, education services, and housing. Meeting the needs of an increasingly diverse population presents significant challenges for many of Canada's cities (Canadian Chamber of Commerce, 2009, p.1).

When discussing the ethnocultural makeup of immigrants, it is important to recognize the different types of diversity that these individuals contribute to the urban fabric of cities. In terms of language, over sixty per cent of newcomers who came to Canada in 2011 were able to converse in English *or* French *and* one or more non-official language(s), in addition to nearly ten per cent knowing English *and* French *and* one or more non-official language(s). Furthermore, nearly three per cent could speak English and French but not a non-official language, while less than one per cent only spoke non-official languages (Statistics Canada, 2013a). In addition to linguistic diversity, immigration has also enabled religious diversity in Canadian cities over time. While more than 22 million people in Canada report affiliation with a Christian religion, more than 1 million people (3.2%) identified as Muslim, Hindus represented 1.5%, Sikhs 1.4%, Buddhists 1.1% and Jewish 1.0% (Statistics Canada, 2013a). Therefore, mobility, globalization and immigration have allowed for the movement of not only people, but also cultures, beliefs, institutions, religious affiliations, and languages. This broad sense of

diversity is what makes the context of Canadian cities such as Winnipeg so unique, while requiring an enhanced practice of societal integration.

Furthermore, research on interculturalism and diversity in the Winnipeg setting conducted by Ghorayshi (2010) indicates: “The colonial, stigmatized, and stereotyped view of Aboriginal people is transferred to the newcomers” (2010, p.95). This may continue to be an ongoing challenge if cultural diversity is not embraced and incorporated through an intercultural perspective. The following section broadly discusses Aboriginal cultural diversity specific to the Winnipeg context.

4.2 A growing Aboriginal culture: Respecting Indigenous roots

The historical importance of Aboriginal peoples and culture is even present in the City’s name: ‘Winnipeg’ is derived from Cree, meaning muddy water (Winnipeg, 2013). The term *Aboriginal peoples* “is a collective name for the original peoples of Canada ... North American Indians (First Nation), Inuit and Métis peoples” (United Way of Winnipeg, 2010, p. 9). Therefore, there are distinct cultural attributes identified by each of these nations.

Currently in Canada, “The Aboriginal population increased by 232,385 people, or 20.1% between 2006 and 2011, compared with 5.2% for the non-Aboriginal population” (Statistics Canada, 2013b, p.8). More specifically, the City of Winnipeg “has both the highest concentration and the largest number of Aboriginal people out of large Canadian cities” (Winnipeg, 2012, p.4). Aboriginal

people live in every neighbourhood cluster in the City of Winnipeg, with the highest percentages living in the inner city neighbourhood of Point Douglas and the Downtown (Statistics Canada, 2006).

According to the 2006 Census, as a percentage of the city's population, 10 per cent of Winnipeg is made up of Aboriginal people – a young and growing population in the urban setting. A United Way of Winnipeg (2012) report has indicated that the growth rate of the Aboriginal population in Winnipeg has increased due to both demographic and non-demographic factors: higher fertility and mortality rates, and the propensity to self-identify, respectively. In addition: “In 2011, First Nations people were younger than the non-Aboriginal population in every province and territory... In Manitoba, there were 41,955 First Nations children, representing 36.7% of First Nations people and 18.4% of all children in [the] province” (Statistics Canada, 2013b, p.16). Therefore, Aboriginal youth comprise a large portion of Winnipeg's population and should be a key focus when planning for the future. While a Direction Strategy for implementing the new *OurWinnipeg* (2011) official city plan notes: “Ensuring meaningful opportunities for Winnipeg's Aboriginal youth will be essential” (p.13), *how do we go about understanding some of the challenges that this diverse cultural group may face?*

4.3 Culture on display for consumption: Celebrating our cultural assets

Winnipeg also capitalizes on its cultural diversity through particular marketing and tourism initiatives. Winnipeg is celebrated, and even marketed, as a cultural city through events and festivals such as Folklorama and Culture Days, and it was nominated as the Cultural Capital of Canada in 2010. Tourism Winnipeg's (2013) '101 Things to do in Winnipeg' outlines several arts and cultural events including: Manito Ahbee (Aboriginal culture, music and art celebrations), the Winnipeg Art Gallery, the Royal Winnipeg Ballet and Festival du Voyageur. Economic Development Winnipeg broadly defines the cultural industries sector as: performing arts, visual arts and heritage institutions; sound recording and music; writing and published works; film and video production; television and radio broadcasting; advertising, creative design and related services; interactive digital media; spectator sports; promoters/presenters of performing arts and similar events and related agents (Economic Development Winnipeg, 2011, p.7). It is no wonder that the terminology around 'culture' is so broad, seeing it is so open to multiple interpretations.

However, these varied cultural industries have flourished in Winnipeg due to a history of ethnocultural diversity:

Diverse cultural communities in Winnipeg are inclusive of the largest francophone community west of Ontario, one of North America's largest aboriginal communities, a Ukrainian heritage, Chinese heritage, Mennonite heritage, and other cultural expressions that have shaped the base of cultural and creative talent. (Economic Development Winnipeg, 2011, p.4)

These industries also employ nearly 12,000 employees, and are supported by the approximate \$1.1 billion spent on cultural entertainment by Winnipeggers each

year (Economic Development Winnipeg, 2011). The Winnipeg Arts Council also identifies several ethnic cultural centres and facilities throughout the city on the Winnipeg Cultural Map (2013) as centres of cultural celebrations. It is these and many other events that help shape Winnipeg's identity through an open and active celebration of cultural diversity. Winnipeg and Winnipeggers evidently place value on these industries, as arts and culture are widely celebrated.

The celebratory aspect of cultural diversity is a key component in a city such as Winnipeg. Displays of cultural diversity comprise only one part of understanding peoples' differences. It is important to also see beyond the outward displays of ethnocultural diversity, and attempt a deeper appreciation for diversity in the urban setting. This outlook can potentially be enabled through more concerted intercultural discourse in planning processes.

4.4 A culture of unconventional planning initiatives: Leading edges of the mainstream in Winnipeg?

Finally, the City of Winnipeg's Official Plan, *OurWinnipeg*, outlines cultural diversity as a strength, key priority and economic asset of the city at large.

OurWinnipeg states the following:

Increased cultural diversity adds to the vitality of our communities, schools, business sectors, and arts and cultural institutions. Diversity will continue to challenge Winnipeggers to be inclusive and responsive to difference and will provide our city the opportunity to be a magnet for talented, creative new residents in an increasingly interconnected world. (Winnipeg, 2011, p.13)

This directive outlines Winnipeg's diversity as an opportunity and priority guiding planning in the city. This directive alludes to an enhanced and more inclusive view of diversity in order to better enable opportunities and, potentially, the 'diversity advantage'.

The City's Official Plan has also guided development of other 'unconventional' plans for Winnipeg such as the Winnipeg Arts Council's two-phase *Ticket to the Future*: "The plan is an ambitious roadmap to integrating arts and culture into our city's planning and practices" (Winnipeg Arts Council & DIALOG, 2011, p.7). The second phase of the *Ticket to the Future* process was also based on the economic analysis of the first, which indicated the "positive impact of the arts and creative industries on the city's economy" (Winnipeg Arts Council & DIALOG, 2011, p. 11). This plan is guided by the directives of *Our Winnipeg* that indicate the importance of integrating culture in city planning: "Given that culture is embedded in all aspects of life, planning for culture ought to be embedded in all aspects of city building" (Winnipeg Arts Council & DIALOG, 2011, p.21). This planning document can be considered other-than-conventional, in that it integrates the importance of art, culture, discussion and city planning.

Another community planning resource developed in Winnipeg is United Way's (2008) *Urban Reflections*. The report outlines research conducted with Winnipeggers regarding their perceptions on several aspects of life in the city. This report is influential for planning in Winnipeg because it discusses and "reflects [the nearly 3,000 participants'] unique thoughts, opinions and insights

and it provides a snapshot of our community's collective outlook on social issues and the quality of life in Winnipeg" (United Way of Winnipeg, 2008, p.9). Interestingly, the social issue that ranks highest in the category of 'feel[s] *individuals* can do a lot to help', is racial intolerance. This particular issue also has a high level of reported personal involvement in addressing it (United Way of Winnipeg, 2009). Recall that tolerance is an intercultural competency: working towards it is a good sign in the direction of interculturalism. Furthermore, according to this report, broad notions of cultural diversity are identified as key priorities for living in Winnipeg (United Way of Winnipeg, 2008). *Urban Reflections* concludes with the following offering: "[The report] will contribute to a collective understanding of the vision, concerns, priorities and values of Winnipeggers" (United Way of Winnipeg, 2008, p.37). This study is important for planning in Winnipeg to help better understand the complexities of the collective outlook of its citizens. Such a document can also be considered other-than-conventional planning.

In conclusion, it is for the above reasons – a focus on immigration, Aboriginal roots with changing demographics, events celebrating ethnocultural diversity, and other-than-conventional planning initiatives – that this research is important for Winnipeg at this time. These areas showcase how the city may be *enhanced* through its diversity, while acknowledging that it is the potential tensions associated with diversity that may inspire the development of further

competencies in order to better serve diverse multiple publics. Ghorayshi (2010)

indicates the necessity for this type of research in Winnipeg:

Cities have priorities, and the direction that a city takes is a choice. The willingness of Winnipeg to welcome its diverse population, and how to encourage and create the means not only for their full involvement, but also our mutual, cultural transformation, will be a measure of the city's commitment to human equality and human dignity – a fitting goal in a city that will host a Human Rights Museum (p.101).

With the literature suggesting the positive aspects of embracing cultural diversity through an intercultural lens, combined with the urban setting of Winnipeg, the research now turns to the agents of other-than-conventional and communicative planning practice. The aim is to gain insight into the opportunities and challenges for a more evolved planning practice in Winnipeg.

Chapter 5: Results

5.1 Profile of participants

The research participants were professional practitioners all formally educated in planning. Of the seven interviewees, three were male and four were female. The focus group consisted of three males and five females. Together, their years of experience ranged from one year to over 25 years, with the most years of experience taking place in Winnipeg. All of the research participants work with diverse cultures and communities in a communicative capacity.

5.2 Findings from the interviews

The intent of the seven key informant semi-structured interviews was to gain insight into the planners' experiences working to bridge diverse cultures in Winnipeg. The following themes emerged from the interviews:

- an inner focus on a 'planning for all' ethos;
- planning as outwardly and actively bridging diversity;
- collective communication challenges for planning/planners; and,
- a range of challenges and opportunities for collaborative planning with diversity.

Together, these themes reflect an attempt to mobilize interculturalism through practicing intercultural communication in planning processes.

5.2.1 *The pursuit of a planner in the making*

The interviews focused on the personal journeys that led these individuals to the field of planning and their subsequent planning practice. To begin, each interviewee was asked an introductory question around what it was that led them to a planning education. The outcomes of this question are as follows, and in no particular order:

- Planning connects people with space, potentially enabling the making of place;
- Planning readily engages comparatively broad socio-economic issues, such as societal inequality;
- Planning with the public domain at the forefront is a way to bring policy and communication to bear on a variety of collective outcomes;
- Planning is potentially powerful in relation to tackling urban inequality; and,
- Planning involves big-picture whole-systems thinking.

Each interviewee mentioned nearly all of these reasonings, in one way or another, as influencing their pursuit of a planning education. Each of the interviewees had a very broad and comparatively other-than-conventional focus to their interest in a planning education, as in viewing planning as more than land use and its regulation. All of the interviewees noted key interpersonal experiences in their lives, which led them to pursue a planning education with this other-than-conventional focus.

Several of the interviewees became interested in pursuing a planning education ‘accidentally’, implying that the interviewees had not deliberately pursued the land use and regulation side of planning as an active initial career choice:

“I relate most to planning because the idea of planning is so broad – it’s that big picture thinking – and where are the gaps?” (I-5)

Many of the interviewees indicated that they became interested in planning from an academic background in design, such as interior design or architecture.

Through these backgrounds they came to feel that the human element of design was sometimes missing, and planning appeared to address this for them. A distinct awareness of individual uniqueness and diversity was outlined as a determinant of design, and planning seemed to wholeheartedly address this for these individuals. Furthermore, the operational element of planning was expressed as an important complement to the structural element of design, including city design. The integration of different disciplines seemed to be a driving focus of these planners’ pursuit of a planning education.

All of the planners interviewed also identified key life experiences that seemed to lead them to an other-than-conventional planning focus. Many of these key experiences were interpersonal in nature, and included aspects of culture and diversity of some sort. One of the interviewees was involved in international work in some very racially contested settings. These experiences shed new light on racism and cultural diversity for this practitioner. This planner also worked in the United States, where the operative metaphor and popular philosophy around

cultural diversity (ethnoculturally-speaking) is that of a ‘melting pot’. This planner observed that the collective outlook on ethnocultural diversity in the United States is very different and felt less welcoming than that which they experienced in Canada, potentially because of this philosophy. It was also noted that ‘post 9/11’, cultural diversity in the United States seemed to become even less tolerated. The collective outlook on diversity, therefore, appears to be an important driver of perspectives on cultural change, affecting the ways in which a group might cope with difference.

In addition, a few of the interviewees alluded to childhood or youth experiences with cultural difference that led them to practise a more equitable and human rights oriented planning ethic. One of the planners shared childhood experiences of growing up in poverty. Another shared how exposure to volunteer community work at a young age was eye-opening, especially in regard to issues of social inequality. Another shared that planning through a Social Work lens could help bring greater decision-making power to those that generally do not have such power. One of the interviewees also noted that living next-door to a recent immigrant – witnessing firsthand their struggle – influenced this planner’s outlook on the role of immigration, integration and cultural diversity in city settings. Each of the planners alluded to a role for planning in remedying some of these problematic urban diversity issues – and that is why they got into planning:

“[Several life experiences and relationships] informed my work and how I see city planning and my work as a city planner ... I don’t just see the policy anymore, I see how it actually directly affects a person” (I-7).

Each of the interviewees acknowledged that experiences with cultural diversity could change one's perspective. All of the planners interviewed seem to have allowed their inner-selves to be changed by their experiences with diversity, which led them to pursue their practice through an integrated 'planning for all' ethos.

5.2.2 *Practicing communicative planning*

Exploring whether the interviewees could conceptualize their planning work as 'bridging cultures' was an intention of the interviews. The researcher sought to inquire into what that expression meant to them, and how they felt they might fit into such a representation of a communicative planning practice. All of the interviewees confirmed that there were various aspects of their practice that could be defined as bridging cultures through communication efforts. This partly confirmed that the key informants selected as interviewees were indeed a good source for information on intercultural communication in planning:

"If people don't think of planning as a communicative act – if they see it as comprehensive, logical, objective and formulaic – if that's someone's view of planning, then I guess I don't plan." (I-1)

The interviewees confirmed that a communicative, culture-bridging disposition was fundamental to their planning practice.

Various definitions and perspectives of 'culture' or 'cultures' were brought up in the interviews. One interviewee described their work amongst *sector* cultures; for example, community, voluntary, business, education, health and

government sectors. The interviewee noted that this milieu is not unique to certain types of other-than-conventional planning work: “*We all do this all the time*” (I-1). The important component is to explicitly acknowledge that these broad differences are ultimately cultural. It is important to learn and try to understand the contexts that are informing people, which in turn influences how they relate and inter-relate. This is true of understanding one’s self as well as someone else at both the individual and cultural level.

Local and international ethnic contexts were also described as cultures that are being bridged by planners working with ethnic communities, immigrants and the business sector:

“So on the one hand you’ve got the mechanics of pulling together all the different players to execute an opportunity related to business development, and on the other hand you’re looking at how do you take the social fabric of a community and make sure that you bring all the players together to address potential opportunities for skill, talent and attraction.”
(I-6)

Therefore, it is important while planning to acknowledge and integrate the social, cultural and economic makeup of a particular community. However, it was stressed numerous times in the interviews that just because someone is from a particular place, or identifies with a particular ethnicity, homogeneity of all members of that particular community cannot be assumed. Culture is made up of individual experiences that can be grouped into a collective in different and unique ways.

Interestingly, the researcher’s broad definition of culture seemed almost interchangeable with some of the other collective terms that were brought up in the

interviews, such as ‘publics’ and ‘communities’. Most of the interviewees were very clear in acknowledging that there is not one public, nor one community. Greater nuancing is required to positively change the discourse – to pluralize publics, even *multiple publics*, and to *communities* rather than community. This broadening and multiplying of perspectives on how we think and talk about difference felt very important when communicating amidst cultural diversity:

“I think everyone defines diversity differently. I’ve been at some events when diversity is defined as having one stakeholder from every group. To me that’s a bit weird – the idea that one person can represent all people who may experience something in common.” (I-5)

A fundamental aspect of this research process was to explore the conceptualization of planning as ‘bridging cultures’ through deliberate communicative acts. The interviewees not only seemed to agree with this interpretation, but also embraced a broad notion of ‘culture’. Furthermore, the interviewees were able to express the challenges and opportunities associated with planning in the cultural diversity of present-day Winnipeg.

5.2.3 Collective challenges and opportunities for planning with diversity

The interviewees were asked to share their perspectives on how Winnipeg as a collective is perceived to view cultural diversity. The planners generally expressed a positive outlook on the way that Winnipeggers outwardly appear to view cultural diversity. A few of the interviewees shared very positive views of celebratory cultural events such as Folklorama, associating it with a very optimistic outlook on ethnocultural diversity in the city. Diversity is seen as

beneficial to the economy and enables enriching cultural events and celebrations. However, a key distinction was made between diversity in Winnipeg being either an advantage or a disadvantage. It was indicated that if diversity is not seen as an economic opportunity, or as some type of measurable advantage, then it appears to be not well accepted in Winnipeg. A thought-provoking question was raised by one of the interviewees:

“Some bear more challenges in Winnipeg than others – isn’t that diversity too?” (I-4)

This response suggests that Wood and Landry’s (2008) ‘diversity advantage’ view cannot be rooted in an ultimate economic advantage: it is more demanding, in terms of a positive collective stance on cultural diversity in relation to enhanced social cohesion. If truly intercultural cities are to embrace the diversity advantage, cultural diversity must be regarded through a holistic intercultural lens, as the ‘success’ of intercultural cities is based on more than an economic platform.

Moreover, racism was noted as part of the negative side of cultural diversity in Winnipeg. Racism towards particular cultural groups in Winnipeg was commented on by all of the interviewees. It was indicated that there needs to be more of a willingness for conversation around how Winnipeggers in general can be more accountable for racism: *“Racism is about ignorance” (I-2)*. Ignorance towards cultures cannot foster an intercultural outlook. This is certainly problematic in a city that is so culturally diverse in so many respects. Along with racism, it was mentioned that issues of privilege and power must be recognized in planning as well.

The interviewees seemed to be indicating that each citizen must acknowledge that they are cultural beings. All need to acknowledge that purely personal ideas of how something might be is not always necessarily the case – personal ideas and frame of mind must be challenged on occasion. One cannot assume to fully know another person or another cultural group when working with them, and attempting to communicate with them:

“Language exists within a structure, and the way we communicate can enforce or challenge that structure. So... modes of communication are very important to express the cultural voice. Being aware of all that, and being ready to challenge your own modes and means of communication, and allowing for a displacement of those structures of power within language.” (I-4)

Again, this appears to tie into the importance of acknowledging that there are communities within ‘a community’, and multiplicities within ‘the public’: likewise, cultures of individuals within ‘culture’.

The interviewees also seemed to be operating from a conscious belief that many people are liable to view diversity differently, and to anticipate this in their practice. It is second nature to think of ‘diversity’ as ethnocultural diversity – as people of different colours, eating different foods, speaking different languages. Most people, however, are very capable of recognizing the unique nuances that represent diversity. There are also those people who simply find change – any change – very difficult, and a healthy view of diversity is ultimately about dealing with change well:

“People like diversity from an ethnic perspective, but all of that has its challenges and it’s basically change. Unless you articulate the value of the change, people will have their own preconceived notions of what that is...”

The questions should be around where is the alignment through collaborative efforts around change, and look at the broader picture around change.” (I-6)

The interviewees seemed to be indicating that, the more people are positively exposed to difference and diversity in the city, the more comfortable and accepting they can become of differences, and potentially acquire competencies for diversity. It was also expressed in a few of the interviews that more Winnipeggers are now very comfortable with multiculturalism, better positioning them to entertain a more evolved concept such as interculturalism.

Furthermore, the interviewees were asked specifically about collaboration in planning processes in Winnipeg, as some of the literature suggests that planning is communicative and should ideally be collaborative. Due to the fact that Winnipeg is an ethnoculturally diverse city, with planning processes involving diverse, often inter-professional stakeholders, there was a curiosity around what such planners might say about experiences of collaboration with diversity. *Might aspects of intercultural communication and associated competencies emerge from this line of questioning?* One interviewee identified the need to incorporate culture into all aspects of planning, especially in a diverse and growing city such as Winnipeg:

“When you’re doing any kind of plan or planning, you need to consider that each culture has different needs – and because the city is so diverse, we need to take those perspectives into consideration. So culture and cultural awareness is something that always percolates to the top and needs to be communicated.” (I-3)

This interviewee stressed that ‘perspective taking’ was fundamental for better integrating the influences of culture into planning work. Collaboration can be viewed as a way of gaining insight into diverse perspectives.

Not surprisingly, however, collaboration was described as ‘easier said than done’ by the interviewees. Each of the planners shared both positive and negative aspects of collaboration from their experience, as well as a sense of the opportunities and challenges for collaboration, specifically for the Winnipeg planning setting. Ideally, all planning processes would be collaborative: it is often acknowledged how important and rewarding collective involvement can be. It was also indicated that collaboration is best and most easily done when the group of people collaborating have a common goal, yet this is rarely the case in practice. Appropriate initiatives and associated enhanced competencies and sensibilities may be required to achieve further levels of development in communication capacity. A more intercultural planning approach may be more naturally inclusive of diversity and diverse perspectives, which might well engender collaboration as a more natural state of planning affairs.

The importance of having all voices coming together around an issue was indicated as being more meaningful than simply engaging those people who are supportive of a process or project:

“It’s better to have all the voices around the table, not just those that are telling you what you want to hear.” (I-2)

It was stated that some of the most important opinions regarding planning issues come from its greatest critics. Such opposing perspectives can help shape a good planning process, and the project may be better for it in the long term:

“We can agree to disagree, but everyone’s voice has to be heard and respected. I do believe that you have better decisions when you listen to people collectively. The collective wisdom comes from the critics and from talking and listening... You can’t have your mindset cast in stone.” (I-2)

Note that this interviewee mentioned that the planner also had to be open to challenge, and to a challenging process in order to enable diverse perspectives to be surfaced and shared. While bringing these diverse opinions and perspectives together may be difficult, a key component of the process happens at the beginning, where ‘rules of engagement’ are stated and agreed upon, so that the process can be conducted respectfully.

Not only is mutual respect in these processes important, but also trust, authenticity and honesty. Collaboration has to happen from the beginning, and can only occur when those involved also have the opportunity to influence the process collectively within the framework of the above principles:

“Collaboration to me is who’s at the table... and how do you bring them there... If you don’t have that, then you’re not building relationships, you’re not building trust, you’re not hearing stories – letting folks use their own voice, share their own stories – if you don’t do that and don’t allow for that then you don’t get collaboration.” (I-3)

Collaboration has to happen collectively, and it requires skill in facilitation.

Throughout the interviews, there was unanimity that collaboration is neither feasible, nor the right process, for every initiative that a planner may encounter. The project and/or the process may simply not allow for collaboration,

along with other challenges, such as resources and time. It was mentioned that what planners can and should do is learn to modify their processes, to achieve the best possible with what is available in an authentic way. That may mean that collaboration is not always pursued, but the other three C's can be practised: cooperation, coordination and communication. Here, communication is the component that applies overall, only on different levels of practice.

Communicative planning allows for the opportunity to engage in discourse that then changes how planning can be done. Therefore, communication is a key piece influencing the nature and quality of planning processes.

Another challenge of collaboration is structural; our current planning structures do not always allow for it. One interviewee noted that even if the process is very collaborative, working towards collective impact, political decision-makers often have the power to over-rule the outcomes of that collaborative process. Therefore, the structure of the political environment within which planners work does not always allow for collaborative consensus-building and joint decision-making. Furthermore, the discourse of planning can also be very unfriendly to those unfamiliar with it, creating imbalances of power. Some cultures are forced to work within these structures/strictures. A discourse that is unfamiliar to them, which does not speak to their own skills and abilities, is not conducive to good planning outcomes:

“There are things that you are forced to work within that may not speak to your skills and abilities of you as a community organization or an ethnic group, etc.” (I-4)

Collaboration is also challenging because sharing power and responsibilities is often difficult. Diversity in collaborative processes is especially challenging because each participant comes to the process with their own ideas, interests and perspectives. A key towards collaboration is to find common ground amidst the participants. Finding commonalities while respecting differences must be an aim of the collaborative process from the very beginning. Grounding planning processes on mutual respect may help enable dialogue and multiple-perspective-taking amongst participants, which may then lead towards collaboration. At their best, planners may play the role of agents of collaboration in such processes.

The interviewees collectively seemed to be suggesting that diversity can positively enable the healthy airing of differences of opinions and the constructive surfacing of multiple perspectives in planning processes. By having a structure and process that enables different perspective taking, planners may be able to help conduce more genuine collaboration. Open communication and intercultural communication competencies were seen as key elements in achieving this. The interviewees were also of the attitude that sometimes communicative and collaborative processes were difficult due to a simple lack of collective understanding regarding the roles planners play.

A further line of questioning regarding the planning profession was pursued for the purposes of understanding the 'culture of planning' in Winnipeg. Because the interviewees were chosen based on their other-than-conventional

cultures-bridging planning work, the research aimed to find out how they described themselves and their work. It was anticipated that there may be a disconnect between their education and their current line of work, and that their personal experiences might be highly influential. One of the struggles of being in other-than-conventional planning practice was expressed as the challenge to better bridge one's academic background and all life experiences with your current planning practice. This seemed more challenging for some planners than others.

The word 'planning' – as it is mostly defined – does not well represent the roles and the work that many planners in Winnipeg and elsewhere undertake. Many of the interviewees stated that they were hesitant to describe themselves as planners in situations where others may be unfamiliar with the diverse roles planners play. 'Planning' on its own is too cumbersome of a term to adequately describe what most planners do. Other words that better described the nature of the work of the interviewees were: explorer, collaborator, connector, communicator, community developer:

*"You're a facilitator, coordinator, interlocutor, all via communication."
(I-6)*

The key *communicative* aspect often seems to be missing in the notion of 'Planning', or the title of 'Planner', though it seems essential and fundamental to the present work of planners.

Many of the interviewees observed that there are different 'schools of thought' regarding the planning profession in Winnipeg. For example, one is more

along the lines of highly functional, highly rational planning, while another may be much more along the lines of community-based and community-driven planning:

“There are these different schools of thought in the profession. But it’s about the person – are you open...?” (I-3)

“There is sort of a divide and I don’t know how to bridge that divide. I think there is a real separation between the different types of planning.” (I-5)

These two ‘cultures’ of planning were expressed in a variety of ways: yin and yang, a balance (and subsequent imbalance), etc. Though each of the planner-interviewees straddle these planning cultures, often meshing the rational/functional with the communal/cultural, they all stressed the importance of the integration of the two worlds. It was also noted that it can be very difficult for single organizations to fulfill both of these roles. There has to be a balance and the contending interests must work together for successful outcomes:

“... You have to know the conventional perspective of the practical and the traditional – you have to be connected to them, and there needs to be a balance.” (I-6)

Describing one’s communicative role as something other than ‘planning’ may potentially be doing the profession a disservice. If planners who do not fit a more conventional description of ‘planning’ are not describing what they do as planning, then that could be considered to perpetuate a lack of understanding about the essential nature of the profession and its practitioners. Having more dialogue around the overlaps in different interpretations of planning could help bridge differences, and contribute to a better understanding of the different types of work that planners undertake.

Several of the interviewees felt their other-than-conventional planning work was accepted and acknowledged as legitimate planning in Winnipeg:

“There are different planning discourses and different modes of doing planning. People who are working in those gaps are providing a means for people to take part in existing mainstream planning.” (I-4)

Many felt that planners in Winnipeg are found in so many different roles, and perhaps because of this, other-than-conventional planning work is quite widely accepted in this city. However, there were also some interviewees who felt that the type of planning they were engaging in was not viewed as ‘high level planning’, based on experiences with other professionals who may be misunderstanding or missing the broad nature of the planning profession.

Though the research initially conceived the interviewees as ‘unconventional’, as the research progressed they came to be viewed probably more accurately as ‘other-than-conventional’ planners. Yet the interviewees themselves did not necessarily describe their planning practice in such ‘other-than-conventional’ terms. Some explored the terminology around conventional and unconventional:

“Conventional, to me, is working...from a structural perspective... Unconventional is not necessarily knowing the mechanics of those processes, but understanding the impact that that might have to the broader positioning of our values...” (I-6).

It was also noted that there seemed to be so many other planners in Winnipeg working in realms and sectors outside of zoning and land use regulation, that their work did not seem so other-than-conventional. Even within the government

sectors there appeared to be planners working in a variety of departments, conferring overlaps among planners – conventional or otherwise – in Winnipeg:

“I feel that having more of an understanding of how planning can cross over and touch all of these other aspects of our lives can be really important. In my mind, if planners in general had more of an understanding of some of the social and cultural issues ... that really directly influence planning and vice versa, then I think that could start to better inform my own work.” (I-7)

It was expressed that there perhaps needs to be a greater presence of planning for it to be further recognized for its integrated and holistic nature.

It was also observed that different types of planning – outside of land use planning for example – are not always so readily accepted or acknowledged in other cities. A distinction was made that, here in Winnipeg, there is so much other-than-conventional planning going on, that it does not seem unconventional anymore. This is because Winnipeg has very strong inter-related networks of planners and related organizations working in diverse realms. It was mentioned that some of these planners have counterparts in other cities where their work is not acknowledged as planning like it is in Winnipeg. The interviewees indicated that Winnipeg, and our professional planning body, should be very proud of this comparatively enlightened viewpoint, and work towards making the relationships and resourcing even better.

One aspect of this research was pursued via questioning along the lines of: how do you feel Winnipeggers view diversity; how does cultural diversity effect/affect your communicative planning practice in terms of collaboration; and

how is the ‘culture of planning’ viewed by yourself and others? The responses to these questions generated insight into both the positive and negative aspects of how cultural diversity affects planning practice. Moreover, the interviewees appeared to incorporate intercultural viewpoints on the integration of ‘the cultural’ and ‘the individual’.

5.2.4 Intercultural planning in Winnipeg

The collective-cultural aspect of this study was pursued by exploring the outward socio-structural aspects of the intersection of intercultural communication, city planning and diversity in Winnipeg. One interest in this line of questioning was to explore how these planners felt about Winnipeg as a collective culture becoming more intercultural through a positive embrace of the diversity advantage, in addition to exploring the role of planning – and planners – as agents of such interculturalism. The interviewees shared their perspectives on what makes a process intercultural, and how interculturalism can be cultivated in Winnipeg.

Through discussion and reflection, the interviewees indicated that the intercultural aspects of planning need to be addressed not only at the beginning of, but also throughout, the planning process. At the beginning, and even in pre-planning stages, planners must acknowledge the diversity that will likely be involved in the process, and efforts must be made to embrace the related differences, to aim for a thorough planning process and outcome. The interviewees offered that there must be an openness on the part of the planner for an other-than-conventional, perhaps intercultural, planning process to occur. It

was perceived that this ‘open’ mindset, or worldview, can lead the way towards opening up an authentic intercultural planning practice:

“All can take advantage of viewing through an intercultural lens and acknowledging and respecting different ways of being.” (I-1)

This mindset of accepting and learning from diverse perspectives, to potentially change one’s own viewpoint, is reflective of an intercultural outlook.

Further to changed personal worldviews, it must also be acknowledged that professional cultures such as planning may require a change in professional values for authentic intercultural planning to be fully enabled. One interviewee explicitly stated that planning is a culture, and the ways in which we undertake planning reflects this ‘culture’. Therefore, the planning that is practised is reflective of planners’ culture in relation to the broader social structure, or the wider culture. For planning practice to become more intercultural it was suggested that there should be recognition that all people are cultural beings, influenced by many diverse perspectives. One planner noted that if we are to plan interculturally, then we too – as planners as people – must be open to change in ourselves, and be positively challenged by the intersections with other cultures:

“Be prepared to have something new come out of the experience and [try] not to predict or predetermine what the outcome of that relationship might be... support the expression of that community in the form of planning.” (I-4)

Allowing the planning process to accommodate all parties, as well as allowing ourselves and our preconceived notions to be challenged, was perceived to be a large part of what it means to be working interculturally, for the interviewed

planners in particular. It was stressed that these processes need to happen naturally and organically; they cannot be over-planned or mandated.

Further to this 'open' outlook, the interviewees promoted use of an intercultural 'lens' and intercultural 'discourse' as potential routes towards better integration in our city-making endeavours. Viewing diversity as an opportunity rather than a challenge – an asset rather than a deficit – enables a more positive embrace of change in cities:

“I wish that the intercultural nature of our city could spread so that people do realize the value of that – that it’s not a negative, not something to be worried about (some people are worried about it just because it’s different) – but it’s actually a really positive thing.” (I-7)

In general, the interviewees had very positive outlooks on diversity and were unanimous in thinking that the only way to embrace diversity is through this asset-focused and opportunity-based outlook. However, it cannot be ignored that there are several challenges that accompany greater diversity. As previously mentioned, increased diversification is ultimately change from a status quo, and some people have a more difficult time grasping and embracing change than others.

Approaching planning through an intercultural lens was thought to be an appropriate and beneficial approach to pursue. One interviewee reflected on the common metaphorical distinctions around cultural diversity and integration: the tapestry versus the mosaic. Perceiving diversity as a tapestry rather than a mosaic connotes an interweaving of differences to create one whole that is stronger, larger and more valuable than each of its separate pieces. A mosaic connotes hard edges

bumping into hard edges. Ultimately, each of the ‘pieces’ in these metaphors are pieces of the same thing – threads or tiles – but it is the capabilities of these pieces that influence how they can integrate and become a whole. The same is true of our social structure: it is the capability and the adaptability of people, from their varied cultural bases, that will ultimately manifest in social cohesion and associated intercultural integration.

Along with the way integration is perceived, the discourse around ‘culture’ was thought to be very influential in intercultural planning practice. By changing the discourse and outlook from multicultural to intercultural, one can more readily conceptualize webs of integration experienced culturally:

“I like intercultural better than multicultural because it gets away from the idea that there are these different groups that you can organize. It’s more that you’re working within cultures and throughout cultures.” (I-5)

The language, and subsequent attitude of interculturalism can effect better integration throughout city life, in pursuit of a more whole – more than multicultural – more intercultural city.

Some of the interviewees offered that there is more to an intercultural city-making practice than simply a lens and discourse of interculturalism. Systems and structures that also reflect an intercultural city-making practice were outlined as crucial for the effectiveness of interculturalism. It was stressed by a few of the interviewees that there must be programming in place to positively and proactively sustain interculturalism in cities. Appropriate ‘languaging’ of interculturalism vis-à-vis multiculturalism for example can be a vehicle for new systems/structures and

cultures; a changed discourse can mean a changed worldview and vice versa. One interviewee especially stressed the role of planners as agents of change in these systems and structures.

All in all, inner humanitarian outlooks/insights were clearly reflected in the conversations around interculturalism with the interviewees. One mentioned that nearly all world religions have some rendition of the saying, “*Do unto others as you would have done unto you*” (I-2). Another interviewee stressed a human rights stance: all people have rights to the city and all need to be better included. One of the interviewees even stated that interculturalism is a part of Winnipeg’s history and began with the Métis Nation (I-2). Furthermore, some interviewees seemed to be of the view that Winnipeg as a collective must take greater responsibility and initiative in relation to some of the racism and inadequacies that are another dimension of diversity, and remedial initiatives were called for:

“If [diversity] is seen to benefit, then it’s celebrated, and it’s often a positive discussion around that in Winnipeg. And then there’s challenges. And I often wonder if it’s a discussion of who bears those challenges and who doesn’t... So how do we talk about that as a city and be accountable to that?” (I-4)

More conscious intercultural planning may enhance the collective capability to change the discourse of diversity in city settings:

“There’s this movement of a changing paradigm shift from multi- to inter-... When we change our way of thinking to inter-, then that for me is starting to change the dialogue... It’s very timely for this inter- evolution from multi-. Original policies of multicultural are from a viewpoint of segregation, it was all that we could wrap our heads around. Now, we’ve shifted the thought, because we can wrap our heads around something more.” (I-3)

Therefore, the concept of interculturalism through planning practice ties into the initial motivations that these interviewees had for pursuing a planning profession. That drive to work from a humanitarian perspective aligns with an intercultural outlook; a concern for attaining the associated competency, or sensibility will obviously help to foster intercultural communication in planning, and intercultural communication *as* intercultural planning.

In summary, the interviewees clearly touched on many points that were earlier reflected in the literature. A sense of the evolution from mono-, to multi-, to interculturalism was realized in regards to considerations of planning with cultural diversity in Winnipeg. The interviewees were open to the opportunities and challenges that ‘the three C’s’ present when working with diversity, yet the asset-based focus was always brought to the forefront, as was the ideal of collaboration as transcending, while including, the three C’s. The diversity advantage associated with intercultural collaboration, and the associated intercultural communication competencies have immense potential for enhanced planning practice in an increasingly culturally diverse Winnipeg.

5.3 Findings from the focus group

The World Café-inspired focus group was intended to gather planners with distinct planning experiences in the Winnipeg context, and to create a space for them to share their stories about working with diversity. The invited planners were selected on a perceived basis that they too ‘bridged cultures’ in their planning

practice in Winnipeg. Some participants were consultants working inter-professionally and inter-sectorally, some were advocates for social and political change, and some were public sector planners. Of the fourteen planners invited, eight were able to participate in the focus group. Several of the interviewees stated that a welcoming space for open dialogue was needed for multiple-perspective-taking, intercultural communication and collaboration to take place. This appeared to validate that a World Café-inspired focus group was conducive for fostering meaningful dialogue on the subject matter.

The intent of the focus group was for the researcher to gain insight into the participants' perspectives on planning processes in Winnipeg as they relate to collaboration, communication and cultural diversity. The themes that emerged from the focus group are mainly reflections on what was shared by the participants, as perceived through the researcher. Collectively, the participants discussed how the communicative practice of Winnipeg planners is affected by culture. Interestingly, the participants felt that their role in planning was in the interstices of diversity: as translators and navigators of 'cultures' in communicative processes. Adaptability was also stressed as a key competence while working in the interstices of cultures.

5.3.1 Reflections on the role of communication in planning

While discussing the various communicative roles that planners find themselves in, several participants mentioned their position as 'translators':

“People in general tend to miss each other – that lost in translation idea – that they can be so close but flying right by each other.” (P-6)

The participating planners agreed that they each practised a communication that was some form of translation between individuals and groups, however, the word ‘translate’ itself was contested. There appeared to be two viewpoints: one being that ‘translator’ was not an appropriate term to describe the role of planners because it connotes the power and ability to restructure information or to reframe discussion; and the second being that ‘to translate’ connotes an interest in the action-oriented process-based nature of planning:

“I think that planners have power and we have to think about how we want to use it... translation connotes that we are still in control of the information... it’s important to use our power at the front end to set up the right environment so that people will come together and talk to each other.” (P-3)

“I’ve found my job to be trying to get people to hear each other. So I like the word translate in a way because of that active thing you’re doing, but it’s not about the language so much as bridging that communication gap.” (P-6)

By discussing these different perspectives, the participants were able to think about and reflect on their role as a ‘translator’. Different words other than ‘translator’ were proposed to describe planners’ roles, one prominent word being ‘broker’. By thinking about the role as ‘brokering’ rather than translating, the participants were able to realize that the discourse we use to describe planners’ work is very important, especially as it relates to power. The question was asked by the participants: *How are we able to translate authentically when we each bring our own biases and values along with our translation of someone else’s words?* Upon reflection, at the very least, planners must recognize their power in

communication roles, and allow themselves to be challenged to operate differently because of this awareness.

Another brokerage role was discussed in situations where there are sometimes communities and individuals that cannot be reached by planners alone, because authentic relationships have yet to be developed. This was especially prominent when discussing ethnocultural communities that may view Canadian planners as a state-mandated authority figure, or an untrustworthy source of information. In those cases, the planner may need to engage in dialogue with an individual or an organization that they do have a relationship with that can then reach out to that particular community more authentically:

“People are often not familiar with you being someone they’ve never met, from a different culture, which means a whole bunch of different stuff like experiences, and different understandings of world community, relationships, trust – which may or may not be there.” (P-7)

This is setting the stage for intercultural communication, and another ‘broker’ is now involved in the intercultural interaction.

The planners’ role as translator was contested by some, as the discourse of ‘translator’ for them connotes power in the ability to change the message simply because one’s own values and biases are always at play in any act of translation:

“Typically, I find that people come to these conversations, let’s call them planning conversations, and they come to them with an idea or a thought or an opinion, and that opinion will often get in the way of them hearing somebody else.” (P-6)

Through reflection and changing the discourse from translator to broker, some participants felt that their role was then better described. The word ‘broker’

connotes the bridging nature of their planning practice. By bringing parties together to talk to one another, the broker is the common element. By being more thoughtful about the language and discourses used, planners can become more aware of the impact of their communicative role in practice.

If planners can truly act as communication brokers between different groups, then they are also acting as intercultural facilitators. By acting as the broker/bridge between cultures – with the aim of enabling dialogue, understanding, and an appreciative perspective taking between the groups – intercultural communication is practiced. As challenging as it may be, planners work towards facilitating these intercultural conversations. Likewise, planners may also require someone to help them broker ‘the planning culture’ with another ‘culture’.

5.3.2 Understanding and navigating ‘cultures’ and ‘worlds’ in practice

During the focus group, the participants were asked how their planning practice was affected by cultural diversity in Winnipeg. In discussing broad notions of culture, the participants began to use the word ‘worlds’ to describe different groups of people and their worldviews or frame of mind. Ideas of worlds and brokerage came together in describing planners’ communicative role: planners must broker between worlds to conduce genuine conversations, by working through the barriers that exist between these worlds that inhibit authentic dialogue. If planners are to broker between different worlds, their perspectives might be

influenced by another's, and vice versa. This would help bridge understanding between different worlds, from different perspectives. The focus group participants appeared to be of the view that, in Winnipeg, there seemed to be very little authentic communication between certain worlds.

Discussing the parallels between traditional notions of ethnic cultural diversity and the broader notion of 'culture as worlds', the participants were able to compare some of the obvious language challenges between ethnic groups with communication challenges of other cultural groups. Engaging people from diverse ethnic backgrounds should always be incorporated into planning processes in Winnipeg, because ethnic diversity plays such a prominent role – demographically and economically. However, engaging with diverse ethnic groups is, without exception, challenging for several reasons. When discussing experiences working with different ethnocultural groups, focus group participants noted some definite communication challenges:

“We can't assume that we know how to go into this area and that people are going to trust us – people from different cultural backgrounds – but also they don't know us and aren't familiar with us” (P-7).

Some of the participating planners had more frequent and direct involvement with diverse ethnic groups than others. Their experiences of challenging communication with different ethnic populations included the following: uncertainty of who the planner is and what their role is; fear of and hesitancy in being critical; suspicious as to why their opinions are being pursued; suspicion in regard to what the information shared would be used for; and an unwillingness to

share with someone they do not know, about a subject matter they may be suspicious of.

Trying to engage and converse with someone from a different ethnic background, who may be very new to Canada, depends on the way in which they are approached. Planners who work with new Canadians on a regular basis shared the advice that you have to build the relationship first. There has to be a trusting relationship already in place before individuals will openly share in an authentic way. If these relationships are not built at the beginning, any information shared may be inauthentic or invalid. Furthermore, planners need to acknowledge this crucial step in the planning process and recognize that, if not undertaken, the information shared may not be genuine. Therefore, there are additional steps to a planning process that strives to be more communicative and more intercultural while working with diversity.

There are also ethnocultural stereotypes that influence people's decision-making. Some groups are suspicious of each other because of ethnic stereotypes they have heard. However, the challenge appears to lie in putting aside our assumptions regarding ethnocultural diversity and recognize that no culture is homogeneous – it is made up of individuals:

“It sounds like the most important part of that is just being aware of it in the first place and not just assuming that everybody within a particular group is the same – cultures are so different. Having that awareness is probably the first step, then if you can do that and get the help of somebody else who can help bridge that gap, I think that's excellent...” (P-2)

It is essential for planners to recognize that, as with different ethnic or national cultures, these diverse ‘worlds’ also speak different ‘languages’ (i.e. engineers’ languages, developers’ languages, politicians’ languages, etc.). It is therefore important for planners to be able to generally understand – or be somewhat fluent in – many of these ‘languages’, to help bridge them. As was noted in a few of the key informant interviews, planners need to be “generalist specialists” – knowing at least a little about a lot of things – because their impact and influence is very broad, and the outcomes and processes are intertwined.

The languages of different ‘cultures’ and ‘worlds’ are evident when diverse people gather in planning conversations. In general, people come into planning conversations with preconceived ideas or opinions about the subject matter without hearing – and truly listening to – the opinion of another, or ‘the other side’ of the story. Planners typically find themselves in the bridging or brokerage role trying to get people not only talking to each other, but also listening to each other. Operationally, planners work to bridge cultures by building trusting relationships with each party, and generating empathy – if not outright compassion – between the parties:

“... As you build trust the communication becomes much easier and you slowly drop those barriers and start listening and hearing what the other is saying.” (P-6)

If the groups or individuals can empathize with each other, they can begin to understand each other and potentially even listen to one another. It was suggested that building empathy helps the two parties understand each other’s perspectives.

However, fostering empathy is not an easy or quick process, but requires time, trust, relationship-building and deep conversations – with the help of a planner in the middle.

Perceiving cultures as ‘worlds’ allowed the participating planners to reflect on their intercultural communication practice. By acknowledging that one’s communicative role is at the interface of different ‘worlds’, ‘languages’ and ‘cultures’, intercultural communication becomes a much more evident and explicit practice of planners.

5.3.3 ‘Planning’ is diverse and collectively misunderstood

While discussing ‘worlds’ and ‘cultures’, the ‘culture of planning’ was mentioned by the participants. By recognizing the diversity of the planners in the focus group, the participants observed that there are several different types of planners working in diverse realms of urban life. Because of this, it becomes very difficult to definitively and categorically describe what a planner does, what a planner is, and so forth. This leads to considerable confusion for those non-planners trying to understand what planners do. Moreover, not all planners have the same outlook on what planning is – the culture of planning is not homogeneous. Because planners are working in and between diverse worlds, there is an ongoing struggle to definitively outline what planning is. The participants stressed that there needs to be more overlap, connectivity and integration within the planning culture, to embrace and learn from all the different types of planning, as well as intersect with

other worlds so that they may better understand the integrative role that planning plays.

Within the broad and diverse planning culture, one of the key similarities that ties all planning practices together is communication. Though the extent and nature of the underlying ‘communication’ may range widely, all planning is in some way or other, communicative:

“Look around ... at what all the planners are doing: they’re sitting in the middle of a number of different stakeholders and interests. And we don’t tend to that by fluke, that’s where we have strength – a strength in listening to people... we help things get produced. [Planners] link thoughts and knowledge and input into something active.” (P-6)

This point really stresses the ‘inter’ – in-between, in the interstices, at the interface – role of planners. Practising intercultural communication to integrate appropriate knowledge and interests with action is outlined.

One of the features of a diverse planning culture, for the focus group participants, seemed to be a perceived lack of common identity among members of the profession. A reason for this may relate to many planners being able to easily ‘morph’ into the aforementioned bridging/brokering roles because of communication strengths. As planners find themselves working amidst diverse interests and stakeholders, and with every context and situation being different, perhaps it is difficult to explicitly and categorically state what ‘planning’ is. Planning’s various roles can certainly create uncertainty for others less familiar with the culture of planning. These uncertainties make others unsure of what skills planners can actually bring to the table. That being said, there are different types

of planners working in different types of planning roles, so not all planners will identify with the same skill-set and professional role. The participants did share that there seems to be a cultural divide of sorts within the planning profession between the land use/zoning/regulatory approach to planning, and the social/community approach to planning. This underlines how individual experiences and perspectives of group members may influence a culture (in this case ‘the culture of planning’); the perspectives of individual members of cultural groups cannot be assumed to be homogeneous.

The planning profession is thought not to have a more significant public profile in part because it is so diverse, but also because there are so many different roles that planners seem to fulfill in different areas. However, despite the lack of a concise coherent professional identity, there was a definite consensus that the focus group planners themselves viewed this quite positively:

“Part of the reason that we don’t have a greater profile is because of all these flavours, these subcategories of planning. Everybody has different perspectives and that’s a great thing about planning.” (P-5)

The ‘culture of planning’ is affected by the ways in which individual planners act and behave, to thereby influence and inform this culture. If planners continue to allow their personal experiences to influence their practice role in the planning culture, this may enable, and potentially effect, more intercultural planning processes. In terms of an intercultural communicative practice, enabling new dialogue and different perspectives through the demonstration of intercultural

competencies, has the potential to foster intercultural communicative planning practice. This intercultural planning practice is learned through experience.

The theme of adaptability of planners in practice was mentioned in the focus group discussion. Adaptability meant that being aware of context was key – in a cultural context especially. Planners need to be able to challenge themselves and the ideas they bring to the table, to facilitate different, appropriately nuanced, planning processes:

“...there’s no textbook/checkbox way of doing planning...”(P-4).

Planners have to be able to nimbly shift their cultural focus depending on each context and interaction – the way we talk, the questions we ask, and so forth. Planners need to cultivate an agility, to better learn from their cultural experiences and be more reflective in their practice. It was suggested that planners need to be self-evaluating and open to evolving, to better reflect the diversifying urban context.

5.3.4 Planning in a changing culture and social structure

As our cities continue to culturally evolve and effectively globalize, the communicative practices of planners must also embrace commensurate change, if an intercultural ethos is to flourish. In terms of planning with the multiple publics that constitute present-day Winnipeg, according to the focus group participants, it seems that there is probably not enough communication between diverse groups, in part because of insufficient opportunities for dialogue. Also, processes for

working towards more intercultural planning must be more consciously engaged. Furthermore, the main communication challenges seem to be cultural; accentuating intercultural competencies learned through well-reflected-upon experience can lead to the more authentic communication that seems to be necessary. These points made by the focus group participants may be considered to reflect how an outlook of interculturalism may advance practice and praxis.

5.4 Pointers for planning practice and praxis

5.4.1 Developing opportunities for dialogue in planning processes in Winnipeg: Designing spaces for intercultural city-making and placemaking

The participating planners pointed to a key systemic problem: there is not enough opportunity for two-way dialogue in planning processes in Winnipeg because there are not enough opportunities or venues for open discussion beyond formal consultation. Planning processes need to foster the opportunity for authentic intercultural dialogue. An important role for planners is to establish a climate for open and authentic discussion among diverse groups; this is what *planning as city-making* and placemaking on a city scale entails. Planners are also, therefore, agents of interculturalism and intercultural facilitators, convening conversations for people to talk with and listen to one another.

It was recognized that planners have the potential to create intercultural spaces – and thus help conduce prospective intercultural places – by bringing diverse groups together, to converse and to engage in mutual learning. It is possible that planners can be agents of, or media for, new forms and levels of

dialogue. However, it was identified that while planners are not only positioned to help create these intercultural spaces for intercultural communication, they must also continually learn from the interactions that take place in these spaces. The component of the process involving continual evaluation – embodying reflective practitioners at their best – cannot be forgotten. It was mentioned that planners seem to often currently miss that critical evaluation component of planning processes:

“... When people start mixing up and different families are [using a planned space], then we’re starting to talk about intercultural relationships. How is this space being used interculturally? I think that part of planning discourse is observing and seeing how space that has room for different uses is actually being used by people. To me that’s part of the continuing plan” (P-7).

As experience is such an important learning factor for self and professional development, the evaluation stage is that element of the process where one can learn from and be changed by the experience. It was suggested that this is an important aspect of the planning process, which can be learned by bringing people together in intercultural places.

5.4.2 Promoting the importance of the planning process

Planning is a process-based profession. It was indicated that this may be another reason why planning tends to be misunderstood, because it does not necessarily always produce a tangible product, such as an architect’s buildings or an engineer’s structures. If planners are to be better at what they do – engaging different cultures, creating the space for dialogue, to better understand and

embrace diversity – then the processes which planners undertake must include more elements along these lines. These processes require systematic change to achieve more intercultural communicative outcomes.

If planners are to be more aware of the cultures and worlds within which they work, then there needs to be at least a phase of the process that specifically aims at addressing some of these issues:

“So I’m saying that it’s maybe more challenging – easier said than done. But there’s a step involved there: what we do to try and make that happen.” (P-7)

It was stressed that the beginning stages of planning processes are crucial.

Research and trustworthy relationship-building at the beginning of a planning process can lead to better outcomes, manifesting a better understanding of the diverse perspectives involved in, or with stakes in, the planning project at hand:

“There were a lot of different pieces to the engagement puzzle of [a particular planning project], but the best ones that we had, looking back on them, were those ones where you actually did sit around a table, hash things out; you don’t agree on everything but you have a chance to have a real discussion.” (P-7)

Putting a face to organizations, groups and other stakeholders in a project is a good first step for the communities and planners to begin to learn about each other, and where they are all coming from. By engaging in communicative research at the front end of planning processes, planners would be using their power generatively, to create authentic conversations from the outset.

Also, if planners are to create holistic processes where diversity is involved, and if diverse publics can thereby hear, share and understand diverse

perspectives, people, planners and processes will be the better off for it in the end. The experience of growth and development, in individual and collective consciousness, creates the ability to enable a more intercultural approach to city-making. If diverse groups are not involved and engaged in meaningful ways, they will never be invested in planning processes or outcomes. The upfront pre-planning stages are so important, because planners need to know that they are going about planning in a way that is meeting the needs of the particular communities with which they are working.

Interestingly, the observation materialized in the focus group that planning processes in Winnipeg are rather reactive. This was an intriguing comment because, by nature, planning is proactive: yet in some systems and processes, planning ends up being more of an after-the-fact response:

*“I tend to find that planning is viewed as reactive rather than proactive and that can depend a little bit on your role in the system...planning [gets] inserted to help mediate an issue and help resolve it. So I do find that people tend to view planning as not facilitating or enabling, but almost a restrictive part of the process... [It's] unfortunate because planning should be proactive by nature... [but] we tend to be responding to things instead.”
(P-5)*

Though such a responsive role is indeed communicative, and in line with bridging diverse cultures, it would be more conducive to have planning and intercultural communication at the beginning, rather than more of a reaction at the end as a remedy for a problematic situation.

5.4.3 Accentuating intercultural awareness

Intercultural awareness was brought up as crucial to better understanding and engaging diverse groups, in addition to better understanding oneself as a person and as a planner. If it can be acknowledged that cultures and worlds are not uniform groups of people, and that individuals are potentially part of many diverse cultures, then that awareness can more directly influence planning practices:

“I think the outlook as sort of bridging and working within cultures, and sort of the idea that we work with groups and we share and communicate within them, as opposed to being that outside person that just hears from everyone. That definitely changes the way you do planning – it’s not just building communication with us as planners or with us in the process, it’s building relationships among others at the same time. That means you have to have a different process to do that.” (P-4)

As planners co-existing and co-labouring in a diverse city such as Winnipeg, one cannot assume to know definitively or authoritatively what others have been through. There must be the awareness and willingness to take the time to try and understand other perspectives and learn from one another.

If planners are more interculturally-informed, they can more readily recognize that culture is also representative of community. Then, when community is discussed, it can be acknowledged that there are multiple ‘communities’ within that community, which can even trickle down to the individual level. Consequently, the discourse of planning must change, in an attempt to be more inclusive of such multiple publics and complex communities: perhaps ‘culture’ should be treated similarly. Culture can potentially be broken down all the way to the individual level:

“Culture has so many levels and it’s really hard to talk about it just as community or just as individual. It also shifts... it’s always evolving.” (P-2)

How one’s personal experiences have influenced their lives, and how their outlook on their experiences has influenced their day-to-day interactions are very important to recognize:

“Whatever outlook you have always has an impact on what you do... All those things, whatever I see that day reflects and changes my own outlook definitely. I think that the successful part of that is when I allow it to, and I can become aware of it and understand how it’s impacting my work and almost pursue it in a way that I want to be changed by the people I’m working with. Whatever intercultural exchange I’m engaging in should influence the work that I’m doing and the way that I see planning...” (P-2)

Culture is fluid and always evolving, which makes it very confusing and complicated, but a realist might say ‘that’s just how it goes’ in our globalizing world.

Intercultural awareness was also brought up as a potential product of culture, through experiences, upbringing, and education. Perhaps intercultural awareness might be a generational – or *evolutionary* – capacity to recognize and acknowledge multiplicities within communities, within cultures. For example, it was brought up several times in the research that we cannot refer to ‘The Aboriginal Culture’ as such anymore. Within the aboriginal community in Winnipeg there are multiple different communities and individuals with different relationships, historical conflicts, and power relationships, to name but a few. These dynamic intricate relationships within communities, within cultures, must be acknowledged and influence discourse.

Furthermore, the intercultural outlook responds to the fact that there is no textbook way of doing planning: processes, contexts and cultures matter. The intercultural outlook suggests that we see ourselves and others as working within cultures, and bridging between cultures. We work and communicate within these realms, rather than outside of them or apart from them. Rather than being a planner that just hears from diverse people, planners should strive to recognize and work with and within diversity in more innovative ways. This is a different kind of planning: becoming a part of the process and building trusting and genuine relationships within this process, rather than existing outside of it. Engaging diversity allows for different perspectives because it opens a different window to try and see through. The intercultural outlook must inevitably impact one's work, because there is eventually the acknowledgement that different layers and logics are simultaneously in play in any given situation. If planners are able to pursue this intercultural outlook, and let it influence themselves and their work, then that would amount to success in a different way of doing planning:

"... This role of the planner as a communication broker, to draw on the knowledge interculturally, amongst cultures, multiple publics, etc. – if that's this thing we do, for me, it's been trial by fire... it's based on experience." (P-8)

This impacts one's professional development as a planner. Working interculturally means that everyone can begin to understand each other and learn from one another, and personal development is also naturally implicated.

5.4.4 *Engaging people at the emotional level*

Reaching out and engaging people ‘at the emotional level’ was explored as a better way for planners to ‘do planning’ in culturally diverse settings. Trying to make connections at that feeling level may be a way to help unduly defensive people lower their guard, making them more willing to openly engage. Planners could do this by changing the way they ask questions in their work:

“I didn’t hear you say, “Going out and asking people what they think;” you’re talking about what are your hopes and fears, and trying to connect on that feeling level could be a way to get people’s shoulders down and they might be more willing to open up.” (P-7)

Also, recall that building empathy was something that the planners had learned through their experiences of working to bridge diverse cultures. Finding that common feeling, or commonality in general, can be the basis of meaningful conversations. Engaging emotions through a more friendly planning discourse around storytelling may further the potential of intercultural communication.

In conclusion, the focus group participants relayed insightful experiences working with cultural diversity in Winnipeg. They warmed to the broad notion of ‘culture’ and were easily able to recognize the role culture plays in their work. The participants were also able to realize the potential of an intercultural outlook to planning, in part because better communication might be enabled through embracing this outlook. The participants, however, stressed the more systematic challenges that planning faces, such as mandated processes and limited resources. Perhaps a changed and more integrated approach, which is more inclusive of

intercultural communication, can help remedy some of the challenges that these planners seem to face.

All research participants were encouraged to conceptualize different aspects of their planning work with diversity in Winnipeg in intercultural terms. Their personal experiences with cultural diversity were seen to influence the outer outlook on one's planning practice. Experience was highlighted as the main route to learning about diversity; through more experiences, interculturalism might be better embraced. Furthermore, the participants also pointed to some of the intercultural competencies or enabling conditions outlined in the literature. Thus, through development of intercultural competencies, and through further experiences positively embracing cultural diversity, an intercultural planning might indeed emerge to advance intercultural city-making in the Winnipeg context.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations

Throughout the course of the research, the researcher was able to reflect on new concepts of culture, diversity and communication relative to the planning profession in the Winnipeg context. The research began with a keen interest in matters of cultural diversity, and led to learning about practicing intercultural communication; the experiences of planning practitioners in Winnipeg were pursued with these interests in mind. The key themes of the research were:

- Reflections on cultural diversity as unique experiences of individuals as well as groups;
- The challenges of navigating culture through communication aiming for collaboration;
- Acknowledging the important role of discourse in planning practice; and,
- Opportunities for intercultural planning through increasing awareness of planning processes and an accentuated intercultural awareness.

The participants also mentioned intercultural competencies throughout the research without being prompted to do so by the researcher, suggesting that these competencies are key when striving for intercultural communication in practice.

By revisiting the research questions, the following conclusions and recommendations have been developed.

6.1 Revisiting the research questions

The first set of research questions relate the concepts of culture and planning to the concept of interculturalism:

What is *intercultural*?

How do cities, citizens and city planners learn what it means to become intercultural? How must we reconceptualize ‘culture’ in order to become more intercultural? What are the key themes that Canadian planning professionals can learn from the literature on interculturalism? How might the concept be best mobilized in theoretical terms, and made operable in practical terms?

This foundational set of research questions was mainly explored through the literature review where the concept of ‘the intercultural’ was first addressed. Becoming intercultural, and learning what it means to be intercultural, involves a process of “self-reinvention” (Kim, 2001, p.70) and continual learning about difference: “...becoming intercultural is a gradual process of freeing one’s mind from an exclusive parochial viewpoint so as to attain a greater perspective on the more inclusive whole” (Kim, 2001, p.193). This research has conceived of ‘the intercultural’ as a distinct worldview and discourse regarding cultural diversity. It has been suggested that, in order for the outlook of interculturalism to emerge, the notion of ‘culture’ must evolve from its traditional meaning, and move beyond the compartmentalized nature of multiculturalism.

The broad framework of interculturalism naturally includes the notion that culture is beyond ethnicity and country of origin; it positively allows the nuances of diversity in a global day-and-age to be recognized. The terminology of the

intercultural is important. It is crucial to note that the prefix ‘inter-’ is a critical component of the concept, evolving from – yet reaching beyond – multicultural:

Multiculturalism promotes the coexistence of, rather than movement among, cultures. Multiculturalism maintains as a principle the current status of cultures involved, rather than expecting change from them. It addresses cultural traditions in more diachronic terms, turning history into a determining force. The multicultural reinforces the *exteriority* of cultures while the intercultural may create a (self-)conscious *interior* for them through the very process of exchange. The “inter-” in intercultural signifies not just the in-between, but particularly the active sense of interaction, confrontation, and even conflict. (original emphasis, Xie, 2011, p.6-7)

‘Intercultural’ also connotes an active process of inner self-growth, to learn to actively embrace the interactions of diverse perspectives, and value the importance of finding commonalities amidst our differences: “Interculturalism is about inclusion versus exclusion, belonging versus isolation, engagement versus marginalization, and is about everyone” (Ghorayshi, 2010, p.99). This can potentially be achieved through cultivating and deploying intercultural competencies in the realm of skills, attitudes and behaviours. An appreciation of the need for intercultural competencies was a main outcome of this research.

Canadian planners can learn from Leonie Sandercock’s (2004) writing on interculturalism, as she re-theorizes multiculturalism towards interculturalism (see section 3.3). Her view of interculturalism is that each and every person is a cultural being, fluid by nature, continually growing and changing through encounters with diversity; people who have rights and who deserve a full sense of belonging and community – without fear of difference (Sandercock, 2004). It is the common elements of our human co-existence that will help us embrace our

differences and learn from one another. This outlook of interculturalism is important for planners, and for Winnipeg planners especially, because the city has a history of ethnocultural conflict – as once inhabited by Aboriginal people, colonized by Europeans, the birthplace of the Métis Nation and a centre for international immigration for decades – causing problematic diversity with a penchant for multiculturalism. Interculturalism requires that we develop the capacity to see beyond the differences and pluralities of a multicultural city, towards the human commonalities of an intercultural city:

To learn to see, to hear, to be mindful of other people, to learn to be alert and open in perspective of diversity and not of differences, calls for the recognition and experience of otherness, experience that is acquired and that is *practiced*. (*added emphasis*, Abdallah-Preteuille 2006, p.478)

If this potentially idealistic theory of interculturalism is to be made operable there requires a shift in perceptions of culture, which leads to a better understanding and appreciation of diversity. This appreciation can then be developed through practiced competencies. These competencies may then foster interculturalism through intercultural communication, all the while recognizing that mutual and reciprocal change and growth is required for interculturalism to influence practice and become widespread. Though there may well be resistance to this perspective on sameness, the reality of the globalizing world ultimately calls for an evolved practice. Planners will need to continue to challenge themselves to practise intercultural communication in this global day and age.

The second set of research questions shifts from a concern with interculturalism in general to address the particular practice of intercultural

communication in planning processes in Winnipeg. This set of questioning was pursued through the participating planners' responses to targeted questions regarding their experiences working with diversity in Winnipeg.

What is significant about specifically *intercultural* communication?

How can planners learn, and therefore operationalize, key aspects of intercultural communication - in order to better engage diverse publics in planning processes, to ideally gain the 'diversity advantage', to help make Winnipeg an intercultural city? What are the opportunities and challenges of this practice?

Throughout the interviews and focus group, the explicit terminology of intercultural communication was not used at the outset, but was gradually introduced via the notion of 'bridging cultures' (or 'bridging the cultural gap'), and this typically was anticipated to take the form of a particular kind of communication. By introducing the topic this way, participants were able to try to conceive of their communicative work as 'bridging diverse cultures'. From here, the intercultural terminology seemed to emerge, making more sense of the essentials of their practice.

Intercultural communication is especially significant for the practice of Winnipeg planners because the city is so culturally diverse: communication necessarily plays such a critical role in planning, and the planning profession is often inter-disciplinary. This research was pursued to help achieve a better understanding of how planners can bridge culturally diverse perspectives. Intercultural communication most basically denotes the challenges that emerge from communicative encounters around diversity. With a multiculturalism

viewpoint, ethnocultural conflict and language barriers in the public realm can easily be perceived. However, with a move towards embracing interculturalism through intercultural communication encounters, the aim is to learn about differences and focus on higher-level similarities.

A notable example of intercultural communication in planning practice came from one of the participating planners who has extensive experience working particularly with ethnocultural diversity. A key element of their practice is aiding the integration process by enabling newcomers to Canada to comfortably discuss their lives and experiences, and thereby learn about someone different than themselves, from a different country and culture. For some immigrants, this may be one of the first conversations that they have had with someone very different from themselves. This planner has witnessed on numerous occasions the rewarding conversations and stories taking place, where common ground is being reached intercultural – between the cultures represented. Other research participants suggested that more of such venues for authentic intercultural conversation are necessary.

It was posited that intercultural communication is a learned practice, reinforced by lived experiences. This was proven by the responses of several of the participating planners. It was also suggested that perhaps planners find themselves in this communicative brokerage role, because communication is a strong and necessary skill of planners. Planners have an inherent proactive nature in a discipline that is inherently diverse and inter-professional. Intercultural

communication, expressed broadly as ‘bridging cultures’ through communication, was something with which all participants identified.

The positive and asset-focused outlook of the ‘diversity advantage’ was agreed by the participants as a necessary outlook for better engaging diversity. It was stressed that conceptualizing diversity as an asset and opportunity, rather than a challenge, will enable innovative outcomes simply because diversity represents *change*. If we are living amidst change, we constantly need to diversify innovatively; however, such practice does not come without its challenges.

The challenge of a communicative intercultural planning practice is that people ‘come to the table’ with different opinions and preconceived notions, depending on their worldview and culture(s). Likewise, planners come to that same table, and Healey (2006) reminds us that we can no longer be “value neutral” (p.29) in these practices. The participating planners observed that discussing matters on a personal emotional level might be a way to achieve commonalities through more trusting relationships and dialogue. Also, building empathy between people with diverse perspectives was viewed as a challenge for planners in intercultural situations. It was noted that diverse people can be so close to each other – even when talking to each other – but they completely *miss* each other, simply because they are not *listening* and *understanding* where that other person is coming from. A brokerage and bridging role is therefore a fundamental component of intercultural planning practice. Another challenge for planners is

the evolution of practice to directly and explicitly incorporate an intercultural perspective in communicative work.

The third and final set of research questions looked at the intersection of the intercultural in terms of a collaborative planning practice, and the necessary competencies to better enable its practice. This set of questioning was addressed by a meshing of the research methods: the literature, and the empirical data from participants in both the interviews and the focus group, with the latter grounded in the Winnipeg context.

What are the implications in particular for *intercultural collaborative planning* as a field of professional practice, and what might this entail, in terms of new competencies, capacities and sensibilities for planners, seeking to operationalize intercultural communication through more collaborative processes?

What potential does the notion of *interculturalism* merit as the necessary venue for authentic collaboration?

It has been identified that the intercultural outlook towards diversity in planning practice is indeed a rewarding avenue of practice for better relationship-building, better informed publics, greater authenticity, and opportunities for continual learning and development, all through positive encounters with diversity. It may be concluded that other-than-conventional planners, especially, are already practicing intercultural communication in Winnipeg. *With the three C's in mind, might intercultural communication become the venue for more authentic collaboration?* The research suggests that, since intercultural communication engages issues of cultural conflict, and if the intercultural outlook is indeed open

and appreciative of diverse perspectives, then practising intercultural communication in a diverse setting has the potential to realize collaboration, rather than merely cooperation or coordination. Communication in the context of collaboration is more likely to be a form of intercultural communication, where diverse cultures and perspectives are involved.

Furthermore, for interculturalism to be regarded as the ideal and necessary context for intercultural communication, and likewise for authentic collaboration in planning practices, then planners must have both an intercultural awareness as well as competency in intercultural communication. The related competencies may take the form of skills, knowledge and attitudes that are learned through experience, if one is open enough to allow them to influence their practice. There are generally twelve intercultural competencies as identified by Messner and Schäfer (2012.): self-awareness, appropriateness, self-confidence, effectiveness, motivation for success, changing perspective, empathy, open-mindedness, communication ability, tolerance, sensitivity, and flexibility (p.193). The participants volunteered all of these acquired competencies throughout the course of the research.

Without the researcher directly discussing these particular intercultural competencies, they were discussed in the participants' experiences with diversity. For example, *self-awareness* was expressed as acknowledging the power and privilege associated with our roles as planners. This awareness must influence planning processes and discourses for intercultural communication to authentically

take place. *Appropriateness* towards diverse audiences and contexts was something that planners needed to be aware of when working with diverse cultures. *Self-confidence* in knowing that planners have a degree of expertise in a matter is important, yet planners need to be open-minded and have the confidence to allow themselves to be changed because of diverse perspectives. Likewise, all people come to the table with degrees of expertise in some way or other, so creating an environment to effectively communicate differences and similarities is beneficial for intercultural communication and collaboration. To the participating planners, *effectiveness* meant knowing the audience, and crafting a methodology into something that will be well received by that particular audience in a genuine way. As well, the preplanning and research stages of planning processes are so important in the effectiveness of plans: planners should place high value on their processes for effective results. *Motivation for success* was noted as the driven nature of some planners who were very passionate about the work that they do, and their driving desire to challenge systemic boundaries in pursuit of change.

Changing perspectives was a key theme for much of this research project. The participating planners were very aware of different perspectives present ‘around the table’, yet it was a difficult task in bridging the diverse perspectives. *Empathy* was highlighted as a critical competency throughout the research, particularly as a strategy to achieve intercultural understanding. One planner in particular stressed that building empathy between diverse peoples is a way to help better understand the perspective of another. *Open-mindedness* is most definitely

a key intercultural communication competency and was expressed by some in the research as the only way to really appreciate diversity. *Communication ability* was an obvious topic of this research. However, it was also observed that, as planners, our discourse is cumbersome and confusing. Becoming clearer and more accessible was suggested as something that planners needed to work on.

Tolerance, unlike most of the other competencies, was not something that came up naturally from the conversations with the participating planners. However, one planner in particular discussed a process strategy that has been learned through practice working with diverse groups. At the very outset of a planning process, while people are gathering together, there needs to be a shared set of 'ground rules' for the process. These ground rules set the stage for discussion, and revolve around the theme of mutual respect. This can be seen as a tool for developing tolerance in diverse groups while planning. *Sensitivity* was expressed as a necessity when working with diversity because one can never be fully aware of another's life or their perspectives. By being sensitive to the emotional lives of others, this might lead to lifting some of the barriers that may lie between people. The participating planners expressed *flexibility* and adaptability as crucial competencies in order to attempt intercultural communication and collaboration with diverse cultures. They also mentioned that planners need to adapt to the different people and groups involved in planning processes by effectively adapting to each situation.

Through learning, sharing and practicing intercultural competencies, intercultural communication has the potential to foster more genuine collaboration for more successful planning processes. The more people are genuinely involved in matters of their city, the more successful planning processes will become. Similarly, the interculturalism that is the foundation for this practice, if realized, may have the positive and asset focused perspective that globalizing cities require for growth – in form, consciousness, and innovation – through bridging cultures.

6.2 Lessons learned and recommendations for future research

Upon reflection, many important lessons were learned through the course of this research. Firstly, this was an opportunity for the researcher to delve into an unfamiliar, yet personally interesting, topic area. It was an opportunity for professional growth in communicative planning with diversity in Winnipeg. There is much more to interculturalism and intercultural communication that this project could simply not do full justice to. However, the ways in which intercultural communication is being embraced by other professions and in other fields, such as education, business and healthcare, encourages a hopeful outlook for the planning profession and its city-making colleagues.

Moreover, this project was an opportunity to introduce an interesting topic to some planning practitioners in Winnipeg, for their reflective practice consideration. An innovative research technique was also experimented with, and was deemed successful. The World Café approach was successful in engendering

open and insightful conversation amongst different types of planners working to uniquely bridge cultural diversity through communication. The participants indicated that a comfortable setting ‘around the table’ is a necessary venue for authentic conversation to occur. They commented that the setting created for the focus group was conducive to open dialogue. However, a challenge of the World Café, if used as a research method, is for the researcher to adequately find the fine balance between the role of the host/participant and that of a facilitator. The importance of active facilitation is necessary for the group to stay on the research topic.

Another rewarding lesson from the research was that Winnipeg planners are very open to, and appreciative of, different ways of ‘doing planning’. Since planners by nature tend to be action-oriented, there was a strong desire on the part of participants to learn how to work better amidst diversity. They were eager to explore different avenues of professional development, and to learn more about intercultural communication, and what it demands in terms of competencies. The participants were eager to develop further skills for operationalizing collaborative efforts with the potential for collective impact. This was a very positive outcome of the research.

Furthermore, as this research project was exploring the personal experiences of planners in both individual and collective settings, further research on intercultural communication in planning could take the form of participant observation in a specific context or planning process. Perhaps observing and

evaluating an innovative planning process, for the presence of intercultural communication competencies in action, might spur further in-depth consideration of planning amidst diversity. It might involve observing a planning process that features an inter-disciplinary team in an ethnically and economically diverse neighbourhood. Though participant observation is a time-intensive research method, learning-by-doing is the ultimate avenue towards more effective intercultural communication for results rich in perspective-taking insights.

Another recommendation for further research came from a few of the participants; again, it was rooted in the action-oriented nature of planning. The idea of full-on collaboration, and the associated collective action, was regarded as a distinct challenge in planning processes – *how do we work towards action through collaboration?* Perhaps different structures need to be in place for both collaboration and collective action to take place in Winnipeg's planning processes. This question around collaborative action is certainly recommended for further exploration.

6.3 Conclusion

In these globalizing times, families, workforces and cities are diversifying to an unprecedented degree. In a city such as Winnipeg, already rich in ethnic heritage with displays of arts-based culture, all the while experiencing investment in growth by immigration, the importance of integrating diversity into the city's overall structure is crucial. As city-making planners, who help shape the face of

cities, how can the embrace of cultural diversity be learned and collectively shared? The response must include multiplying and broadening perspectives, while focusing on the cultural assets of the city as the locus of a complexity of diversity. The concept of interculturalism has the potential to be a particularly fruitful venue for seeking to harness the ‘diversity advantage’ for cities.

Based on a targeted review of the literature, and in-depth conversations with a sample of other-than-conventional Winnipeg planners, the following conclusions may be offered. Firstly, the personal outlook of interculturalism relative to the diversity advantage has great potential in a diverse city such as Winnipeg:

The idea of intercultural personhood has profound relevance for our time of great uncertainty. People the world over are being challenged to adapt to an unprecedented acceleration of technological, social, and cultural change and to discover ways to live more cooperatively together. (Kim, 2001, p. 234)

Secondly, Winnipeg’s diversity is perceived as celebratory of difference; however, this is often only when that diversity is seen as advantageous. As globalizing citizens, more Winnipeggers need to become more responsive in relation to some cultural groups for an intercultural outlook to be effective. As van Leeuwen (2010) suggests: “...notions of intercultural citizenship often focus on the ethical dimension of citizenship” (p.639). Thirdly, planners are working as ‘culture-bridgers’, helping to fill gaps in the city’s civic infrastructure and to repair tears in its social fabric. These planners, most notably, appear to be intercultural communicators. Fourthly, intercultural communication competencies can be

learned when one is ready; they must be recognized and adopted for one's practice to be advanced. Finally, if intercultural communication is authentically practised, there is a greater potential for a truer form of collaboration to be achieved.

In summary, this research project represents a positive linking of intercultural communication, diversity, and city planning in Winnipeg. It may be concluded that there is an important role for planners in diversifying Canadian cities: planners who are open to learning and sharing different processes to better embrace cultural diversity. The broad and all-encompassing notion of culture can lead to more thorough understanding between people, for truer intercultural communication to take place. By embracing this view of culture while practising intercultural communication, planning processes have the potential to be more collaborative. All in all, the Winnipeg planners who participated in this research are working towards a more 'intercultural' planning with such communication as the focus of their practice.

References Cited

- Abdallah-Preteceille, M. (2006). Interculturalism as a paradigm for thinking about diversity. *Intercultural Education*, 17(5), 475-483.
- Achugbue, E. (2005). *Multiculturalism and planning: Lessons from Vancouver*. Retrieved from DSpace@MIT dspace.mit.edu, March 28, 2013.
- Acocella, I. (2012). The focus group in social research: Advantages and disadvantages. *Quality & Quantity*, 46, 1125-1136.
- Afshar, F. (2001). Preparing planners for a globalizing world: The planning school at the University of Guelph. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 20, 339-352.
- Allan, M. (2003). Frontier crossings: Cultural dissonance, intercultural learning and the multicultural personality. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 2, 83-110.
- Allmendinger, P. & Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2002). The communicative turn in urban planning: Unravelling paradigmatic, imperialistic and moralistic dimensions. *Space & Polity*, 6(1), 5-24.
- Berry, J.W. (1991). Understanding and managing multiculturalism: Some possible implications of research in Canada. *Psychology & Developing Societies*, 3, 17-49.
- Berthoin Antal, Ariane & Friedman, Victor J. (2008). Learning To Negotiate Reality: a Strategy for Teaching Intercultural Competencies. *Journal of Management Education*, 32, 363-386.
- Brouwer, M. A., & R., Boros, S. (2010). The influence of intergroup contact and ethnocultural empathy on employees' attitudes toward diversity. *Cognition, Brain, Behavior. An Interdisciplinary Journal*, XIV(3), 243-260. Retrieved from <http://nursingworld.org/MainMenuCategories/ANAMarketplace/ANAPeriodicals/OJIN/TableofContents/vol132008/No1Jan08/CulturalLens.html#Paniagua>.
- Burayidi, M. (2003). The multicultural city and planners' enigma. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 4(3), 259-273.
- Canada, Government of. (2010). *The current state of multiculturalism in Canada and research themes in Canadian multiculturalism 2008-2010*. Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

- The Canadian Chamber of Commerce. (2009). Immigration: The Changing Face of Canada. Policy Brief, *Economic Policy Series – February 2009*. <http://www.chamber.ca/images/uploads/Reports/economic-immigration-0209.pdf> Retrieved on May 28, 2013.
- Chan, K. (2003). Inner hybridity in the city: Toward a critique of multiculturalism. *Global Economic Review: Perspectives on East Asian Economies and Industries*. 32(2), 91-105.
- Chase, S. (2011). Immigrants should adopt Canadian values to settle here, survey finds. *Globe and Mail*, Wednesday, November 16, 2011.
- Chen, G-M., & Starosta, W.J. (2008). Intercultural communication competence: A synthesis. In Asante, M.K., Y. Miike & J. Yin, (Eds.), *The global intercultural communication reader* (p.215-238). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, 9, 119-161.
- Denise, L. (1999). Collaboration vs. c-three (cooperation, coordination, and communication). *Innovating* (Reprint), 7(3). Retrieved from <http://www.ride.ri.gov/adulteducation/Documents/Tri%20part%201/Collaboration%20vs.%20the%203c's.pdf>, August 17, 2012. (Pages 1-6 unnumbered)
- Economic Development Winnipeg Inc. (2011). *Winnipeg cultural industries: Grow brighter creative and clever*. Winnipeg, MB: Economic Development Winnipeg Inc.
- Enviroics Institute. (2011). *Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study: Winnipeg report*. Toronto: Enviroics Institute.
- Florida, R. (2005). *Cities and the creative class*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fraser, H., & Schalley, A. C. (2009). Communicating about communication: Intercultural competence as a factor in the success of interdisciplinary collaboration. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 29(1), 135-155.
- Garang, R. (2012). Integration and settlement: The experiences and expectations of African immigrants and refugees. Do Canadians understand the potential consequences of success or failure in integrating and settling African immigrants and refugees? Winnipeg Harvest Inc. Retrieved from <http://winnipegharvest.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/2012-ALL-report-African-July-2012.pdf>.
- Ghorayshi, P. (2010). Diversity and interculturalism: Learning from Winnipeg's Inner City. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 19(1), 89-104.

- Goosen, M. (2009). Cooperation, coordination, collaboration: Asking the hard questions. *Kansas Inservice Training System (KITS) newsletter*, 18(4). Retrieved from <http://kspreschoolpartners.org/how-do-partnerships-get-started>.
- Grant, J. (2011). Storytelling, group dynamics, and professional cultures: Lessons from a focus group study. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 12(3), 407-425.
- Gray, D. E. (2009). *Doing research in the real world*, Second Edition. London: Sage.
- Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1992). Beyond “culture”: Space, identity, and the politics of difference. *Cultural Anthropology*, 7(1), 6-23.
- Healey, P. (2006). *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies, 2nd Edition*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hofstede, G. (2012). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. In Samovar, L.A., R.E Porter and E.R McDaniel (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader, thirteenth edition*, (p.19-33). Wadsworth: Boston.
- Innes, J. E. (1998). Information in communicative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 64(1), 52-63.
- Irving, A. (1993). The modern/postmodern divide and urban planning. *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 62(4), 474-487).
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Jackson, J. L. (2008). Toward and ethnographic lingua franca. Communication and Anthropology. *Journal of Communication*, 58, 664-678.
- Khan, M.E., Anker, M., Patel, B.C., Barge, S., Sadhwani, H., & Kohle, R. (1991). The use of focus groups in social and behavioural research: Some methodological issues. *World Health Statistics Quarterly*, 44, (1-6 unnumbered).
- Kim, Y. Y. (2008). Intercultural personhood: Globalization and a way of being. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32, 359-368.
- Kim, Y. Y. (2001). *Becoming intercultural: An integrative theory of communication and cross-cultural adaptation*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Landry, C. (2000). *The creative city: a toolkit for urban innovators*. London: Earthscan.

- Landry, C. (2006). *The art of city-making*. London: Earthscan.
- Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (2008). *Theories of human communication, Ninth edition*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Lloyd, S., & Härtel, C. (2010). Intercultural competencies for culturally diverse work teams. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(8), 845-875.
- Lorinc, J. (2006). *The New City: How the crisis in Canada's urban centres is reshaping the nation*. Toronto, ON: Penguin Canada.
- Maginn, P. J. (2007). Towards more effective community participation in urban regeneration: the potential of collaborative planning and applied ethnography. *Qualitative Research*, 7(1), 25-43.
- Manitoba, Government of, Manitoba, Labour and Immigration, Immigration Division. (2011). *Manitoba immigration facts - 2010 statistical report*. Manitoba: Government of Manitoba.
- McDaniel, E.R., Samovar, L.A., & Porter, R.E. (2012). Using intercultural communication: The building blocks. In Samovar, L.A., R.E Porter and E.R McDaniel (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader, thirteenth edition*, (p.4-18). Boston: Wadsworth.
- Messner, W. & Schäfer, N. (2012) Advancing Intercultural Competencies for Global Collaboration In Bäumer, U., P. Kreutter, and W. Messner (Eds.), *Globalization of Professional Services*, (p.189-201). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Montuori, A. (2005). Literature review as creative inquiry: Reframing scholarship as a creative process. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 3(4), 374-393.
- Morgan, D. (2008). Snowball Sampling. In Lisa M. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. (pp. 816-817). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- New Oxford American Dictionary*. (2005). 2nd edition, Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Paniagua, C. T., & Taylor, R. E. (2008). The cultural lens of genomics. *OJIN: The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*, 13(1), Manuscript 5. Retrieved from <http://ana.nursingworld.org/MainMenuCategories/ANAMarketplace/ANAPeriodicals/OJIN/TableofContents/vol132008/No1Jan08/CulturalLens.aspx>.
- Patel, F., Li, M., & Sooknanan, P. (2011). *Intercultural communication: Building a global community*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

- Qadeer, M. (1997). Pluralistic planning for multicultural cities: The Canadian practice. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63(4), 481-494.
- Rahder, B., & Milgrom, R. (2004). The uncertain city: Making space(s) for difference. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research. Canadian Planning and Policy Supplement*, 13(1), 27-45.
- Reeves, Dory. (2005). *Planning for diversity: Policy and planning in a world of difference*. New York: Routledge.
- Rittel, Horst W. J., & Webber, Melvin M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155-169.
- Ross, C. L. and Leigh, N. G. (2000). Planning, urban revitalization, and the inner city: An exploration of structural racism. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 14, 367-380.
- Saldana, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. (2nd ed.). Sage Publications Ltd.
- Sandercock, Leonie. (2004) Reconsidering multiculturalism: towards an intercultural project. In Wood, Phil (Ed.), *The Intercultural City Reader*, p.372. UK: Comedia.
- Sandercock, L. (2003). *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel cities of the 21st century*. London: Continuum.
- Sandercock, L. (1998). *Toward cosmopolis*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Schieffer, A., Isaacs, D., & Gyllenpalm, B. (2004a). The world café: Part one. *Transformation*, 18(8), 1-7.
- Schieffer, A., Isaacs, D., & Gyllenpalm, B. (2004b). The world café: Part two. *Transformation*, 18(9), 1-9.
- Shuter, R. (2008). The centrality of culture. In Asante, M.K., Y. Miike & J. Yin, (Eds.), *The global intercultural communication reader* (p.37-43). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Statistics Canada. (2013a). Immigration and Ethnocultural Diversity in Canada. *National Household Survey, 2011*. Canada: Minister of Industry. Retrieved from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-010-x/99-010-x2011001-eng.pdf>.
- Statistics Canada. (2013b). Aboriginal peoples in Canada: First Nations people, Métis and Inuit. *National Household Survey, 2011*. Canada: Minister of

- Industry. Retrieved from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/index-eng.cfm?HPA>.
- Statistics Canada. (2011). Focus of geography series, 2011 Census: Census metropolitan area of Winnipeg, Manitoba. Retrieved from <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-cma-eng.cfm?LANG=Eng&GK=CMA&GC=602>.
- Statistics Canada (2006). City of Winnipeg Census Profiles 2006. Retrieved from <http://winnipeg.ca/census/2006/City%20of%20Winnipeg/>.
- Throgmorton, J.A. (2003). Planning as persuasive storytelling in a global-scale web of relationships. *Planning Theory* 2: 125-151.
- The World Café. (2008). A quick reference guide for putting conversations to work... Retrieved from <http://www.theworldcafe.com>.
- Tourism Winnipeg. (2013). 101 things to do in Winnipeg in Spring/Summer. Retrieved from <http://www.tourismwinnipeg.com/101-things-to-do>.
- Tsuda, Y. (2008). The hegemony of English and strategies for linguistic pluralism: Proposing the ecology of language paradigm. In Asante, M.K., Y. Miike & J. Yin, (Eds.), *The global intercultural communication reader* (p.167-178). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.
- United Way of Winnipeg. (2008). *Urban Reflections: Winnipeggers have their say about our city and its direction*. Winnipeg: United Way of Winnipeg.
- United Way of Winnipeg. (2010). *Eagle's Eye View: An environmental scan of the Aboriginal community in Winnipeg, 2nd Edition*. Winnipeg: United Way of Winnipeg.
- van Leeuwen, B. (2010). Dealing with urban diversity: Promises and challenges of city life for intercultural citizenship. *Political Theory*, 38, 631-657.
- Weiming, T. (2008). Mutual learning as an agenda for social development. In Asante, M.K., Y. Miike & J. Yin, (Eds.), *The global intercultural communication reader* (p.329-334). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Winnipeg Arts Council. (2013). Winnipeg Cultural Map. Retrieved from www.winnipegculturalmap.ca.
- Winnipeg Arts Council & DIALOG. (2011). Ticket to the future phase 2: A cultural action plan for Winnipeg. Retrieved from <http://www.artsforall.ca/images/uploads/general/TTTTF2%20for%20Web%200611%20rev.pdf>

- Winnipeg, City of. (2013). Winnipeg's History: Historical Profile of Winnipeg. Retrieved from <http://www.winnipeg.ca/services/CityLife/HistoryOfWinnipeg/HistoricalProfile.stm>)
- Winnipeg, City of. (2012). The community trends report: Selected demographic and economic information, April 2012. Winnipeg, MB: City of Winnipeg.
- Winnipeg, City of. (2011). OurWinnipeg. Winnipeg, MB: City of Winnipeg.
- Witty, D. R. (2002). Professional Practice Manual. Canada: Canadian Institute of Planners.
- Wood, P. K., & Gilbert, L. (2005). Multiculturalism in Canada: Accidental discourse, alternative vision, urban practice. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(3), 678-691.
- Wood, P., Landry, C., & Bloomfield, J. (2006). *Cultural diversity in Britain: A toolkit for cross-cultural co-operation*. Comedia. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.praxisinstitut.de/motzko/downloads/pdf/2702.pdf>.
- Wood, P., & Landry, C. (2008). *The Intercultural City: Planning for diversity advantage*. London: Earthscan.
- Xie, Ming. (2011). *Conditions of comparison: reflections on comparative intercultural inquiry*. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.

Appendix I: Research Summary

Research Backgrounder

For the Information of Participants

Research Project Title:

Intercultural Communication, City Planning, and Diversity in Winnipeg MB

Principal Investigator: Johanna Washchyshyn

Advisor: Dr. Ian Wight

Preamble

The study I am pursuing – as a City Planning Graduate Student at the University of Manitoba – is entitled, *Intercultural Communication, City Planning, and Diversity in Winnipeg, Manitoba*. You are being asked to participate in this research project because:

- you have a professional education background in some aspect of planning;
- your line of work and outlook on the planning profession is thought to be mainly out-with the more conventional/mainstream realm (land use planning, regulation and development control);
- your practice can be considered mainly communicative, and ‘bridging’ between cultures and sub-cultures (broadly defined).

Project Background

I am proposing to look inwards at the culture of city planning in Winnipeg, conceiving planners as potential agents of collaborative intercultural communication to creatively embrace diversity.

I aim to contribute to the professional practice of city planning in Winnipeg – a city seeking to creatively embrace its diversity through the following investments:

1. Immigration: Enhancing Our Cultural Mix

- The Provincial Government is largely responsible for the immigration process to Manitoba through the Provincial Nominee Program, which is itself a unique and very successful program: “With the success of the Provincial Nominee Program, which began in 1999, Winnipeg’s immigration has quadrupled and for 2011 saw over 13,000 immigrants arrive in the City” (City of Winnipeg, 2012, p.2). Winnipeg is the sixth

most popular Canadian destination for newcomers for a second year in a row in 2010 (Manitoba, 2011, p.8).

- These immigrants are now adding to the population of first-, second-, and third-generation Canadians in Winnipeg – a city, workforce and culture *already* rich in ethnic heritage. *With this desire to substantially boost population through immigration, what are the implications of this for planning amidst the associated increasing cultural diversity?*

2. *A Growing Aboriginal Culture: Respecting Our Indigenous Roots*

- Winnipeg also “has both the highest concentration and the largest number of Aboriginal people out of large Canadian cities” (City of Winnipeg, 2012, p.4) – a young and growing population also requiring attention in the urban setting. *In what ways can Winnipeg better embrace and integrate Aboriginal culture?*

3. *Culture on Display for Consumption: Celebrating Our Cultural Assets*

- Winnipeg is celebrated and even marketed as an arts and culture city through events and festivals such as Folklorama, Culture Days, and was nominated the Cultural Capital of Canada in 2010. *What do these festivals and events really portray about ‘culture’ in Winnipeg?*

4. *Unconventional City Planning Initiatives: Leading Edges of the Mainstream?*

- Public planning initiatives for Winnipeg (i.e. *OurWinnipeg*, *Ticket to the Future* Phases 1 and 2 by Winnipeg Arts Council, and the United Way’s *Urban Reflections*) often highlight cultural diversity as a key priority, and especially as an economic asset. *What can be learned from these planning documents and the planners who work to develop them?*

On these grounds, I believe this research could be very important for Winnipeg at this time – to explore ways how the city may be *enhanced* through its increasing cultural diversity, rather than be unduly challenged by the associated changes.

I am interested in how people can be better enabled to not only co-habit and co-exist, but ‘co-labour’ – collaborate – in our evermore globalizing cities of the 21st century, where extra-ordinary communication has become essential, to better address the diversity encountered at every turn. How can we not only better communicate with one another, but truly collaborate through a deeper understanding of other perspectives – in this case, regarding urban planning issues – but also in all facets of our lives.

How do we plan – in, for, and with – such hitherto unprecedented cultural diversity? How do we plan ‘in-between’ – in the interstices, in between a multiplicity of cultures, interculturality? What new worldview is needed to better ‘welcome the world’ to our cities? What capacity needs to be developed, to

commensurately evolve notions of planning professionalism and a more global citizenship?

To provide context, part of this research will explore a distinction between the ‘Three C’s’ – cooperation, coordination and communication – versus collaboration, in the ‘intercultural’ context. For this, I turn to Leo Denise (1999) as a starting point. Communication is how people understand one another through the broadest array of human interactions and experiences. The problems of communication generally take the form of a ‘lack of communication’ (rather than a lack of *listening*). By contrast, collaboration is a creative process where something new emerges from the communication, rather than a mere exchange of information. Interestingly, Denise mentions: “If we use this rigor to define collaboration, we will use the word much less frequently to describe what we do” (1999, p.3). In this research project, I aim to look at different ways of communicating – in the context of exchanges and understandings between different people each with different perspectives and *cultures* - as a competency that can ultimately lead to new levels and forms of collaboration in planning processes (i.e. more than cooperation and coordination).

Planning, as a professional practice, is essentially communicative, valuing knowledge, information and action, but privileging their *integration* – their working together – *ideally* in the form of the above-mentioned collaboration, manifesting a high level of ‘multiple publics’ participation. The multiplicities in play are increasingly cultural in constitution; the operative milieu for practice is becoming *intercultural* – where the prefix *inter-* denotes “between; among; mutually; *reciprocally*” (New Oxford American Dictionary, 2005). The earlier confines of cultural homogeneity no longer pertain; diversity abounds, and demands new practices, new capacities, and new sensibilities. *What does this mean for the profession of planning, for the education of planners, for the development of professionals in the increasingly diversifying and globalizing cities of Canada?*¹

Collaborative multiple-publics participation – in this new operative milieu – in my opinion, requires enhanced intercultural communicative capacity that must be learned and cultivated. A recent *Globe and Mail* article (*Immigrants should adopt Canadian values to settle here, survey finds*) states that 97 per cent of new Canadians as well as long-time residents agree that immigrants should accept and adopt Canadian values upon arrival into Canadian society (Chase, 2011). This has spurred thoughts about societal integration and Canada’s multiculturalism policies; just because these policies exist, is our social project called ‘multiculturalism’ really working? Is there more to multiculturalism than tolerance? Is more than multiculturalism called for? *What are the implications for planning practice, especially in an ethno-culturally diverse city such as Winnipeg, with increasingly*

¹ See notes for intentionally deleted excerpt

diversifying communities, publics, and workforces? Anticipating the need for planning processes that are appropriately communicative and collaborative, how might the capacity for diversity be more creatively embraced, and in particular operationalized, in professional planning practices?

Upon reviewing the theoretical literature on ‘multicultural planning’ (Sandercock, 2003), collaborative planning (Healey, 2006) and the communicative turn (Allmendigner & Tewdwr-Jones, 2002) in urban planning, the term *intercultural* surfaced, but was seldom thoroughly defined as a concept. I aim to explore more fully what is meant, or intended, by reference to the ‘intercultural’, through a review of literature where the term appears, especially in the context of communication and collaboration. I hypothesize that *intercultural communication* represents a particularly informative linkage of planning theory and planning practice, to help bridge cultures.²

In a city setting, according to Wood and Landry (2008), in their book, *The Intercultural City*, cultural diversity is the key to achieving innovation – economically, through increased global awareness and flexibility, and creatively through diverse perspectives – it is what the authors identify as the “diversity advantage” (p.41). Wood and Landry propose that the diversity advantage can only be operationalized in Intercultural Cities, that is, cities that value the capacity for cultural diversity and intercultural exchange, and which harness these conjunctions as a positive source of creativity and innovation for global city competitiveness. As a city that celebrates its cultural diversity, in the centre of a politically multicultural Canada, *is Winnipeg an Intercultural City that successfully operationalizes its cultural diversity to its advantage as a global urban centre?* I hypothesize that Winnipeg city planners – broadly defined – are potential agents enabling Winnipeg’s emergence as an Intercultural City. Given this, *what are the competencies and capacities that planners will need to learn and acquire, to realize an Intercultural Winnipeg – to make it operational?*

Key Research Questions

- How do cities and citizens (and therefore, city planners) learn what it means to become intercultural? What is *intercultural*? How must we (re)conceptualize ‘culture’ in order to become more intercultural? What are the key themes that Canadian city planning professionals can learn from the literature on interculturalism? How might the concept be best mobilized in theory terms, and made operable in practice terms?
- What is significant about specifically *intercultural communication*? How can planners learn, and therefore operationalize, key aspects of intercultural communication - in order to better engage diverse publics in collaborative planning processes, to ideally gain the ‘diversity advantage’,

² See notes for intentionally deleted excerpt

to help make Winnipeg an Intercultural City? What are the opportunities and challenges of this practice?

- What are the implications in particular for *intercultural collaborative planning* as a field of professional practice, and what might this entail, in terms of new competencies, capacities and sensibilities for planners, seeking to operationalize intercultural communication through more collaborative processes? Is the notion of *interculturalism* the necessary venue for authentic collaboration?

Notes

Integral Theory was an initial interest for this research, and informed parts of the research proposal. As the research continued, it was decided that this theoretical element would remain an outside interest rather than form part of the documentation. The following excerpts were initially part of the research summary, and have become endnotes in the appendices of the final document.

¹ I propose to research how planners can enhance their capacity to communicate *interculturally*. ...in part through embracing an integral approach to their planning work. According to Ken Wilber (2000) *integral*: "...means to integrate, to bring together, to join, to link, to embrace. Not in the sense of uniformity, and not in the sense of ironing out all the wonderful differences, colors, zigs and zags of a rainbow-hued humanity, but in the sense of unity-in-diversity, shared commonalities along with our wonderful differences" (Wilber, 2000, p.2). In this approach, higher principles of humanity prevail, as each moment and interaction can be conceptualized by acknowledging that "there are at least four irreducible *perspectives* (subjective, intersubjective, objective, and interobjective) that must be consulted when attempting to fully understand any issue or aspect of reality" (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009, p.2). I maintain that, by achieving an enhanced capacity for intercultural communication – especially in conjunction with an integral approach to practice, and a larger world-centric perspective – planners will be much better positioned to contribute more authentic collaborative processes, more aligned with the emerging intercultural reality. Their city planning may be evolved into intercultural city-making, where cities such as Winnipeg can truly 'welcome the world' into their midst's.

² ...to better enable more integral forms of communication - via collaboration - in what might currently be regarded as 'post-conventional' forms of professional planning practice.

References

Allmendinger, P. & Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2002). The communicative turn in urban planning: Unravelling paradigmatic, imperialistic and moralistic dimensions. *Space & Polity*, 6(1), 5-24.

Chase, S. (2011). Immigrants should adopt Canadian values to settle here, survey finds. *Globe and Mail*, Wednesday, November 16, 2011.

- City of Winnipeg. (2012). *The Community Trends Report: Selected Demographic and Economic Information*, April 2012. Winnipeg: City of Winnipeg.
- Denise, L. (1999). Collaboration vs. c-three (Cooperation, Coordination, and Communication). *Innovating* (Reprint), 7(3). Retrieved from, <http://www.ride.ri.gov/adulteducation/Documents/Tri%20part%201/Collaboration%20vs.%20the%203c's.pdf>. August 17, 2012. (Pages 1-6 unnumbered)
- Esbjörn-Hargens, S. (2009). An overview of integral theory: An all-inclusive framework for the 21st century. *Integral Institute*, Resource Paper No. 1, 1-24.
- Healey, P. (2006). *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies*, 2nd Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Manitoba, Labour and Immigration, Immigration Division. (Summer 2011). *Manitoba Immigration Facts - 2010 Statistical Report*.
- New Oxford American Dictionary. (2005). 2nd edition, Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Sandercock, L. (2003). *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel cities of the 21st century*. London: Continuum.
- Wilber, Ken. (2000). *A theory of everything: An integral vision for business, politics, science, and spirituality*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- Wood, P. & Landry, C. (2008). *The intercultural city: planning for diversity advantage*. London: Earthscan.

Appendix II: Semi-Structured Interview Guidelines

Intercultural Communication, City Planning and Diversity in Winnipeg, MB

Introduction: Winnipeg is rich in cultural diversity – a trait often celebrated and positively regarded in official public discourse. However, it can be argued that the planning practices and processes in Winnipeg are not fully embracing broad notions of cultural diversity and associated intercultural collaboration imperatives. While cultural diversity is thought to positively effect innovation in cities, there are issues for the planning profession in better dealing with diversity, by constructively bridging cultures. I am looking to currently practicing planning professionals – with these particular interests – to help me explore these issues. In particular, I am looking to explore the realms of planning on the edge of, or out-with, ‘mainstream’ planning (normally defined as physical land use planning, zoning, subdivision and development control). I hope to find out what and how they feel about communication, cultural diversity, and planning (including processes and practices) in Winnipeg at the present time.

Research Objectives: The purpose of this research is to satisfy the Major Degree Project requirement of the Master of City Planning degree at the University of Manitoba. Through investigation of the potential and prospects for better collaborative processes in Winnipeg, drawing on an improved competence in intercultural communication in planners, the intent of this research is to examine linkages between planning amidst cultural diversity, and communication theories. I am exploring issues relating to achieving collaboration amidst increasing cultural diversity, how planners can become better equipped to foster intercultural collaboration, and – generally - what might be entailed by positioning planners as being in the intercultural city-making business, creatively embracing diversity.

Consultation & Methods: My intention is to consult particular planning practitioners – on the edge of or out-with mainstream planning – in the Winnipeg context. I seek to gain an understanding of the implications of seeking to achieve collaboration amidst diversity, the ideal pre-conditions, and especially the improved competencies required to establish intercultural collaboration via communication. I want to explore: how these practitioners found themselves in their professional positions on the edge of, or out-with, mainstream planning; what their experiences have been practicing in this way; and what they have ‘learned by doing’ as regards intercultural communication and collaborative planning competence – potentially without knowing it.

Confidentiality & Consent: Participants will not be identified by name in the thesis. However, there is the potential that they may be identifiable based on their line of work, the experiences identified, and their choice of words. These

confidentiality issues will be outlined at the onset of the research, upon recruitment of participants, as well as in the consent forms. Dissemination of interim results from interviews will also be provided to participants; if there are any requests for further privacy at this point, the researcher will address them accordingly. Interviews will be recorded digitally, if permission to record is granted by the participant. Hand-written notes will be taken for each interview in any case. If permission to record is not granted, only notes will be used. Data gathered during the research process will be stored in a password-protected file on the researcher's personal computer. Only the researcher will have access to the files and information. Physical notes will be kept in a filing cabinet in the researcher's locked home. All data gathered will be destroyed at the conclusion of the thesis project (December 2012). Consent will be obtained from participants in writing. An overview of research results will be given to all participants for review prior to the conclusion of the thesis project. The full thesis will be made available to those who are interested, in PDF format by email.

Semi-Structured Interview Guide: By way of a preamble, to open the interview, I will advise the interviewee that I am interested in their 'story' about what they have been making of themselves, professionally, since completing their planning education.

- You are a planner by professional education; how/why did you get into planning education?
- How would you describe your current job/line of work/contribution in professional planning terms?
 - o Are there any aspects of your work that you identify as 'bridging cultures', broadly defined?
 - o Communicate as a mediator between cultures, broadly defined?
 - o Find yourself learning about other cultures, broadly defined, through active and appreciative communication?
- Did you think that your planning education would bring you to this type of outside-the-mainstream planning work? How/why did you get into this type of work?
- How do you describe yourself? As a planner? As something else? As a planning professional? As a professional?
- Do you think the mainstream planning profession members in Winnipeg consider what you do to be planning? Few? Some? Many? Most? Why?
- Do you consider yourself as 'pushing the boundaries', 'breaking new ground' (or some equivalent phrase) in the Winnipeg planning profession context?
- What have you noticed of importance that you have 'learned by doing' - by being 'on-the-job' especially as it relates to culture and communication amidst culture - that was not necessarily a product of your planning education?

- What would you advocate for, in planning education and/or professional development, to better support the line of planning work you find yourself in.
- Thinking back to some of the planning theory you may have encountered, and combine that with your work experience, to what extent do you feel that planning is and/or should be a communicative act, linking knowledge and action? Please elaborate.
- How do you feel that your 'Winnipeg', in cultural terms, views diversity, broadly defined? As no big deal? As just ethnic diversity? As more than a multiplicity of cultures? As an aspiring intercultural city? Or what?
- In what ways do you perceive cultural diversity in Winnipeg? Is it positive, appreciative and respectful, or not?
- What has been your experience with cultural diversity in Winnipeg? What have you come to know better through your work?
- What particular challenges do you face – working outside the mainstream – when professing your planning in the diverse, culturally complex, present-day Winnipeg context? ... thinking especially of intercultural communication and collaboration...
- In what ways might Winnipeg planners such as yourself be better supported in your work? ...Bridging cultures? ...Raising the bar? ... Creatively embracing diversity? [However you care to define the challenge/essence of what you do]
- How do you feel about characterizing what you do as an aspect of creative intercultural city-making? (Mentioning the Wood and Landry books if necessary). Please elaborate.
- Are there any other matters you would like to raise/suggest that I might wish to incorporate in this research?

Appendix III: World Café-Inspired Focus Group Guidelines

Intercultural Communication, City Planning and Diversity in Winnipeg, MB

Introduction: Winnipeg is rich in cultural diversity – a trait often celebrated and positively regarded in official public discourse. However, it can be argued that the planning practices and processes in Winnipeg are not fully embracing broad notions of cultural diversity and associated intercultural collaboration imperatives. While cultural diversity is thought to positively effect innovation in cities, there are issues for the planning profession in better dealing with diversity, by constructively bridging cultures.

Through a focus group, I am looking to host a conversation between currently practicing planning professionals – with these particular interests, to help me explore these issues. In particular, I am looking to explore the realms of planning on the edge of, or out-with, ‘mainstream’ planning (normally defined as physical land use planning, zoning, subdivision and development control). I hope to find out what and how they collectively feel about communication, cultural diversity, and planning (including processes and practices) in Winnipeg at the present time. In addition, with their input, I hope to explore better approaches to communication and collaboration in an intercultural context, including ideas for enhancing competency in intercultural communication and collaborative planning.

Research Objectives: The purpose of this research is to satisfy the Major Degree Project requirement of the Master of City Planning degree at the University of Manitoba. Through investigation of the potential and prospects for better collaborative processes in Winnipeg, drawing on an improved competence in intercultural communication in planners, the intent of this research is to examine linkages between planning amidst cultural diversity, and communication theories, especially communicative planning theory. I am exploring issues relating to achieving collaboration amidst increasing cultural diversity, how planners can become better equipped to foster intercultural collaboration, and – generally – what might be entailed by positioning planners as being in the intercultural city-making business, creatively embracing diversity.

Consultation & Methods: My intention is to consult a group of particular planning practitioners – on the edge of or out-with mainstream planning, representing a broad cross-section of sectors - in the Winnipeg context. I seek to gain an understanding of the implications of seeking to achieve collaboration amidst diversity, the ideal pre-conditions, and especially the improved competencies required to establish intercultural collaboration via communication. I want to explore: how these practitioners found themselves in their professional positions on the edge of, or out-with, mainstream planning; what their experiences

have been practicing in this way; and what they have ‘learned by doing’ as regards intercultural communication and collaborative planning competence – potentially without knowing it. The group discussion will help to indicate important common themes and patterns. It will take the form of a World Café.

Confidentiality & Consent: Focus group participants will not be identified in any way, other than their identified sector of work (public, private, nonprofit, etc.). They will not be identified by name in the thesis. However, there is the potential that they may be identifiable by non-participants - based on their line of work, the experiences identified, and their choice of words. These confidentiality issues will be outlined at the onset of the research, upon recruitment of the focus group participants, as well as in the consent forms. Dissemination of interim results from the focus group will also be provided to participants; if there are any requests for further privacy at this point, the researcher will address them accordingly. The focus group discussion will be recorded digitally, if permission to record is granted by all the participants. Hand-written notes will be taken in any case. If permission to record is not granted, only notes will be used. Data gathered during the research process will be stored in a password-protected file on the researcher’s personal computer. Only the researcher will have access to the files and information. Physical notes will be kept in a filing cabinet in the researcher’s locked home. All data gathered will be destroyed at the conclusion of the thesis project (projected December 2012). Consent will be obtained from participants in writing. An overview of focus-group-related research results will be given to all participants for review prior to the conclusion of the thesis project. The full thesis will be made available to those who are interested, in PDF format by email.

Focus Group Interview Guide: Briefing materials (a backgrounder – see Appendix I) on the research topic will be distributed to participants prior to the focus group. The agenda for the discussion may include revisiting some of the themes raised in the individual interviews, but now being addressed in the collective focus group context.

By way of a preamble, to open the focus group, I will advise the participants that I am mostly interested in common aspects of their ‘story’, about what they have been making of themselves, professionally, since completing their planning education.

- As planners by professional education; how/why did you get into planning education?
- How would you describe your current job/line of work/contribution in professional planning terms?
 - o Are there any aspects of your work that you identify as ‘bridging cultures’, broadly defined?
 - o Communicate as a mediator between cultures, broadly defined?

- Find yourself learning about other cultures, broadly defined, through active and appreciative communication?
- Did you think that your planning education would bring you to this type of less-than-conventional/outside-the-mainstream planning work? How/why did you get into this type of work?
- How do you describe yourself? As a planner? As something else? As a planning professional? As a professional?
- Do you think the mainstream planning profession members in Winnipeg consider what you do to be planning? Few? Some? Many? Most? Why?
- Do you consider yourself as ‘pushing the boundaries’, ‘breaking new ground’ (or some equivalent phrase) in the Winnipeg planning profession context?
- What have you noticed of importance that you have ‘learned by doing’ - by being ‘on-the-job’ - that was not necessarily a product of your planning education?
- What would you advocate for, in planning education and/or professional development, to better support you generally in the line of planning work you find yourself.
- Thinking back to some of the planning theory you may have encountered, to what extent do you feel now that planning is and/or should be a communicative act, linking knowledge and action? Please elaborate.
- How do you feel that your ‘Winnipeg’, in cultural terms, views diversity, broadly defined? As no big deal? As just ethnic diversity? As more than a multiplicity of cultures? As an aspiring intercultural city? Or what?
- In what ways do you perceive a positive appreciation and respect for cultural diversity in Winnipeg? Or not?
- What has been your experience with cultural diversity in Winnipeg? What have you come to know better through your work?
- What particular challenges do you face – working outside the mainstream – when professing your planning in the diverse, culturally complex, present-day Winnipeg context? ...thinking especially of intercultural communication and collaboration...
- In what ways might Winnipeg planners such as yourselves be better supported in your work? ...Bridging cultures? ...Raising the bar? ... Creatively embracing diversity? [However you care to define the challenge/essence of what you do]
- How do you feel about characterizing what you do as an aspect of creative intercultural city-making? (Mentioning the Wood and Landry books if necessary). Please elaborate.
- Are there any other matters you would like to raise/suggest that I might wish to incorporate in this research?

In addition the focus group will be encouraged to discuss the following matters:

- How do you think that the 'ideal' city (alluded to by Wood and Landry) - The Intercultural City – might be operationalized through planning practices? (look for mentions of collaboration and communication, and probe for more depth)
- What are the advantages/limitations of an approach emphasizing 'embracing the diversity advantage' in the Winnipeg planning context? (What other framings, or qualifications, might merit greater consideration, to better capture the Winnipeg situation at this time?)
- What do you think of this type of conversation-style focus group (World Café) as a vehicle for intercultural communication in the Winnipeg context?
- What developments in the planning profession and/or planning education merit consideration to improve planning practice in the arenas of intercultural communication and collaboration? (What has to change? How should such change be pursued?)

Appendix IV: Sample Consent Form

Statement of Informed Consent

Research Project Title:

Intercultural Communication, City Planning, and Diversity in Winnipeg MB

Principal Investigator (and contact information):

Johanna Washchyshyn

Research Supervisor and contact information:

Dr. Ian Wight

This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

1. Purpose of the Research:

The purpose of this research is to satisfy the Major Degree Project requirement of the Master of City Planning degree at the University of Manitoba. The project is titled, *Intercultural Communication, City Planning, and Diversity in Winnipeg, Manitoba*. The purpose of this project is to identify how the concept of interculturalism may help create a deeper understanding of diversity in the Winnipeg setting, and through this understanding a better framework for collaboration - through intercultural communication - may be enabled. There is particular concern for the development of intercultural communication competence in professional planners, framing their practice as intercultural city-making - fostering innovation through creatively embracing diversity.

2. Procedures:

You are being asked to participate in an interview and/or focus group addressing matters relating to collaborative planning amidst cultural diversity in Winnipeg. The interviews and focus group are intended to clarify and illustrate the role of planners and the planning profession in relation to better collaborative outcomes that more fully embrace cultural diversity. The interview is expected to take forty-five minutes, while the focus group is expected to take an hour and a half. The total potential time required of you will be approximately two hours and fifteen minutes. Interviews will be recorded and notes

taken. The project is expected to include a minimum of ten key informants/focus group participants from various planning backgrounds in Winnipeg.

3. Recording Devices:

With your permission, interviews will be recorded digitally to ensure an accurate record of responses. Hand written notes of the interview will be taken. If you do not wish to be recorded, only these notes will be used. You will not be identified in the project documentation. All audio files and interview notes collected during the research process will be stored securely, and destroyed upon completion of the project.

4. Risk:

There are no particular risks or benefits to you in participating in this study. There are no risks associated with this project beyond normal everyday risk. The study does not address personal or confidential issues. The study asks only for your professional knowledge and opinion about planning amidst diversity in Winnipeg. However, you should be aware that the general role you play in the Winnipeg context will be identified. As such, it may be possible for those with knowledge of the city and planning processes/professionals to infer your identity. As well, given the small pool of relevant participants, a participant might be identified by their choice of words used in the thesis. Participants will benefit professionally by learning more about collaborative processes through insight on intercultural communication competence in planning processes, as an outcome of this research.

5. Confidentiality:

Your privacy is important. You will not be personally identified in the thesis document. Data gathered during the research process will be stored in a password-protected file on the researcher's personal computer. Only the researcher will have access to the files and information. Physical notes will be kept in a filing cabinet in the researcher's locked home. Recordings of interviews and notes taken will be secured during the project and destroyed at project completion, expected in December, 2012.

6. Credit or Remuneration:

There is no credit, remuneration, or compensation for participant involvement in this study.

7. Debriefing:

A summary of research results will be made available to all participants. For those who are interested, the final completed Major Degree Project will also be made available. Feedback will be provided by email in PDF format.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and /or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence.

Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation. The University of Manitoba Research Ethics Board(s) and a representative(s) of the University of Manitoba Research Quality Management / Assurance office may also require access to your research records for safety and quality assurance purposes. This research has been approved by the Joint Faculty Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact any of the above-named persons or the Human Ethics Coordinator (HEC) at 474-7122. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

Participant's Signature _____ Date _____

Researcher's Signature _____ Date _____