

# 9P Planning: Overcoming Roadblocks to Collaboration in Intercultural Community Contexts

**Marcella LaFever**

California State University Stanislaus

1 University Circle

Turlock, CA 95382 USA

+1 530 554 2543

MLaFever@csustan.edu

## ABSTRACT

Encouraging involvement in local, regional and national communities in order to develop a healthy democracy is a laudable goal for society. The present paper investigates positions of power and dominant ideologies as they relate to communication roadblocks that inhibit the representation of marginalized cultural groups in collaboration and decision-making processes in multi-cultural communities. In this research, interviews with professional planners working in intercultural community contexts were analyzed utilizing a framework of five actions identified by Paolo Freire that must be taken by the oppressor in order to enter into solidarity with the oppressed. From this analysis I describe a holistic planning model for overcoming communication barriers in order to increase social inclusion of marginalized cultural groups in collaborative efforts.

## Keywords

Inclusion, dialogue, planning, oppression

## ACM Categories

A.2 General Literature; REFERENCE

## INTRODUCTION

Within current public decision-making processes, there is generally an expectation of assimilation for aboriginal, immigrant, refugee and other cultural groups experiencing Diaspora. For example, in North America there is generally an expectation that individuals will speak up and take a public stand if they have something important to say [6]. For many groups this is not a culturally appropriate way to deliberate on issues. Differing communication norms such as this one are exasperated by feelings of being an outsider and result in a reluctance to become publicly involved in community development processes. The issue of non-participation impacts local, municipal, state, provincial, national and international communities in planning, development and decision making processes.

Utilizing data from in-depth interviews, the purpose of the present paper is to identify and analyze issues of power and oppression as they act to sustain dominant culture interests as groups attempt to create structures that empower co-culture<sup>1</sup> participants in public dialogue and decision-making. I am not interested in assimilation of non-dominant co-cultures into the dominant culture but rather ways that communication structures can be changed in the dominant culture to equalize the ability to participate from all community members. Therefore the research question in the present study is: How must communication processes in traditional public planning be changed in order to increase social inclusion of non-dominant cultural groups in public decision-making?

## COLLABORATION AND PUBLIC DECISION-MAKING

Communication, as a whole, can be described as a social process that constructs a meaningful cultural world and serves to produce, maintain, and understand reality as a system or container for human action. For example, within group decision-making, a decision is constituted through interaction, mediated by member's reactions as influenced by the social process and individual background. Each individual has a set of identities, beliefs, values, goals and ideologies by which they interpret the objects and actions around them [11]. Because each individual is different, there must be interaction with others to come to a common understanding of any particular object or act. Communication is a process of socially constructing common meanings and norms for interaction between individuals and groups [10]. This social construction of meaning is mediated by societal systems, historical context, and cultural background.

When people come from a widely varying set of societal systems, historical contexts, and cultural backgrounds, the

---

<sup>1</sup> The term co-culture is taken from co-culture communication theory as presented by theorist Mark Orbe [9] who explains that it is "based on the belief that [North America] is a [continent] of many cultures, each of which exists simultaneously within and apart from other cultures...over time one co-culture...has acquired dominant group status in the major societal institutions."



was concerned with the inclusion of voices of First Nation's members, was having a much harder time understanding the need to be re-educated and voices an experience of negative effects without understanding the connection to the need to change her view of the world.

Diane: What I find is really frustrating in the process is that it seems that the First Nations...when its an issue that involves First Nations...those people who are involved with the board are really focused on their First Nations stuff but when it comes to talking social rights and environmental rights, or even industrial rights (for other than First Nations)...its almost as if they haven't been listening to everything else that's been going on, but when its their turn, we all have to stand up and take notice. Everything should stop. OK now we're talking about indigenous people's stuff...everything should stop.

Diane doesn't want to have to suffer through listening to something that a historically marginalized person is compelled to voice as part of his or her own process of humanization.

### **Demonstrating Trust**

Freire [5] speaks about demonstrating trust in several different ways. He speaks specifically of learning to listen. Freire states that if we do not truly learn to listen to each different group we can never really learn how to speak. Learning to listen entails the need of the dominant "to silence themselves so that the voice of those who must be listened to is allowed to emerge...[because] none of this would make sense if the educator does not understand the power of his or her own discourse in silencing others (p. 306)."

For example Diane stated that she had a problem with First Nations people came to the table with what she assumed would be values about 'preserving mother earth' and that she saw her group as "bringing everybody together so that we can have a common goal and we can have a good understanding of moving things forward for the betterment of the entire (global) community or family" and was disappointed when it seemed the First Nations member's goal was to "get the forest and get the economic rights to it".

Trusting, through the process of listening, came up in several of the interviews during this research project. Primarily because non-dominant groups engaged in or demanded to have, their own processes of dialogue, involving exclusively their own members, before coming to the table with the dominant group. Not only do these entities have to have processes that connect listening to results but the dominant culture members must remain engaged with the processes even when the non-dominant co-culture is not present.

### **Remaining Engaged**

One piece that is essential is recognition of the long-term nature of the relationship between dominant and non-dominant [7]. The concept of relationship as central is

demonstrated in what Freire says about not being tourists of the oppressed.. The relationship upon which the dialogue must pivot is one of long-term solidarity, not one where the dominant group can just pick up and leave when the hardships get to be too much.

The following example ties the act of listening and experiencing negative effects, to the tendency of the dominant group to withdraw from any process that they do not like.

Jaime: There were probably between 150 to 200 (Native American) participants who actually came... we decided to take it to the nations and Navajo opted to host us so we went to Window Rock. We spent an entire day listening to their needs and their concerns... It was very strenuous for our executive. They will never do that again. They'll never convince them to do that again.

The dominant group made some effort to broaden the method of participation and were willing to let that process be determined by the non-dominant group, but they *suffered*, and were not willing to do it again even if it was productive and worked for the non-dominant participants.

### **Praxis**

For Freire there is no such thing as dialogue that does not include action. The combination of reflection and action is the essence of praxis. Praxis is tied to trusting of the oppressed in that when trust is lacking, any initiation of what is supposed to be dialogue will quickly become talking at or instructing the non-dominant, therefore continuing the oppression. Praxis encompasses many issues, including communication structures, ideologies, individual stakes, and conflict.

One way of creating this undesired monologue is to utilize bureaucracy in the process of hearing. Two examples come out of my research:

Jaime: I think the third (public dialogue forum) really tied everything together...The sad part about it was that the timing of it was so terrible The regional executive committee changed it five times because they wanted a format...show us a format of what this thing is going to look like; what's this summit conference going to look like? What are you going to try and do? So every time it got sent back for revisions, redoing, they changed the date.

and from another's experience:

Will: We had a lady on our board of directors, from (a nearby town), just recently resigned...[She] was always frustrated by [the use of parliamentary procedure] because that wasn't part of her culture. Our North American culture limits them within the organization, because she wanted to chair a

subcommittee but didn't want to use the rules that we were using. We never resolved it.

Unwillingness to change communication structures to adapt to a different way of engaging in dialogue acted as a way of silencing non-dominant groups and maintaining the power and privilege of the dominant culture.

Freire also states, "we must explore every possibility to change reality democratically. We have to take advantage of the space we have in order to challenge...Dialogue characterizes an epistemological relationship. I engage in dialogue because I recognize the social and not merely the individual character of the process of knowing. 6, p. 379]". In the democracy of North American societies we have the best opportunity to take advantage of having the kind of dialogue that Freire talks about. If we can utilize underlying principles of our societies that say we need to have everyone involved in the creation of a just society then let us use every means we can to get rid of the culture of conflict.

## DISCUSSION

The topic of public dialogue for collaboration among dominant and non-dominant co-cultures is an important one, especially in the context of preventing and ameliorating situations of conflict in planning for community social and economic development. The intercultural communication situation in North America may be unique among places in the world due to a combination of long established principles of democratic participation, pluralism in public life, the nature of immigrant and refugee communities, as well as the special attention that is called for in supporting the efforts of African American and First Nations to overcome the Euro and ethnocentric attitudes of the past in order to truly reach economic and social potential. The existence of this milieu, however, does not in itself provide the means to humanize both the oppressor and the oppressed and the struggle is the same whether it is in North America or elsewhere.

## Limitations

As with any research there are limitations to the present study that must be taken into consideration when utilizing the findings and conclusions. In this short article the primary limitation is the inability to explicate a thorough explanation of all the elements that are essential to an understanding of the issue of social inclusion of marginalized cultural groups. Specifically, the variety of communication norms across the variety of cultural groups in North America is too extensive to be able to provide adequate examples. It is essential that for any 9P planning process that is undertaken by a community, that an assessment of communication norms be done that is specific to the needs of that community.

## Future Directions

This study and the 9P Planning model provide a theoretical framework for future research in intercultural collaboration for community, social and economic development. It is my hope that any individual or group that is sincerely interested in increasing the inclusion of marginalized cultural group members in collaborative efforts will utilize the information that is offered herein, to both validate and to expand on the concepts.

## REFERENCES

1. Allen, R. (2005). Whiteness and critical pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 37(2). 121-136.
2. Berger, C. R. (1986). Social cognition and intergroup communication. In W.B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intergroup communication* (pp. 51-61). London: Edward Arnold.
3. Brislin, R. (1986). Prejudice and intergroup communication. In W.B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intergroup communication* (pp. 74-85). London: Edward Arnold.
4. Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Seabury Press. (Original work published 1968)
5. Freire, P. (1997). A response. In P. Freire (Ed.), *Mentoring the mentor: A critical dialogue with Paulo Freire* (pp. 303-329) New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
6. Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1995). A dialogue: Culture, language, and race. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), 377-402.
7. Karlberg, M. (2003). The paradox of protest in a culture of contest. *Peace & Change*, 28(3). 329-351.
8. LaFever, M. (2008). Communication for public decision-making in a negative historical context: Building intercultural relationships in the British Columbia treaty process. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* 1(2). 158-180.
9. Oetzel, J. G. (2001). Self-construals, communication processes, and group outcomes in homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. *Small Group Research*, 32, 19-54.
10. Orbe, M.P. (1998). *Constructing co-cultural theory: An explication of culture, power, and communication*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
11. Pearce, W. B. & Cronen, V. (1980). *Communication, Action, and Meaning*. New York: Praeger.
12. Penman, R. (1992). Good theory and good practice: An argument in progress. *Communication Theory* 2(3), 234-250.