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ABSTRACT

The world is undergoing the largest human migration in history: that from rural to urban. It is expected that sixty percent of the world population will be urban by 2030. This unprecedented human migration will bring together increasingly diverse populations to live together in growing urban centres. Canada's cities are no exception to these global trends of urbanization and immigration. While immigrants make up 18% of the population of Canada, more than half live in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. While this diversity will help to enrich our cities, it could also mean increased ethnic tensions and, in the worst cases, ghettoization or violence. This study looks at ways to engage Canada's current residents or "the host culture" in an active multiculturalism, in which they learn to co-adapt with diverse immigrants. In particular, it focuses on training that has been carried out over the past fifteen years by the City of Vancouver's Hastings Institute and Equal Employment Opportunity program to build cross-cultural understanding in members of Vancouver's host society.

Using a case study approach framed by phronetic research and experimental ethnographic methods, this study looks at the impacts of this training over time and asks whether the programs of the Hastings Institute offer an effective approach to helping to prepare Canada's cities for immigration. Relying on interviews carried out with past trainees, employees and trainers of the Hastings Institute and Equal Employment Opportunity program, as well as key documents such as Council reports and training materials, this study gives an overview of the work of this organization and gives recommendations for how Vancouver and other cities can better build multicultural readiness. It also discusses how provincial and federal governments can become more engaged in multicultural initiatives and programming at the local level. Overall, it finds that in order to better prepare Canada's host society for increasingly diverse cities, we must re-envision our approaches to multiculturalism at the local, provincial and federal levels.
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I grew up in a divided community. Though my town was bordered by a larger reserve, by the time I hit grade nine the last First Nations kid in my class – Delbert – had dropped out after continual heated arguments with Mr. Stott our English teacher. Like any small town in B.C., stereotypes abounded about the First Nations in our community – they were drunks, they were violent, they were lazy and couldn’t take care of themselves. First Nations’ kids hung out at Wizard’s, the dank pool hall in the crumbling downtown. Only the really “bad” white kids went to Wizard’s or ever hung out on the reserve. Around the same time that Delbert dropped out of school, another division began to appear in the community. South Asian immigrants started to move to the valley. Though they came from different parts of South Asia, these new immigrants were all labeled with the derogatory term “Pakis.” Stories circulated throughout the white community about how rude these newcomers were, how horribly they treated employees, how they were not to be trusted. I got out of that town about as quickly as I could, moved on to bigger cities where I think it is easier to pretend that a more cosmopolitan frame of mind leads to more tolerance. Yet, of course this isn’t the case. We see in big cities throughout the world, the same kind of divisions that I saw growing up in a small town.

So I do not think my community was atypical. In fact I think of it as a microcosm of the kind of divisions, the stereotyping, and the fear that can occur in towns and cities throughout the world when people from different backgrounds come to live together. What was it about the differences between us that created such distrust and derision? What fear drove the boundaries and hierarchies that were created?
I ended up pursuing a Master's degree in planning in part to try to answer these questions. Specifically, I came to SCARP with the hope of answering the question: how can social change be accomplished? More specifically, what are the most effective ways that we can work to transform the world of human thought and behaviour to overcome what I understood to be the biggest threats to our world: issues such as prejudice, hatred, and environmental destruction? From a big question, I ended up focusing on a very small example: the Hastings Institute/Equal Employment Opportunity program—a multicultural programming set up by the City of Vancouver. This example, I feel, was in some part created by people trying to find answers to the same kinds of questions. Like all human attempts, this small story has its bright and dark moments, its politics, its successes and its failures. I hope that by documenting its strengths and weaknesses here, I can contribute a few insights into the strategies that can be used to counter the divisions that I witnessed growing up in my small community and that people throughout the world continue to see in their own communities.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Increasing Urbanization: Increasing Diversity

The world is undergoing the largest human migration in history — that from rural to urban. In 2000, about 47 percent of the world's population lived in urban areas. It is expected that 60 percent of the world population will be urban by 2030 (Population Reference Bureau, 2006). This unprecedented massive urban migration will bring diverse populations from all parts of the world to live together. This diversity will help to enrich our cities. However, there is also the possibility of increased ethnic tensions, segregation, ghettoization, and, in the worst cases, violence. Since the end of the Cold war, the number of conflicts within states has greatly exceeded the number of conflicts between states (Kymlicka, 1995: 1). These conflicts have largely arisen from the cohabitation of peoples with different cultural or linguistic identities (Dion, 1996).

As new cultures come to live together in urban centres, our fundamental conceptions about what cities are undergoes a shift. Pulling on Iain Chambers' discussion about today's cities, Edward Soja observes in his book Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions that new urbanization processes represent

a profound change in what the city represents, a deep restructuring of the meaning, cultural symbolism, and prevailing discourses attached to... the urban imaginary, [or] the ways we think about cities and urban life... [Chambers] argues that cities, in Europe and North America... are coming less and less to represent the "culmination of local and territorial cultures," an intrinsic quality of urbaness that can be traced back to the origins of cities (Soja, 2000: 150).

In this context of shifting meaning, John Friedmann points out that newcomers to cities are
regarded as a threat to old ways of thinking. He observes that “transnational migrants are often perceived as strangers whose very presence poses a threat to the way of life and sense of self/identity of the host society” (2002: 55). In her book Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities, Leonie Sandercock elaborates on the fear that newcomers can create. She states:

The cities and regions moving into the 21st century are multi-ethnic, multi-racial, multiple. The cultural diversity which is emerging as a distinguishing characteristic of new global cities is also producing a new world disorder. The multicultural city/region is perceived by many as more of a threat than an opportunity. The threat is multiple: psychological, economic, religious, cultural. It is a complicated experiencing of fear of ‘the Other’ alongside the fear of losing one’s job, fear of a way of life being eroded, fear of change itself. These fears are producing rising levels of anxiety about and violence against those who are different, who are seen as not belonging, “not my people.” This fear is a great threat to the future stability of our cities and regions. (1998: 3).

As urban centres become the loci of immigration and individual and group identities become challenged, local politics and political discourse shift. Sandercock outlines that “xenophobic fears can quickly turn to territorially based racist politics as the new mix of cultures projects itself onto the urban landscape” (2003a: 20). This mindset has increasingly been finding its way into public discourse. As Edward Soja observes

Often disguised under guileless arguments of overpopulation – too many people for too few resources – an anti-immigrant movement has also been growing in the academic and public policy discourse, especially in response to the increasing ethnic and racial tensions that have been so evident in Los Angeles, New York, and other major urban regions in the 1990s (Soja, 2000: 269).

While polyethnic cities represent a challenge in terms of potential conflicts they also hold within them the means to evolve new conceptual frameworks that embrace this new multiplicity. Edward Soja argues that

the Postmetropolis... becomes a Fractal City, fragmented and polarized, but also the scene of creative new “hybridities” and a cultural politics aimed not just at reducing inequalities but also at preserving difference and fostering flexible
“transversal” identities (Soja, 2000: 155).

The question, then, becomes what are concrete ways to build transversal identities and connections in post-metropolitan cities? Cities, and their multicultural and social policies, thus become an important focus of research in an era where local political initiatives can have a significant impact on how people can live together in the new “ethnoscapes” created by global migration and urban growth (Appadurai, as quoted in Sandercock, 2003a: 20).

**The Canadian Context**

Canada’s cities are no exception to these global trends of urbanization and immigration. While immigrants only make up 18% of the total population of Canada, more than half live in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver (Wallace and Milroy, 1999). In Toronto, half of the population is made up of immigrants, in Vancouver just under half (46%), and in Montreal 28% are immigrants (Statistics Canada, 2001). In an age of migration, the make-up of Canada’s communities is, thus, changing dramatically. Increasingly, these immigrants are visible minorities from third-world countries, who were previously labeled ‘non-preferred’ by restrictive immigration policies (Wallace and Milroy, 1999). In 2001, 13.4% of the country’s population was made up of visible minorities. This was up significantly from 4.7% twenty years earlier (Parkin and Mendelsohn, 2005). Cities like Toronto and Vancouver in particular have seen a steady rise in the level of visible minorities (see Figure 1).
Despite the Canadian notion of ourselves as an accepting multicultural society, recent reports indicate that racism is alive and well. In a recent national survey, 41% of visible minorities who had been in Canada for at least a generation reported that they had been discriminated against (Janzen, 2003). These high levels of discrimination indicate a weakness in current multicultural policies and strategies. In 2000, the challenge of accommodating new immigrant populations was identified by the federal Privy Council and Office of Intergovernmental Affairs as the leading policy challenge facing Canada’s largest cities (Edgington and Hutton, 2002). The key task confronting these multicultural cities is whether they can create an inclusive political culture and promote intercultural coexistence (Sandercock, 2003a). This is a significant challenge in a political environment where cutbacks and downloading of responsibility from senior governments have left integration largely to municipalities (Au, 2000). This is exacerbated by the fact that local authorities
currently lack the constitutional obligation and the financial support needed to respond to higher levels of immigration (Ley and Murphy, 2001, Edgington and Hutton 2002). The tension between the need to create intercultural cities and a lack of support for cities to take this role is a key challenge in Canadian multicultural policy and programming. The need to engage the host society effectively in creating a welcoming society is another key challenge for multicultural policies and programming. Innovations that can aid in the transition from a passive or shallow multiculturalism to an active or rich multiculturalism, wherein new immigrants do not bear the responsibility of one-sided adaptation, need to be examined. How do we shift the focus of multicultural policy from “an institutional project which funds and promotes staged ethnic representations” (Mahtani, 2002: 74) to a more profound project with real impacts at the local level?

**Research Focus**

In a manner, this research is set up to answer the following plea:

I would like to plea for more research on the complexities of migrant incorporation into transnational cities. The questions that arise in this context are legion, and we are far from having an adequate theoretical framework for understanding the dynamics of successful incorporation. Before such a framework can evolve, however, many more detailed studies are needed (Friedmann, 2002: 66).

This research addresses the challenge of preparing Canadian cities to effectively receive and integrate immigrants. It examines public policy efforts to engage members of the host society, specifically employees of public institutions, in active multicultural citizenship and to counter institutional racism and discrimination. It focuses on the diversity and anti-discrimination work carried out by an organization established by the City of Vancouver, namely the Hastings Institute/Equal Employment Opportunity program, in order to
illuminate ways in which multiculturalism can be implemented at the city level. With a few notable exceptions, there is not much literature looking at strategies that have been implemented by municipal governments to respond to emerging polyethnic urban landscapes (Pestieau and Wallace, 2003: 255). This study therefore is intended to provide insight into the outcomes of an innovative and long-term approach carried out by the City of Vancouver with the aim of illuminating how this work can be more effectively carried out in emerging polyethnic urban centres around the world.

Research Location: Vancouver

Vancouver, as a gateway city (Ley & Murphy, 2001), is a prime example of what Leonie Sandercock calls the mongrel city of the 21st century (Sandercock, 2003a). One of the most prominent distinguishing characteristics of the city of Vancouver is its increasing ethnic, racial and linguistic diversity. As stated above, 46% of Vancouver’s population is made up of immigrants. 51.3% have a mother tongue other than English (Statistics Canada, 2001). The majority of new immigrants to the city come from Asia – largely China, the Philippines and India. Although today Vancouver prides itself as being a multicultural city, we still see many struggles of racism, prejudice, and misunderstanding accompanying the high influx of newcomers. Over the past thirty years, the City of Vancouver has put in place some innovative programming to try to address issues linked to immigration. It is important to note that Vancouver is one municipality of 21 in the Greater Vancouver Regional District. By far the largest, with 27% of the population of the region, it is certainly not the only locus of immigration (GVRD, 2006). Municipalities such as Surrey and Richmond, for example, receive a large proportion of the region’s immigration. The City of Vancouver has traditionally been at the forefront of both immigration and municipal multicultural
policies in the region, and thus serves as a rich illustrative example for other municipalities in the GVRD and beyond.

**Case Study: The Hastings Institute/ Equal Employment Opportunity program (EEO)**

One of the most ambitious of the City of Vancouver's multicultural initiatives has been the Hastings Institute/ Equal Employment Opportunity program. Though the focus of this research was primarily on the Hastings Institute, the work of the EEO is often closely linked with it and it was mentioned frequently by interviewees. Thus, they will be discussed in tandem throughout this research. The EEO was established in 1977 to achieve the City of Vancouver's goal “to have a workforce that reflects the diversity of our community” (City of Vancouver, 2006a). The Hastings Institute was founded in 1989 to take some of the internal diversity training and cross-cultural communications strategies developed for the City internally by the EEO, to a broader audience. Both the EEO and the Institute currently deliver training on issues related to employment and service equity, diversity, cross-cultural relations, literacy, and harassment-free workplaces. The EEO does this internally within the City as well as providing informal and formal processes to deal with concerns of discrimination and harassment. The Hastings Institute provides training and consulting services externally for provincial government ministries, municipalities, crown corporations, community agencies and the private sector.

These initiatives offered a prime case study for this research as they were set up specifically by a City with fast-changing demographics to prepare its employees and the broader population for these changes. Specifically, these organizations were created to
engage members of the host society in a process of co-adaptation. This was a significant and
ambitious innovation for a city to carry out and was on the leading edge of multicultural
programming in this province and the country. The fact that this programming has been in
place continuously for over fifteen years offers a rich case study of the shifting priorities and
agendas of local, provincial and federal governments in terms of multicultural policy as well
as the ability to look retrospectively at some of the longer-term impacts that these initiatives
had in the city of Vancouver.

Outline

This paper will begin with the methodological framework for this research, which
will be outlined in Chapter 2. From there it will move on to a broad look at literature
relevant to this discussion in Chapter 3. This literature review will begin with an overview of
literature on multiculturalism and multicultural planning. This will be followed by a
discussion of transformative learning, anti-racist education, the role of storytelling and an
overview of a complementary case study in order to further set the context through which
the case study will be viewed. This will set the stage for the discussion of this case study in
Chapter 4. This discussion will include an overview of the context of multicultural policy in
British Columbia and Vancouver, and move on to an analysis of the Hastings Institute/
EEO which will present data from interviews carried out with past trainers, trainees and
employees as well as from evaluative reports carried out on the institution over the years of
its operation. Chapter 5 will then present the set of recommendations which arose out of
this inquiry. Finally, Chapter 6 will summarize the insights gained through this research and
give suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2
METHODOLOGY

I can only answer the question “What am I to do” if I can answer the prior question “Of what story or stories to I find myself a part?”

-Alasdair Maclntyre as quoted in Bent Flyvbjerg’s Making Social Science Matter (2001: 137)

The design of this research was shaped by two current bodies of thought in social science research methodology. Firstly, Bent Flyvbjerg’s vision for a revitalized and relevant approach to Social Sciences, which he labels a phronetic research approach, shaped the selection of a specific case study and the lines of questioning which were undertaken. Secondly, I relied on ethnographic methods to shape the construction of interviews, my process of self-reflection, as well as the way in which the rich and contradictory narratives that arose from the interviews have been represented. The following two sections will elaborate on these approaches and discuss how they were used to shape this research.

Phronetic Research and the use of the Case Study

Using Aristotle’s outline of three basic knowledges: scientific knowledge (episteme), technical knowledge (techne) and phronesis (often translated as prudence or practical wisdom), Bent Flyvberg outlines in his book Making Social Science Matter, how phronesis is ideally suited to the study of complex human social dynamics. Trying to understand social practice through episteme or techne, he argues, can lead alternately to gross simplification or gross generalization. According to Flyvberg, “the task of phronetic research is to clarify and deliberate about the problems and risks we face and to outline how things may be done differently, in full knowledge that we cannot find ultimate answers to these questions or even a single version of what the questions are.” (2001: 140). Generalizations about
social phenomenon are, therefore, not what we seek through phronesis, but rather, specific examples from which we can draw to shape debates and understanding about social phenomena. Flyvbjerg summarizes this stance in this way:

predictive theories and universals cannot be found in the study of human affairs. Concrete, context-dependent knowledge is therefore more valuable than the vain search for predictive theories and universals. (2001: 73)

For Aristotle, and in turn Flyvberg, case knowledge is, therefore, central to the practice of phronesis. The practical rationality that characterizes phronesis is derived from reference to particular, concrete examples. As Robert Yin outlines in his book *Case Study Research*, the case study approach is used in order to “explain the presumed causal links in real-life interventions that are too complex for the survey or experimental strategies” (Yin, 2003: 35). Case examples are complex narratives that reveal multiple perspectives and set the stage for continued social dialogue regarding the issues at hand, an approach that Flyvberg neatly summarizes as “dialoguing with polyphony of voices” (2001: 139). In phronetic social research, the most rich narratives “typically approach the complexities and contradictions of real life” (2001: 84). Divergent perspectives on the case study are thus not neatly summarized into broad theories and generalizations, but represented in all of their complexity.

This approach has been central to the development of this research. Firstly, a specific case study was chosen. The City of Vancouver’s Hastings Institute/ Equal Employment Opportunity program (EEO) was selected as a case study through which to examine a municipal approach to building multicultural readiness in the host society. The aim of the research process was to access a diverse array of experiences regarding the cross-cultural training undertaken by the Institute. Past and present employees, trainers, and participants in
the programs over its twenty-year lifespan were interviewed. They were given the same set of
general questions to answer (See Appendix D for these), however the interviews were left
open-ended in order to follow their lead on what they felt was important to pull out from
their experience with the Hastings Institute / EEO. As Robert Yin outlines, open-ended
questioning is particularly well-suited to case studies as it enables the investigator to “ask
respondents about the facts of a matter as well as their opinions about events. In some
situations, you may even ask the respondent to propose his or her own insights into certain
occurrences” (Yin, 2003: 90). Divergent narratives about the impacts of the work of the
Institute emerged through these interviews as a result of this approach. These have been
represented in the write-up of the interviews in Chapter 4. In addition to interviews,
additional sources such as reports to council, outside evaluations, and other written
documentation were used to deepen the inquiry and to develop what Robert Yin calls
converging lines of inquiry:

The use of multiple sources of evidence in case studies allows an investigator to
address a broader range of historical, attitudinal and behavioural issues. However the most important advantage presented by using multiple sources of
evidence is the development of converging lines of inquiry... Any finding or
conclusion in a case study is likely to be much more convincing and accurate if it
is based on several different sources of information (Yin, 2003: 98).

Gathering an historical analysis of the work of the Institute and people’s perceptions
of the work was also a key part of the inquiry. This was done in order to give greater context
about the work of the Institute and the various forces which have shaped it over time. If the
ultimate aim of this research is to draw conclusions for what municipalities should be doing
in terms of building multicultural readiness, this perspective is key in giving a concrete and
rich example of how this has been attempted. As Alasdair MacIntyre points out, “I can only
answer the question ‘What am I to do?’ if I can answer the prior question ‘Of what stories
do I find myself a part” (Flyvbjerg: 2001: 137). A key aim of the open-ended conversations with interviewees was to decipher the larger context or stories (personal, political, societal) in which the initiative was undertaken. In addition, to further understand the broader context in which the various stakeholders were acting, the multicultural policies that have influenced the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO from municipal, provincial, and federal levels of government were examined.

The research was greatly influenced by Flyvbjerg’s assertion that the aim of phronetic social sciences is social commentary and social action. He summarizes the fundamental questions that this kind of research answers as:

1. Where are we going?
2. Is this desirable?
3. What should be done?
4. Who gains and who loses? (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 60)

Based on this line of questioning then, key issues central to this study include:

1. Where are we going in terms of implementing multicultural policy at the local level and in the urban centres where most new immigration is occurring? Specifically, for the sake of this study, what kinds of policies are being implemented that prepare the host society for the demographic/cultural/social shifts which are occurring? Even more specifically, is the kind of training offered through the Hastings Institute and EEO an effective way to engage the host society as co-participants in multiculturalism?
2. Is the direction we are heading, given the current level of programming for members of the host society, desirable?
3. What could be done to improve upon efforts to prepare the host society for immigration?
4. Who is gaining and who is losing through the current approaches?

These questions have been reflected upon throughout this research process and will be examined in the summary of the research in Chapter 6.
While Flyvbjerg details the way in which phronetic research can influence society to be more self-reflective, he does not overtly discuss the need for the individual researcher to be self-reflective. He outlines how both social sciences and natural sciences alike are influenced by subjectivity, but doesn’t touch on the importance of the researcher, themselves, integrating their story into the research. One methodological approach for trying to make the influence the researcher has on their own research more transparent comes through incorporating the researcher’s personal story and process within the research. The self-reflexivity that this kind of approach engenders in the research is arguably a key component of the practical wisdom (phronimos) and deliberation of values with reference to praxis that Flyvbjerg argues are central to phronesis, though he doesn’t discuss this approach overtly. In order to further elaborate on a methodological approach for incorporating the researcher’s voice into their research, I will now turn to ethnographic literature.

**Ethnography: the role of Narrative and Self-Reflection**

**EVOKING NARRATIVES**

Ethnographic research is increasingly being used in planning research as a way of understanding how urban policies and places affect people’s lives (Greed, 1994). In her essay *The Place of Ethnography in Planning: Or is it “Real” Research*, Clara Greed outlines two ways in which an ethnographic approach can enrich planning research. Primarily, she asserts:

ethnography is very good for increasing understanding of an issue or what makes a group of people ‘tick’, and can prove invaluable in investigating the effectiveness, or appropriateness, of an urban policy or plan, or in making sense of a particular social problem (1994: 6).

This is due to the fact that the ethnographic approach, originally developed in anthropologic
research, “attempts to understand social and cultural phenomena from the perspective of participants in the social setting under study” (Schensul, Schensul and LeCompte, 1999: 165).

The use of an ethnographic approach is key for this study of the work of the Hastings Institute/EEO, as what is ultimately being documented is not the day-to-day functioning of the organization, but the human experience of those involved in its programs. The qualitative frameworks and methodology that are part of ethnographic research are thus ideally suited to this research. Interviewees for this study were selected using a snowballing technique. The interviews were semi-structured and questions were shaped to elicit a range of responses from interviewees. In particular, much of the research centered on gathering personal narratives from a variety of individuals involved in the Hastings Institute/EEO over its last twenty years of operation. Narratives were used to “provide rich descriptions of particular events, situations and personal histories” (Chambers, 1997: 86). Using narratives allowed the research to focus on what is important to participants about their involvement with the Hastings Institute/EEO. As an information gathering technique, narratives provide an interpretive framework based on the concepts and meanings used by the storyteller (Schensul, Schensul and LeCompte, 1999). This was important for this research as people’s experience of the Hastings Institute/EEO’s programs were very much affected by their own worldviews and prior experience. This was so much so, that many contradictory narratives about the organization emerged, adding richness and complexity to the study.

In addition to being useful for understanding individuals’ meaning making process around their involvement with the Hastings Institute, it is my hope that by focusing on narratives this research, rather than being a dry discussion of policy and
programming, will engage the imagination of the reader and build a more fundamental understanding of the impacts of this work. This approach is modeled after much recent literature in planning around the importance of stories in planning practice and research, especially with reference to the need to transform the often gray world of policy into Technicolor (James Throgmorton and Peter Marris, as discussed in Sandercock, 2003a: 194). This literature will be further discussed in Chapter 4.

EXPERIMENTAL ETHNOGRAPHY AND SELF-REFLECTION

According to Clara Greed in *The Place of Ethnography in Planning*, ethnography can enrich planning research through the process of self-reflection. She asserts that the methodology of ethnography is useful when:

> turned upon planners themselves, as a tool in exposing the values of the planning subculture as held by its members. It has long been argued that planners' professional decisions are not value-free but are undoubtedly influenced by their own personal world view and private attitudes about public issues. (1994: 6)

It is important to note that the self-reflection, which Greed sees to be a central component of ethnography, is actually a more recent development in the field. As this is an important distinction, a few paragraphs will be spent on further elaborating this point before turning to how ethnographic methods shaped this research specifically.

Ethnography, as a written representation of a culture, can be presented in a variety of ways depending on how the relationship between the observer and the observed is conceptualized. If the observer of a culture, the ethnographer, understands her/himself to be undertaking an objective scientific study of another culture (or segment of society), her/his ethnographic description is presented as an authentic account of that culture. John
VanMaanen titles this perceived authentic, objective account "the realist tale." In the realist tale format the ethnographer's voice and experience is not explicitly part of the text except occasionally in brief introductory statements about the extent of fieldwork which was carried out. The reader is given the impression that the ethnographer is an omniscient observer presenting a true to reality representation of a culture or a group of people. The author of the realist tale thus presents a culture by stating "The X do this," not "I saw the X do this" (VanMaanen, 1998: 47). Another characteristic of the realist tale pointed out by VanMaanen is the detailing of a total view of a culture through presenting, not individuals in that culture, but common denominator people or "the typical Native." In essence the realist tale is a scientific analysis and representation of a culture which often uses technical jargon to discuss the characteristics of that culture. The author is represented through the text of the realist tale as an authority on the culture which they have observed through fieldwork. This approach can trace it roots back to Greek philosopher Herodotus who first used the term ethnos in contrast to the Greek polis which signified ordered, civilized existence. Those groups of peoples not of the Greek polis were of an ethnos "or ethnikos, often translated as 'heathen'" (Day, 2000: 52). As one can observe through this use of language, Herodotus' representations of cultures, like those of many ethnographers to follow him, were not value neutral, but were constructed to illustrate a cultural "Other" in opposition to civilized (in this case Greek) citizens.

While this supposedly objective method of ethnographic representation is still used, in recent years the questioning of the ability of an ethnographer to present an unbiased and authentic representation of a culture has resulted in the development of new ethnographic styles. Sally McBeth states that this is a result of post-modernist thinking which, with its
focus on “heterogeneity and difference… begins to grapple with deconstruction of the myth
of objectivity through self-reflection and acknowledgement of the power-laden relationships
of ethnographic writing” (McBeth, 1993: 146). In the new ethnographic styles which arise
from this line of thinking the understanding of others is presented as a complex interaction
between the observer and the observed. The ethnographer’s portrait is understood to be one
person’s subjective representation of the observed. As a result of this the ethnographer’s
experience becomes an integral part of the new style ethnography. In their essay *Ethnographies
as Texts*, Marcus and Cushman state that “the major characteristic shared by experimental
ethnographies is that they integrate, within their interpretations, an explicit epistemological
concern for how they have constructed such interpretations and how they are representing
them textually” (1982: 25). Experimental ethnographies, thus, play with new styles of telling
which attempt to incorporate the ethnographer’s voice.

Thus, experimental ethnographies have arisen from the questioning of any
ethnographer’s ability to truly represent an unbiased view of the culture or group which they
observe and/or interview. This questioning itself arose from the realization that we all bring
our own understandings to our observation and, therefore, each view the world though our
own complex conceptual filter which is shaped by a variety of factors including race, class
and gender. The aim of self reflection in experimental ethnographies, then, is to produce a
more authentic representation of the observed through an open representation of the biases,
perceptions and experiences which shape their interpretation by the observer. The idea is
that if we understand ethnography to be a constructed tale and are given insight into the
‘filter’ of the ethnographer we are then presented with, perhaps not a more accurate
description of culture, but at least a more accurate description of how culture is understood.
The application of self-reflection to planning practice and research has also emerged in planning literature in recent years. Notably, John Forester maintains in *the Deliberative Practitioner*, that the ability to be self-reflective is an essential new tool for planners (Forester, 1999). Self-reflection is, thus, used in this research not only to bring in my own stories that have influenced the research but to model the kind of self-reflection that planners such as John Forester assert are key to planners' ability to take more effective action. Throughout this research, then, are my own reflections in the prologue, reflections on interviews, and epilogue sections, on how I became engaged in this project as well as my thoughts about the research as it proceeded.

**Limitations to the Research**

This research is intended to be a broad assessment of the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO which provides recommendations for further work by the City of Vancouver as well as other municipalities. It is not intended to be a comprehensive evaluation. Training and the impact it has on individuals and, in turn, on their work, is impossible to measure quantitatively and adequate qualitative assessment would need to be an involved, multi-year process. For instance, in order to try to adequately measure the impact of training, testing would have had to be done on participants in advance of their training to gauge their attitudes and opinions before their participation in training. Goals and targets would have to be set up in advance by which participants could be evaluated afterwards. In addition, control groups which had not had any training would have to be evaluated for the purpose of comparison. This kind of in-depth evaluative framework would be most effectively set up as an integral part of the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO, a point which will be revisited in the recommendations section. The conclusions
that can be drawn from the interviews and research I have conducted, then, can be seen as valuable qualitative and story-based observations from which future directions can be drawn.

The information can not be seen, however, as a definitive account of the direct impacts of the Hastings Institute/ EEO. I have tried to be broad in my selection of interviewees.

However, it is possible that a different set of interviews would have revealed some different conclusions.
CHAPTER 3
FRAMING THE DISCUSSION: A LOOK AT THE LITERATURE

This discussion will begin with an overview of some of the current literature in multiculturalism and multicultural planning. This will provide the context of current thought in which this investigation occurred and will frame the ideas and debates which this study was set up to address. In order to further set the framework from which the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO can be viewed, I will then turn my focus to a discussion of transformative learning and its implications for changing individuals’ mindsets. This discussion of transformative learning will be followed by brief outlines of two other key concepts for framing our understanding of the Hastings Institute / EEO’s work: anti-racism education and the role of story-telling in social change. I will then briefly outline a complementary case study of a multicultural initiative carried out by a local government; that of AMKA in Frankfurt. This will further add to the framework through which the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO will be examined.

Multiculturalism and Its Discontents

AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Canadian multiculturalism became permanently embedded in both the Canadian imagination and political discourse beginning in 1971, when Canada became the first country in the world to introduce a policy on multiculturalism (Canadian Heritage, 2006b). It was questioning of the relevance of the ongoing bicultural debate between English and French Canada by those who felt they fell into neither category that gave rise to Canada’s first step
towards multicultural policy (Hiebert et. al., 2003, Fleras and Elliot, 1999). Though still privileging the identity of English and French Canadians as the founding nations (completely overlooking the First Nations who were here long before Europeans), early multicultural legislation acknowledged the changing demographic makeup of Canada in the post-war period. As the idea of multiculturalism evolved it came to encompass broad issues such as the rights of individuals to retain their culture (versus notions of assimilation), the provision of services to immigrants, and anti-discrimination (Hiebert et al., 2003). These notions became deeply embedded in a broad range of laws, policies and international agreements such as: the Employment Equity Act (1986), the Pay Equity Act (1985), the Multiculturalism Act (1988) (Canadian Heritage, 2006c). Multiculturalism as a central tenet of Canadian society was also enshrined in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982 (Canadian Heritage, 2006c). As the idea of Canada as a multicultural nation has gained prevalence, multiculturalism has begun to trickle into provincial and municipal policy and legislation. How these policies have taken shape will be discussed in-depth in Chapter 5.

The need for multicultural policy has been driven by the need for continuing immigration to Canada as outlined by senior levels of government involved in the task of nation-building. Canada has always needed immigrants, as labourers, as stimulus for the economy, and more recently as tax-paying supporters for an ageing population (Fleras and Elliot, 1999, Baxter, 1998). The puzzle for legislators and government officials who saw the necessity in increasing levels of immigration to Canada has been how to frame Canada’s national identity to include those whose arrival the country depended upon, but who were not necessarily a part of the established national identity. Early attempts at solving this issue centered on shaping immigration laws to ensure that those who came would be easily
incorporated into existing hegemonic European, and largely Anglo-European, cultural
norms. This has always been an unattainable ideal, however. Cultural others, from the First
Nations who occupied the territory prior to European colonization to early Dukabour and
Chinese immigrants onwards, have always posed a challenge to (Western) Eurocentric
notions of “Canadianess.” Multicultural policy has thus always been about more than
managing the coexistence of disparate groups of people. It has, at its most fundamental,
been about changing the story of a nation to include multiple identities, multiple histories,
and multiple ways of being Canadian.

Canadian multicultural policies are commended for having promoted the importance
and understanding of multiculturalism not just in Canada, but also around the world (Fleras
and Elliot, 1999: 318). The federal government has succeeded at dispersing multicultural
policy through many acts, departments and programs, thus making multiculturalism an
integral component of governance at the federal level. However, there is still much debate
about how successful Canada has been at changing the core story in which its citizens’
identities are embedded. The irony of political discourse around multiculturalism in Canada,
and in other countries that have embraced multiculturalism, is that immigrants who are seen
as solutions to challenges facing the nation (usually economic) often come to be seen as
challenges to nationhood themselves. To understand the underlying reasons for this, I will
now turn to a brief historical unpacking of the idea of difference and diversity in Canadian
society.
THE POWER TO NARRATE: THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE
"PROBLEM" OF CANADIAN DIVERSITY AND MULTICULTURALISM

Perhaps the most significant problem with current multicultural policies is the Euro-
Canadian centric definition and formulation of the policies (Sandercock, 2003a; Mahtani,
multiculturalism back to Western colonial mindsets—from Roman conquerors to Christian
liberators, Richard Day argues that the discourse is one of “Self/Other differentiation and
management” (Day, 2000: 70). According to Day, the European discourse on diversity has
always been quite naturally steeped in notions of European superiority. The first instance of
Euro-Canadian ordering of difference came when early explorers encountered First Nations
throughout the continent. These peoples were dismissed as savages who lacked political
organization and thus any claim to their land, which in the European mind became “terra
nullius” or empty land. First Nations were not just a different people, but a different race,
readily identifiable through their divergence from European norms.

This process of differentiation, definition, and sublimation of Others by Europeans
had a tried and true history. Edward Said was one of the first to outline the underpinnings of
this process with specific reference to “the Orient” of the European imagination in his
pivotal postcolonial text, Orientalism. "The Orient," asserts Said, was a European invention.
The Orient, and thus "the Oriental," according to Said, only exist in so far as they have been
set up through Western thought and institutions as the antithesis of all that is Occidental.
Through the process of defining the "Oriental" as the quintessential "Other" Westerners
have fabricated "the Oriental" in a very real and lasting sense. Out of the Western discourse
surrounding the Oriental "there emerged a complex Oriental suitable for study in
the academy, for display in the museum, for reconstruction in the colonial office, for theoretical illustration in anthropological, biological, linguistic, racial and historical theses about mankind and the universe” (2003: 460). Said asserts that the definition/creation of "the Oriental" has rested on the authority of prior and concurrent European texts concerning the Orient. He states that these texts "acquire mass, density, and referential power among themselves and thereafter in the culture at large" (2003: 50). The hegemonic discourse which develops from these texts thus operates to restrict what can imaginably be said regarding the Oriental.

This kind of totalizing view of cultural Others, was equally applied by Europeans to the peoples that they encountered in the “New World.” Interactions between cultures are always shaped by each culture’s own culturally constructed understandings of “the Other.” However, in illustrating how this has shaped European-Native relationships Brown and Vibert in their book Reading Beyond Words point out:

it is human nature to view and describe other peoples in relation to ourselves: but in doing so Europeans had the privilege of more power than most. A crucial aspect of that power was the power to narrate (1996: 14).

As Michael Dorris points out in his essay “Indians on the Shelf” the stereotypes of “the Indian” which Europeans narrated have “become a real and preferred substitute for ethnographic reality” (1994: 99). Dorris goes on to point out that “it has been in vogue for hundreds of years for Europeans to describe Native Americans not in terms of themselves, but only in terms of who they are (or are not) vis-a-vis non-Indians” (1994: 100). Europeans, then, have historically defined First Nations cultures in opposition to themselves; incorporating a dualistic framework of subject versus object, us versus them, standard versus divergent into their narrations of them. The stereotypes concerning First Nations which
have been formed in this manner have proven to be very persistent. Images formed about
First Nations by early European visitors to and settlers of the “New World” which originally
shaped the European conception of “the Indian” have continued to shape the
understanding, and thus treatment of, First Nations to this day.

This discourse on the first people that Europeans encountered as “Other” in the
territory that would become Canada is relevant to a broader discussion on the ideology of
Canadian multiculturalism, as both aboriginal and immigrant have become similarly
“colonized identities within the purview of the Canadian state” (Day, 2000: 116). The way of
thinking about one gives insight into the way of thinking about the other. As Himani
Bannerji puts it in her essay *On the dark side of the nation: Politics of multiculturalism and the state of
“Canada”*, “it is the nationhood of this Canada, with its two solitudes and their survival
anxieties and aggressions against ‘native others,’ that provides the epic painting in whose
dark corners we must look for the later ‘others.’” (1996: 4). This established juxtaposition of
Canadian norms against those of a cultural other, thus, lay the groundwork for a
conceptualization of Canadian identity in terms of who belongs and who, by extension, does
not. Day outlines a post-war conception of Canadian identity in Figure 2:
The hierarchy of identity which these authors are discussing has shifted through time. Categorization of different peoples has been shaped around notions of race and more recently ethnicity, which are far from static categories. For instance, race was used as an early explanation of difference between French and English settlers. When conflicts emerged between the two groups, their perceived differences became naturalized through the evocation of fundamental racial differences (Day, 2000: 108). With the Immigration Act of 1869, which was created to help fill the ‘empty’ west (this in itself, a discounting of the First Nations that lived there), a new category of Canadian emerged – what Day calls the “Internal Other.” A hierarchy of desirability emerged from Canada’s new immigration policy. British followed by other Northern Europeans were at the top of the scheme and debates about
undesirables such as Dukabours, and in British Columbia in particular, Chinese, came to the fore. Discourse ensued about the threat that these “Strangers within our Gates” posed to Canadianess – which naturally was understood to be pure Anglo-Saxon (Day, 2000: 128, Fleras and Elliot, 1999: 300).

There is not room within this overview to go into an in-depth analysis of the kinds of reasoning and policies that have been used to manage immigration since this process was embedded in legislation in 1869. However, it is worth underlining the fact that explicit measures, such as exclusion acts and head taxes, as well as implicit measures, such as continuous journey requirements or restrictions on foreign credentials, have always been used to legislate who did or did not qualify to be Canadian. As Day puts it, these things were put into place to carefully select those who posed “as little challenge as possible to the existing attempt at order” (Day, 2000: 224).

THE ETHNIC QUESTION

A key outcome of this kind of categorization of peoples has been the idea that some possess ethnicity while some do not. Both Anglophone and Francophone Caucasians in Canada continue to see themselves as separate from the ‘ethnic population.’ In his analysis of multicultural language, Day points out that “‘ethnic’ is used in everyday language to refer to any person or group other than those whom the speaker considers normal or dominant” (Day, 2000: 52). The term is, like race, a cultural construct, with flexible definitions. Manuel Castells has this to say about how the idea of ethnicity comes into being:

Ethnicity, while being a fundamental feature of our societies, especially as a source of discrimination and stigma, may not induce communities on its own. Rather it is likely to be processed by religion, nation and locality. The constitution of these cultural communities is not arbitrary. It works on raw
materials from history, geography, language and environment. So they are constructed, but materially constructed, around reactions and projects historically/geographically determined. (Castells, 1997: 65).

This unquestioned ethnicity of Caucasian Canadians gives rise to the notion that mainstream society does not constitute an immigrant society (Moodley, 1983). This in turn creates what Yasmin Jiwani refers to as the assumed “invisible white background of the dominant culture” (1995: 5). Ethnicity, then, is the criterion for membership and ethnic “otherness” creates a feeling of non-belonging. As Himani Bannerji states, many non-Caucasian Canadians feel “our existence a question mark in the side of the nation.” (1996: 2) On the other hand, she states, “white people, no matter when they immigrate to Canada… become invisible and hold a dual membership in Canada, while others remain immigrants for generations” (1996: 14).

Federal multicultural policies have failed to build an understanding in the host culture of their own ethnicity and culture (Sandercock, 2003a and Mahtani, 2002). The majority of policies focus more on the need for “ethnic” populations to adapt to that of the dominant society and do not overtly address underlying issues of racism, exclusion or ghettoization nor the need of the host society, themselves an ethnic group, to co-adapt. This very serious omission limits the policy’s effectiveness in bringing about sustainable change in Canada’s race relations. One current concrete example of this is the implicit racism involved in the lack of acceptance of foreign credentials, which leads to economic and social alienation of immigrants (Moodley, 1983). In not accepting foreign credentials, as Augie Fleras and Jean Leonard Elliot point out, “a Catch-22 is constant: without Canadian experience, many cannot get certified even with extensive retraining; without a certificate, they cannot get the experience to secure employment or peer acceptance” (1999: 313). This
has hard-felt impacts on new immigrants. According to the 2001 census, 65.8% of recent immigrants were employed, compared to 81.8% among Canadian-born (Alexander, 2003: 28). At the same time, foreign-born visible minorities earn only 78 cents for every dollar earned by foreign-born non-visible minorities (Alexander, 2003: 29). Some immigrant groups, such as Indo-Pakistanis and South Americans, “experience levels of poverty that are twice the national average and that the second generation immigrants may be poorer than their parents, despite not having to face language and cultural obstacles” (Halli and Mohammad, cited in Fleras and Elliot, 1999: 278).

In the midst of this increasing disparity, there has also been a cut back of government spending targeted towards multiculturalism. While federal policies encourage programming to address multicultural issues, the funding available for these programs has been significantly reduced over the last few years even though immigration continues to rise. Leonie Sandercock calls this the fiscal crisis of multiculturalism (2005). In an era of increased need for immigrant services, such as education, housing and health, as well as programs to counter discrimination, these areas are undergoing dramatic cuts from both provincial and federal levels of government.

What results from this deprioritization of multiculturalism is a shallow multiculturalism where diversity is paid lip service to but there is no fundamental redistribution of power in order to include immigrants in Canadian society (Fleras and Elliot, 1999: 138). In a study on mixed race women’s perceptions of the federal multicultural policy, the women described the policy as “an institutional project which funds and promotes staged ethnic representations” which do not reflect the daily realities of their lives (Mahtani, 2002: 74). Others similarly argue that the government is willing to support folk
festivals and ethnic performing arts in an elaborate game of pretend pluralism, but is at the same time reluctant to support minority demands for collective rights or socioeconomic enhancement (Fleras and Elliot, 1999: 313). Diversity is celebrated, while fundamental problems of discrimination and systemic racism are not addressed.

CREATION OF THE UNRULY IMMIGRANT

The perceived inability of immigrants to “blend in” may well arise from the host society’s inability to accept them. Manuel Castells outlines how, in discriminatory environments, resistance identities are formed which are centered around the exclusion of the excluders by the excluded (Castells, 1997). What this entails is “the building of a defensive identity in the terms of dominant institutions/ideologies, reversing the value judgment while reinforcing the boundary” (Castells, 1997: 9). There is a surprising inability by members of the host society to see that their very resistance to immigrants, through such things as exclusion, segregation, and racism (Sandercock, 2003a: 78) may indeed create the kind of “unruly immigrants” they so mistrust and fear. Ongoing and abundant portrayals in the media of these narratives of immigrants as social threat help to further perpetuate this state of mutual exclusion (Jiwani, 1995: 4). In his discussion of urban riots in Britain, Ash Amin asserts that “the rampage of Asian youths should be seen in terms of a “counter-public making a citizenship claim that cannot be reduced to complaints of ethnic and religious mooring or passing youth masculinity” (2003: 462). Interestingly, what Amin outlines here is mainstream society’s ability to feed immigrants’ reactions against segregation or racism into the pre-existing notions about these ‘others’ that gave rise to these acts of resistance in the first place. What ensues is a lack of dialogue and an entrenching of
opposing ideologies. Amin asserts that this is the very thing we should avoid when conflicts arise but need, instead, to shift "towards a politics of presence that is capable of supporting plural and conflicting rights claims and is ready to negotiate diversity through a vigorous but democratic clash among individuals" (2003: 463).

MULTICULTURALISM AS ONGOING DIALOGUE VERSUS A "FAIT ACCOMPLI."

Many agree with Amin's sentiment that societies need to engage in this dialogue and that attempts to stifle debate are counterproductive (Kymlicka, 1998: 69). Many, in fact, feel that keeping debate and renegotiation of multiculturalism alive is the only way to ensure that it is not dismissed as an outmoded concept. However, many also assert that the government has presented the concept in just the opposite manner. In Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity, Richard Day examines Federal multicultural policies in terms of their intended use of the word multiculturalism. He concludes that rather than describing a sociological fact of Canadian diversity, prescribing a social ideal or describing and prescribing a government ideal, the government presents multiculturalism as an already achieved ideal (2000: 6). Koglia Moodley echoes this idea when she states that the Canadian government depicts multiculturalism in a "festive aura of imaginary consensus" (Moodley, 1983, 320). Multiculturalism is often seen as not up for debate. Those who critique it are often accused of racism (Fleras and Elliot, 1999: 313, Kymlicka, 1998). There is, thus, an ingrained fear of dialogue when it comes to multiculturalism.

Some tie this to a fear of challenging underlying issues of power. Day argues that opening up multiculturalism to dialogue is a radical act. It necessitates some giving up of
power by Euro-Canadian elites. He asserts that in “accepting the necessity of an ongoing negotiation of all universal horizons, Canada could start to move from multiculturalism to deep diversity – as more ‘well-managed difference’ within an authoritarian and hierarchical capitalist state form – to multiculturalism as radical imaginary, as difference, de-territorialization, more-than life” (Day, 2000: 227). For Day, this entails that Euro-Canadians ask themselves some challenging questions:

What is it precisely, that is so frightening about the ethnocultural Other? Is it really his outlandish customs and costumes? Or is it rather the claim he necessarily makes, through his simple presence, to engagement as another human being?... The encounter with the Other is valuable precisely to the extent that it demands the modification of Self’s own structures, that it demands change. (2000: 224)

These authors argue that, whatever our current reasons for resisting this dialogue, we must open the idea of multiculturalism up for an informed dialogue about the roles we must all take in building a genuinely multicultural society. It is this kind of dialogue, some argue, that may in fact be one of the unifying features of Canadian society. Many argue that “the Canadian Conversation” – the dialogue over what Canada is and how its different people can live together – is something which Canadians universally identify with and take pride in (Kymlicka, 1998, 176, Fleras and Elliot, 1999: 299). A 1996 survey reported that multiculturalism ranked third (behind health-care and the Charter of Rights but ahead of the CBC and bilingualism) as an important symbol of Canadian identity (Fleras and Elliot, 1999: 316). Rather than fearing a dialogue regarding multiculturalism, these authors are arguing that we should invite it as an exciting and meaningful articulation of who we are. Perhaps Amy B. Sajoo summarizes how we should conceive of multiculturalism most eloquently when he compares our attempts to create cohesive multicultural societies to an orchestral symphony:
Ours is more like an orchestral symphony, complex and energetic in its flow. If the result sometimes strains harmony, blame it on tough rehearsals by an ambitious if relatively young orchestra (1994: 17 as cited in Fleras and Elliot 296).

**RECONCEIVING THE ROLE OF THE HOST SOCIETY:**

Interestingly, the dialogue that currently does occur around multiculturalism often altogether ignores the role which the host society must play in co-adaptation. Popularized critiques of multiculturalism, such as Neil Bissoondath's *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada* and Richard Gwyn's *Nationalism Without Walls: The Unbearable Lightness of Being Canadian* assert that, through encouraging minorities to hold on to their cultural heritage, multicultural policy has operated to separate ethnic minorities from mainstream culture, creating what Bissoondath calls a “psychic apartheid” (2002: 151). These perspectives focus on the need of new immigrants to adapt to the host society, rather than the host society to genuinely adapt to receive immigrants. These critiques by first or second generation immigrants have opened up much debate in multicultural literature, receiving critiques from political theorists such as Will Kymlicka who counters that multicultural policy acts to protect, rather than exclude immigrants (1998). However, Kymlicka’s own definition of multiculturalism is telling:

Multiculturalism is often described as a set of demands made by ethnocultural groups upon the state. In one sense this is quite correct. Yet in another sense multiculturalism is best understood as a response by ethnocultural groups to the demands that the state imposes on them in its efforts to promote integration. From this perspective, the first step towards understanding multiculturalism is to understand the pressures – both positive (incentives and negative (barriers) that the state exerts in order to persuade immigrants to integrate into Canadian society (1998: 25).

Here, Kymlicka also overlooks the role of the host society in multiculturalism focusing, rather, on the ability of immigrants to integrate. The nuances of these authors’ arguments
regarding the limits of multicultural policy are beyond the scope of this thesis. However, I invoke them to illustrate the dynamic and ongoing debate about multiculturalism in this country and, most importantly for the purposes of this research, the fact that much of it completely overlooks the role of the host society in multiculturalism.

Some authors have, however, recently begun to turn their attention to the idea that multiculturalism needs to equally engage members of the host society. In an essay aimed at dispelling many of the critiques of multiculturalism, Augie Fleras and Jean Leonard Elliot underline that multiculturalism is not just for “ethnics” but that attention should be directed at the ethnic mainstream - both attitudes and institutions - by modifying public perception of and response to diversity through modification of rules, rewards, structures, mindsets and symbols. In the final analysis, multiculturalism is an exercise in society building by which all citizens are incorporated as legitimate and distinctive contributors to a united and inclusive society (1999: 317).

The ongoing social disparity and critiques leveled by immigrants who feel they are excluded from access to mainstream society detailed above seem to indicate that Fleras and Elliot’s ideal of inclusivity for all is certainly not part of multiculturalism’s current manifestation. Others elaborate further on what engaging members of the host society in multiculturalism would look like. In her pivotal essay, Canadian Multiculturalism as Ideology, Kogila Moodley argues that in addition to improved services for immigrants such as adequate language and education programs, not the least, the target of multiculturalism would have to be the dominant culture. Anglo-conformity standards would have to be multi-culturalized. This would jettison the very notion of a mainstream culture, in which the others would have to fit. On the contrary, English Canada would genuinely have to learn from other traditions and also internalize valuable habits of other ways of life. At present, not even a different face for a CBC television announcer is tolerable, let alone a Punjabi accent. To be authentic, genuine multiculturalism would have to preclude a cultural hierarchy as well as mere parallelism of
cultural traditions in isolated compartments and represent a mutual learning process, in contrast to the one-sided effort at present. (Moodley, 1983: 327).

Moodley and others outline that multiculturalism, as it is currently practiced in Canada (and other countries), has resulted in segregation by not ever putting the ‘founding nations’ on equal footing with cultural others. Thus the onus has always been put on the immigrant to blend in, not on the host society to adapt. This has lead to increasing fear, distrust of the immigrant, frustration at their inability to “just fit in”, and to the notion that they are a presence which needs to be “tolerated” by mainstream Canadian society.

Many argue that in order to transform how multiculturalism is manifested, a reconceptualization of what it means to be Canadian needs to occur. Ian Angus outlines this idea in *Cultural Plurality and Democracy* stating that “in order for one to experience his/her ethno-cultural belonging as not competing with his/her national identity, it must be seen as a component of national identity” (Angus, 2002: 5). He asserts “the distinction between normative national culture and the so-called folk survival of others” depends upon a concept of core Canadian identity as European. (Angus, 2002: 10). He, thus, advocates that Canadians transform their way of conceiving of multicultural interactions from a relationship of “us-them” to one of “us-we,” where difference becomes a way to participate in the national collective. Other authors echo this sentiment. Ash Amin asserts that the “ethnic moorings of national belonging need to be exposed and replaced by criteria that have nothing to do with whiteness” (Amin, 2003: 22–23). Leonie Sandercock asserts that fear and intolerance can only be reduced through the dual approach of “addressing the prevailing inequalities of political and economic power as well as developing new stories about and symbols of national and local identity and belonging” (Sandercock, 2003a: 103). This new multicultural identity would entail opening the idea up for negotiation from all members of
Canadian society. James Donald argues for this by outlining an ethical need for openness to unassimilated otherness. He proposes an ongoing shared process of meaning making, “an always emerging, negotiated common culture” (Donald, 2003: 88).

These authors’ fundamental argument is that Canada as a nation needs to feel comfortable with diversity, not as an enclave of mainstream society, but as a central feature of society. They are calling for a radical re-conceptualizing of Canadianess that would see unity in multiplicity and operate to transform the role that immigrants have in the national imaginaries of members of Canada’s host society. They see the problems that have arisen from diverse cultures coming to live together as not stemming from diversity itself. Rather, they see the root of the problem as the way in which diverse Others are understood in relation to the dominant society.

How this issue gets dealt with in the day-to-day lives of immigrants and members of the host society alike is a key question for planning professionals. This overview of the origins and current debates around multiculturalism and the role of the host society sets the stage for a discussion on how planning as a profession has traditionally, and is currently, addressing issues of diversity.
Planning: from Modernism to Multiculturalism

The history of planning could be rewritten as the attempt to manage fear in the city: generically, fear of disorder and fear of dis/ease, but specifically fear of those bodies thought to produce that disorder or dis/ease

Leonie Sandercock, Mongrel Cities.

In order to understand what planning’s role is and should be in the face of increasing diversity, it is important first to get a sense of the historical development of the profession. This section will, thus, begin with a brief discussion of planning’s foundation within the modernist paradigm. In order to illustrate what this means and to begin to localize this discussion in the city of Vancouver, an example of how modernist rational planning has been enacted in Vancouver, specifically in the largely Chinese neighbourhood of Strathcona, will be discussed.

MODERNIST PLANNING

Planning as a profession emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century as a rational response to the chaos of the industrial city. Modernist planning was founded upon the idea that order could be made out of the city. At its root was the Enlightenment’s faith that progress could be brought about through reason and science (Sandercock, 1998, Sandercock, 2003a). Central to modernist planning was the idea that only a centralized, top-down approach where planning professionals made rational decisions for the greater good could rid the city of chaos and disorder. One of the key proponents of this approach was Le Corbusier, a Swiss architect who proposed plans for major restructuring of European cities along modernist lines. Along with many followers, Le Corbusier proclaimed in the Athens Charter of 1941 that “lack of urban planning is the cause of anarchy that reigns in the
organization of cities" (Sandercock, 1998: 23). His ideas incorporated a functionalist aesthetic, egalitarian social aims and state-centered total planning (Sandercock, 1998). This approach became a key component of planning education in Europe and North America for the next forty years (Sandercock, 1998).

VANCOUVER'S STRATHCONA NEIGHBOURHOOD AND THE FIGHT AGAINST RENEWAL: AN ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

Planning departments throughout North America were heavily influenced by the modernist approach, and Vancouver was no exception. Vancouver's adoption of the modernist approach is clearly depicted in the 1950s film "To Build a Better City." The film begins with ominous music and a deep man's voice declaring that "blight is death to a city." It depicts the hero planners, represented in the film as clean-cut men in suits bent over city plans, planning strategies for overcoming the "destructive band of blight around the city centre." The movie focuses in on the Maclean Park development in Vancouver's Strathcona district as a key starting point for their urban renewal projects as it was to provide housing for those who were moved during the following phases of the project. The film clearly outlines that blight in the form of poor housing and improper land use has dire social and economic consequences for the city such as poor health, lack of civic pride and crime. It ends on a triumphant note stating, "to build a better city requires only the industry and ingenuity of man." Maclean Park, and the Strathcona area in general, were central to the City's implementation of its ordering, modernist ideology.
Issues of Race and Class

It has been widely documented that urban renewal schemes developed in this era were not blind to white, middle-class imaginings of the chaos of poor, ethnic and immigrant communities (Beauregard, 1993, Jacobs, 1996). The terms “blighted” and “slum” had distinctly racist overtones. From Robert Moses’ mega-projects in New York, to the still controversial leveling of Africville in Halifax, urban renewal schemes overwhelmingly impacted poor, ethnic communities who occupied some of the low tax base areas of the city. Many communities still feel the hurt of the displacement that resulted from these projects to this day, as can be seen in David Woods 1997 poem Africville: Requiem which incorporates the voices of displaced residents:

Mrs. Howe sees the horror of the projects,  
Hears the notes of the lost children,  
Sees the young girl walk half-naked in shame,  
And decides to bless her people  
With a gentle, unending smile.  
Mr. E cried for two years  
Not understanding why a nation  
Of 3 million square miles,  
Could not spare the ¼ mile X ¼ mile  
That was Africville.


Some members of the Chinese community also see the urban renewal scheme that the City of Vancouver began to implement in the Strathcona area as a historical wrong that has never been adequately dealt with. In her dissertation, East as West: Place, State and the Institutionalization of Myth in Vancouver’s Chinatown 1888–1980, Kay Anderson argues that the targeting of Strathcona for urban renewal, and later, for freeways, were examples of a long
history of the majority Caucasian population enacting its fears and biases against the area’s Chinese residents. The Maclean Park Housing complex is as much a manifestation of dominant racist ideology, argues Anderson, as early 1900s campaigns to exclude Chinese from the vote.

The above example illustrates how modernist planning, despite its assumption of rationality and objectivity, could operate to embody and enact the ideologies of the dominant culture to the detriment of other groups. Though this example is taken from the past, contemporary planning departments wrestle with the same issues. For instance, the monster homes issue in Vancouver became a point of contention in the 1980s and 1990s. There was much debate regarding the impact of building typologies, which were seen as being undertaken by immigrants, on urban neighbourhoods (Ley, 1997, Dunn, Hanna, and Thompson, 2001: 1586, Qadeer, 1997).
WE HAVE NEVER BEEN MODERN

As Sandercock outlines, planning has never been the idealized rational and disinterested practice that modernist planning theorists imagined. Rather, it has been deeply influenced by dominant ideologies, and the hopes and aspirations of individual planners.

Post-modern critiques of power and the production of discourse and knowledge, when applied to planning, view planning as a mechanism of social control which reproduces dominant social norms and continually orders and generates ‘the Other’ (Fenster:1999: 13). The norms and rules set and enacted by local governments and planning institutions are not value free. As Mohammad Qadeer points out, “a seemingly neutral regulation about tree maintenance [in a Canadian context] is in fact an embodiment of English/ European preferences” (1997: 482). Sandercock outlines four distinct ways in which dominant social norms can be embedded in planning practice:

first, the values and norms of the dominant culture are typically embedded in the legislative frameworks of planning, in planning bylaws and regulations... Second, the norms and values of the dominant culture are embodied in the attitudes, behaviour and everyday practices of actual, flesh-and-blood planners... Third, the xenophobia and racism that can exist in any neighbourhood of any city may find an expression or outlet through the planning system... Fourth, and most intransigent, what happens when citizens and planners come up against cultural practices that are incompatible with their own deeply held values? (Sandercock, 2003a: 21).

One key indication of planning’s bias towards the concerns of the dominant culture has been its lack of engagement with issues of multiculturalism. Even though the rise in immigration is one of the most pressing issues facing many communities, planning has generally been slow to address the issue. This is in part due to the fact that many planners see their work as technical not cultural (Wallace, 2000). In addition, multicultural policy and programming has often been seen as a federal responsibility, and not something that should
be dealt with at the municipal level. However, cities and municipalities are increasingly being faced with dealing with this and other social issues (Wallace and Milroy, 1999: 57). As Wendy Au points out, “cutbacks and downloading of responsibility from senior governments have left integration to municipalities which have no additional resources to run programs” (Au, 2000: 21). Where planning has begun to deal with issues around diversity and multiculturalism, it has often been seen as an add-on. Diversity has been something “that needs to be accommodated over and above a ‘normal’ set of demands covered by the planning function” (Wallace and Milroy, 1999: 55). For instance, a study which surveyed planners in Australia determined that most saw multicultural policies as a luxury or fringe item (Dunn, Hanna, and Thompson, 2001: 1591).

**MOVING TOWARDS MULTICULTURAL PLANNING**

Recently, planners (at least in planning literature) have begun to address the kind of shift that needs to occur in order for the profession to begin to more adequately deal with increasingly polyethnic cities. In their discussion of approaches to multiculturalism in Australia, Dunn, Hanna and Thompson make a distinction between what they call assimilatory multiculturalism and radical multiculturalism as enacted at the level of local governments. The former focuses on creating what they call tokenistic celebrations of diversity. Radical multiculturalism, on the other hand, “involves political and institutional change, in which the state becomes less clearly aligned with the dominant culture” (2001: 1579). Tactics for this include: antiracism policies, examining cultural biases in local service provision, examining local interethnic tensions and responding in a remedial role when they arise, and changing the face of who is engaged and employed in local government. In short,
it requires that institutions and the people within them undergo a transformation, where diversity is not seen as problematic or additional to their work, but becomes central to how they operate (Dunn, Hanna and Thompson, 2001).

Other authors back up this idea that a shift towards a more radical multicultural practice in planning is needed and suggest actions which planners need to take. Stephen Ameyaw underlines the importance of diversifying planning institutions, as well as articulating the importance of diversity in policy and codes of conduct and through increased accessibility and participation (2000). Mohamed Qadeer calls for “systematic attempts to forge pluralistic visions of urban plans and programs... that [go] beyond simple advocacy for the disadvantaged” (1997: 492). In their overview of planning in ethno-culturally diverse cities, Pestieau and Wallace assert that the training that planners receive “appears to be key to the transformation required to be a “culturally sensitive planner”... or a “culturally inclusive planner”” (2003: 257). In her response to the issues raised in Pestieau and Wallace’s overview, Leonie Sandercock agrees that training is a key component of a larger picture which also includes such things as an overhaul of current planning systems, and an integrated inter-governmental approach to multiculturalism (2003b: 322).

A NEW SKILL SET FOR PLANNERS

In their call for the transformation of current systems of planning and of current planners, these authors all address the need for a new set of skills for planners. They underline the need to develop skills which enable planners to communicate effectively across cultural (and other) boundaries and incorporate the viewpoint of multiple publics instead of manufacturing a “public interest” which is defined from the perspective of the dominant
class (Sandercock, 2003a). These authors are part of a tradition of planning theorists and practitioners who have been calling for shifts in how planning is practiced and taught. John Friedmann began talking about the need to shift from a top-down planning approach to a community-based, dialogic approach over thirty years ago. In works such as *Retracking America*, Friedmann framed his transactive planning approach which focuses on mutual learning between planners and the communities they worked with (Friedmann, 1973). Other planners picked up on the need for a deliberative practice in which planners reflected and learned from their work (Donald Schon, 1983). Recently, John Forester’s 1999 *The Deliberative Practitioner* focuses on the need for planners to use self-reflection and to keenly develop their listening skills. In public deliberations, Forester calls for the “need to learn about strategies, about norms, and about selves transforming all three as we go” (1999: 218).

Sandercock also calls for a dialogical and transformative approach to multicultural planning practice and observes that “it hardly needs to be said that the success of this kind of planning work depends very much on the skills and wisdom of the practitioners involved” (Sandercock, 2000: 27).

In a more recent work, Sandercock outlines some of the skills and wisdom needed by planning practitioners including the ability to listen, enter into dialogue, draw from local knowledge, read the non-verbal, cultivate contemplative or appreciative knowledge, and learn by doing (2003a: 81). In her study of cross-cultural planners and the cross-cultural planning tools that they see as central to their practice, Jill Atkey, highlights a similar set of skills such as reflexivity, listening, and facilitation as key (Atkey, 2004: 84). What these planning theorists are all pointing out is that, in order to transform planning practice, we need to first transform planning practitioners. Harvey sums this idea up by observing:
The planner cannot, in the end, suppress or repress the personal anymore than anyone else can. Furthermore, the planner cannot hope to change the world without changing herself or himself. The negotiation that always lies at the basis of planning practices is therefore, between political persons seeking to change each other and the world as well as themselves (Harvey 1999: 273 as quoted in Atkey, 2004: 23).

The next logical question emerging from this dialogue, then, is how do we transfer the kind of knowledge and skills that these authors are talking about to planners and to others working in polyethnic landscapes? This question brings us to a discussion of an approach that has gained a lot of attention as a way to affect individuals’ attitudes and actions: transformative learning. The following discussion will outline the development of the field of transformative learning and elaborate on how it might be used to create the cultural competencies that planners and others need to engage in the complex planning processes of polyethnic cities. This will provide a backdrop through which to view the efforts of the Hastings Institute/ EEO to affect the kind of change in the skills and attitudes of individuals which is discussed by these authors.

**Transformative Learning**

*The transformation of our culture and society would have to happen at a number of levels. If it occurred only in the minds of individuals (as to some degree it already has), it would be powerless. If it came only from the initiative of the state, it would be tyrannical. Personal transformation among large numbers is essential, and it must not only be a transformation of consciousness but must also involve individual action. But individuals need the nurture of groups that carry a moral tradition reinforcing their own aspirations.*

Robert Bellah, et al, Habits of the Heart

*What we want is a new transformed humanity, not equal opportunity in a dehumanized one.*

Vincent Harding as quoted in DeRosa

To be effective, diversity training and cross-cultural communication initiatives for planners – who currently are for the most part members of the host society (Hoch: 1993: 451) – must create long lasting change in a person’s behaviour. Theorists and practitioners of
transformative learning have dedicated themselves to exploring how such changes come about in people. Transformative learning has its roots in the social learning tradition, used by such groups as the Highlander School which advocated working “with, and from the perspective of the poor rather than from the perspective of state-directed, or expert-centered planning practices” (Sandercock, 2003a, 81). Thinkers such as Paulo Freire have been central to shaping the field. A key aspect of a transformational approach is the reliance on a continuous cycle of action and reflection. The kind of reflection in practice that was also discussed by the planning theorists in the last section has its roots in Paulo Freire’s notion of praxis or the integration of action and reflection to engage in a critical literacy that entails reading “the word and the world” (Mayo, 1999: 74). For Freire, this combination was essential to social change and separation of action and reflection resulted in “either mindless activism or empty theorizing” (Mayo, 1999: 63.)

More recently, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), one of the premier centres for the study of transformative learning, has developed a definition of transformative learning that is particularly relevant to this discussion:

Transformative learning involves experiencing a deep, structural shift in the basic premises of thought, feelings and actions. It is a shift of consciousness that dramatically and permanently alters our way of being in the world. Such a shift involves our understanding of ourselves and our self-locations; our relationships with other humans and with the natural world; our understanding of relations of power in interlocking structures of class, race, gender; our body-awarenesses, our visions of alternative approaches to living and our sense of possibilities for social justice and peace and personal joy. (Morrell & O’Connor, 2002; p. xvii)

Transformative learning is explicitly aimed at working on both the societal and individual levels (O’Sullivan, 2002, Tisdell, 2003). It capitalizes on times when the society’s fundamental beliefs and understandings are being questioned in a way that demonstrates
they are no longer functional and so cannot be maintained (O'Sullivan, 2002). At the individual level, transformative learning tries to capitalize on an individual’s reaction when he or she finds that the assumptions they use to categorize and make meaning consistently give them a misunderstanding or misperception of what is happening (O'Sullivan, 2002). Racism and fear of the cultural ‘Other’ are classic examples of times when assumptions are not functional at both the individual and societal level and when transformative learning techniques can be used to shift people’s understanding.

Morrell and O’Connor acknowledge that for sustainable behaviour change to occur, deeply and often unconsciously held beliefs must be changed. It is important to note that discriminatory thoughts and behaviour need not be the result of what Fleras and Elliot call ‘red-neck racism’ – the explicitly avowed belief that one race is genetically inferior to another. Nor need they involve ‘polite racism’, the kind practiced by people who believe in racial superiority but avoid saying so in public. Rather, such prejudices can be seen as examples of what Elliot and Fleras call “subliminal racism.” This sort of racism is found in people who genuinely accept egalitarian values, but who nonetheless, often unconsciously invoke double standards when evaluating or predicting the actions of different racial groups (Fleras and Elliot, 1999). This sort of racism is particularly difficult to identify, or to eliminate, since it is found in people who “consciously and sincerely reject all racist doctrines” (Kymlicka, 1998, 81). This requires education that moves beyond rational, mind-based techniques to techniques that, while they include the mind, also address a person’s emotions, spirit and body (Morrell & O’Connor, 2002; Tisdell, 2003; Miller, 2002). Thus, transformative learning does not rely exclusively on rational methods of education, but expands this to create dialogue about other aspects of our lives and acknowledges that
multiple ways of knowing are necessary for multicultural understanding (LeBaron, 2002; Morrell & O’Connor, 2002; Sandercock, 1998).

Due to its focus on long-term, fundamental change, transformative learning focuses not only on shifting a mindset but in creating a skill-set that enables continual learning to occur. An example of the kinds of skills that are focused on in transformative learning literature is outlined in bell hooks’ *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*. hooks presents an analysis of teaching in a way that allows “border crossings” or community building across difference to occur. She asserts that “to build community requires vigilant awareness of the work we must continually do to undermine all the socialization that leads us to behave in ways that perpetuate domination” (hooks, 2003: 36). This vigilant awareness is at the root of a key skill needed to actively engage in community, that which hooks calls a “radical openness” to different perspectives and the will and ability to shift one’s own mindset (hooks, 2003: 48). Creating abilities such as self-reflection, listening, and communication, as well as a long term commitment to using them in active engagement is at the core of transformative approaches.

**Multicultural versus Anti-racism Education**

A focus in diversity education on transformative approaches is outlined in the current literature on multicultural and anti-racist approaches. A key distinction is often made in the literature between these two approaches. This distinction centres on the idea that anti-racist education is a more holistic, challenging and engaging approach to overcoming strongly-held beliefs. Effective anti-racism education is seen as a proactive process that “seeks to balance a value on difference with a sharing of power” (Dei, 1996). Rather than
merely focusing on rights and responsibilities, this pedagogical approach focuses on
developing critical insight into issues of power and inequality. It also aims to focus this
insight on existing institutional practices, and to pose a challenge to those which foster
inequity (Fleras and Elliot, 1999). This is contrasted to multicultural education, which does
not openly challenge racism but is “merely intolerant of racism in its practice (Fleras and
Elliot, 1999: 353). In their summary of anti-racism training resources, Bina Mehta and Joelle
Favreau summarize the distinction in this way:

Generally, anti-racist work addresses issues of power and privilege, while
multiculturalism encourages a celebration of one’s culture. While anti-racist
training acknowledges the need to respect differences, it also tries to address the
more complex issues of how people are treated unfairly as a result of their racial
background... Ultimately, the goal of anti-racism is the elimination of racial
discrimination and prejudice. Anti-racism is more overtly politicized,
acknowledges the historical oppression of people of colour and calls for action
against racism; by comparison, multicultural training does not often develop
beyond celebrations of peoples’ different backgrounds, as the primary means for
achieving harmonious communities. This is an important distinction (2000: 4).

A key aspect of the anti-racist approach is a focus on the historical and societal
structures that give rise to racism. As Sefa Dei observes, “justice is... not about simply
treating everyone the same. Justice is recognizing the different ways individuals and groups
have been historically disadvantaged and developing remedial measures that work within the
lessons of history” (Dei, 1996: 312). Those who advocate for anti-racist over multicultural
approaches feel that unless we become critically reflective about the cultural norms we are
embedded in, we will take for granted social norms and cultural codes which distribute
power and privilege. It is this lack of critical insight into systems of oppression and
domination that multicultural approaches are criticized for. Diversity trainer Carl James
worries that the very idea of multiculturalism may actually be detrimental to changing racist
behaviour. He warns:
Canadian anti-racism sources are sometimes stifled by the fact that we assume that because, unlike the Americans, we consider ourselves multicultural, then we are accepting of everyone... Obviously that is not the case. Racism is just as prevalent here as elsewhere. So we have to look more carefully at what our rhetoric of multiculturalism covers up in terms of getting at the issues of inequalities and injustice due to racism. Multiculturalism is not anti-racism, there are different tenets that underlie their orientations and actions (as quoted in Mehta and Favreau, 2000: 8).

In her overview of diversity training, Patti DeRosa makes further distinctions between the varied philosophical underpinnings of training approaches. She outlines the “intercultural approach” which sees “ignorance, cultural misunderstanding and value clashes” as the problems and “increased cultural awareness, knowledge and tolerance” as the solutions (1996: 1). She asserts that this is the approach used in most international business and student exchanges. The “managing diversity approach” shares many similarities with the intercultural approach, though its focus is more on higher level managers and the need for them to learn to engage with difference in a business context. The “legal compliance approach,” on the other hand, focuses on lack of compliance with civil rights regulations, and exclusionary procedures within an organization as the problem. It focuses on education about and compliance with legal frameworks, rather than on personal transformation. The “prejudice reduction approach” focuses instead on activities that promote emotional release. While DeRosa applauds this approach for helping to get at the emotional core of prejudice she argues that often the emphasis is too much on personal hurt and not enough on institutional oppression. The “valuing diversity approach” looks at all aspects of diversity. DeRosa argues that in this approach, “since all human differences are up for discussion, the unique histories and experiences of specific groups may be obscured or diluted. Issues of privilege and entitlement of dominant groups’ members may not be critically examined” (1996: 3).
For DeRosa, the anti-racism approach is the only one which adequately brings together critical reflection on societal issues of power as well as a focus on individual transformation. She outlines how this approach has moved away from the ‘in-your-face’ style of early civil rights work. For her, new anti-racist approaches effectively combine aspects of other training philosophies:

New-style AR (anti-racism)… takes a knowledge of cultural dynamics from the Interculturalists and an understanding of the need for legal supports from the Legal Compliance approach. From Managing Diversity, it takes the recognition of the impact of diversity on organizational effectiveness. Like Prejudice Reduction, it is committed to emotional exploration and healing, and like Valuing Differences, it focuses on wide spectrum of human differences. (5)

In her analysis, new style anti-racism both combines and moves beyond these approaches. It “clearly links the micro-analysis and the macro, the personal and the political. It requires deep self-examination and demands action in our personal and political lives. It is inclusive and transformative, rather than additive, reformist or assimilationist” (5). We can see through this discussion, that there is strong parallel between anti-racism education, as outlined by these authors, and the kind of pedagogical approaches that are extolled in transformative learning literature. Both are looking at using innovative and expansive approaches to training and education in order to engage individuals in more fundamental shifts in attitude and understanding. These approaches help to set the stage for the analysis of the approach of the Hastings Institute/ EEO to education and training.
The Role of Storytelling

Stories are merely theories. Theories are dreams.
A dream is a carving knife
and the scar it opens in the world
is history.

*from The Geology of Norway by Jan Zwicky*

Another key idea for setting the context from which to view this case study is the role of storytelling. Increasingly, in planning discourse and other literature about social change, the transformational role of stories and storytelling is being explored. This discourse is particularly relevant to this study because, as discussed above, it is the stories, both conscious and unconscious, about ourselves and others that create either the cohesiveness or divisiveness of communities and societies. In particular, it is the narration of the cultural ‘Other’ by members of the host society that creates boundaries between those conceived of as “natives” and those conceived of as newcomers. It is, thus, essential to examine how current thinkers are looking at how stories can be used to reframe our understanding, rather than to engrain long-held biases and prejudices.

Sandercock asserts that the stories that we usually hear create boundaries between urban citizens:

Official urban discourses (those produced by City Council’s Departments of Planning, Police Departments, mainstream media) tend to legitimize and privilege the fears of the bourgeoisie, their fears of those Others who might invade or disrupt their homely spaces, their habitus. We rarely hear from those folks whom official discourse classifies as Other, about their fears: the fear for example, of being hungry, homeless, jobless, of having no future in the city, of being unable to provide for one’s children, the fear of not being accepted in a strange environment, the fear of police or citizen violence against them (Sandercock, 2003a: 124).
While this official urban discourse operates to create and maintain boundaries, Sandercock and others have begun to conceptualize how stories can be used in quite a different way. In *Story and Sustainability*, James Throgmorton and Barbara Eckstein compiled the work of planning scholars who argue for a very different use of stories. These authors frame how sharing stories across imagined boundaries can shift the discourse from one of division to one of shared understanding.

In this collection, Robert Beauregard outlines what urban citizenship entails in his discussion of discursive democracy. He discusses the ideal urban citizen as an active storyteller who is expressing a view of the world from a personal perspective. She or he is also an active listener to stories told by others. While public spaces might lend themselves to political speeches, harangues, and avant-garde raving, the basic democratic work is only to be done when people interact with each other in ways that allow specific experiences to be set against other specific experiences and to be considered, validated and challenged. Telling and knowing are connected. Stories are told not just to express understanding and intentions to their listeners but also to reshape them. A discursive democracy has to enable private stories to become public... For this to happen, trust and reciprocity must be strong, Deliberations must be non-threatening. In the absence of such conditions, citizens will remain silent or defensive (Throgmorton and Eckstein: 2003: 68).

In his discussion, Beauregard is elaborating on Habermas’ ideas about discursive democracy which see mutual dialogue as a key building block for democracy. Central to this idea is the notion that people’s opinions are formed through interactions and deliberation. As Beauregard puts it, “people’s interests are not presocial, but emerge out of social interactions. People reveal their feelings about an issue, listen as others speak, reflect on what they have said and heard, and search for common ground” (in Throgmorton and Eckstein: 2003: 75).

The challenge these scholars present is that of creating story-telling occurrences and
stories that allow people to renarrate their cities. They argue that we need to create opportunities for citizens to manifest accounts of inclusive rather than exclusive cities and that allow them to expand their notion of community rather than cocoon in the face of difference. Barthel argues in this collection that “story at its best creates a sense of commonality; commonality generates a sense of shared history, creates the possibility of community. We need to create spaces and ways to hear, share, draw lessons from, and act on these stories.” (Barthel in Throgmorton and Eckstein, 2003: 242.) What these writers are calling for, then, is the creation of spaces for interaction – these spaces include events where different cultures can gather to talk across difference, actual physical spaces which are set up for cultures to gather as well as what Sandercock calls banal transgressions where the explicit aim is not formal dialogue, but rather the creation of environments where cultural exchange can occur on a more casual and ongoing basis.

STORYTELLING AND DIALOGUE CREATION THROUGH THE ARTS

An approach to engaging a wide audience in shared storytelling that is gaining a lot of attention in current literature is to create opportunities for dialogue through the arts. In his new book Better Together: Restoring the American Community, Robert Putnam, who is well-known for his work on the decline of social capital in modern society, states that “the arts represent perhaps the most significant underutilized forum for rebuilding community in America” (as quoted in Borrup, 2003: 5). Czech president Vaclav Havel, also a renowned playwright, observed “that arts offer a unique means of connecting us to our common humanity” (Saguaro Seminar, undated: 1). Community arts, undertaken with a community engagement approach, offer unique opportunities to create dialogue around this common
humanity. Researchers at Harvard’s Saguaro Seminar on Civic Engagement in American have observed that community arts “have a singular advantage in rebuilding social capital: they are enjoyable and fun” (Saguaro Seminar, undated:4). Other civic activities such as attending meetings or voting, they argue, are akin to “civic broccoli’ because they are good for all but unpleasant to many” (Saguaro Seminar, undated: 4). Community arts are also seen as being especially useful for engaging citizens in cross-cultural dialogue. One example where community arts had a profound impact is outlined in renowned cultural planner Robert Palmer’s discussion about the impact the development of a parade had on cross-cultural understanding in the diverse city of Brussels.

When we started to work on the parade… we began to talk to people about… integration. Through our discussions, we began to understand that the real belief was not in integration but in a respect for difference. That was what people actually wanted was a real respect for their own particular cultural positions and identities… They wanted opportunities to develop those traditions and to share them with others… [The parade] offered a visible statement about the importance of cultural differences in Brussels. This parade became a metaphor or icon… [and it] substantially influenced the new way in which the city began to look at cultural diversity. (Palmer, 2002)

Community arts, from events like parades to murals and mosaics, can give groups a way to express and celebrate difference in an engaging and fun way. As in the example from Brussels, this can help to shift the perspective from the need for new immigrants to integrate to one where different cultural identities are valued. In this way, communities focus on diversity as an asset rather than a threat. Incorporating these kind opportunities for intercultural interaction into the daily lives of citizens is seen as key to building cross-cultural understanding between diverse groups. As Ash Amin points out, “changes in attitude and behaviour spring from lived experience” (Amin, 2003: 15).

In using community arts approaches, however, it is important not to revert to the
kind of multicultural celebrations that have been criticized by some as supplying nothing more than a veneer of shallow multiculturalism over larger issues of societal racism. In their discussion of successful policy directions for building social cohesion, Waters and Teo emphasize that building connections across group lines best occurs through ongoing strategies. In fact, they point out that “one-time efforts often exacerbate rather than solve tensions” (Waters and Teo, 2003: 37). It is important, then, to make community arts and other initiatives ongoing or part of larger ongoing efforts to create linkages between people. The ultimate aim of this interaction needs to be the creation of what Edward Soja calls intercultural coalitions which “consciously combine formerly separate and often antagonistic racial and ethnic grouping.” (2000: 282). Soja sees these kinds of coalitions as having the ability to open up “spaces of resistance in the Postmetropolis, not just as figures of speech but also as concrete sites for progressive political action” (2000: 282). Soja outlines a concrete example of how this occurred in Carson, the most heterogeneous neighbourhood in L.A. He outlines that Carson’s awareness of its unusual cultural heterogeneity has led to the creation of the country’s first Museum of Cultural Diversity, described as a “Forum for Cultural Collaborations Through the Arts” (2000: 296). This substantial arts and cultural initiative worked to create a permanent space to showcase, celebrate and re-narrate ideas of cultural difference. It, thus, became the kind of ongoing site for interaction and building of understanding across cultural boundaries that these thinkers are advocating.

STORYTELLING AND THE ROLE OF PLANNERS

Leonie Sandercock asserts that much of what planners do is performed story (Sandercock, 2003a: 183). Part of what she means by this is that planners’ actions are an
enactment of the stories within which individual planners are embedded – from the story of their society’s origin, to their own personal stories about who they are and their role in the world. Beyond this, she is getting at the idea that even the seemingly driest policy documents are stories that planners are telling about the places we live. In addition to this, she is getting at the idea that public meetings are events which centre around the telling and, ideally, the reconciling of competing narratives. Other authors also elaborate on the role of planner as storyteller. In her discussion of James Throgmorton’s writing on the subject, Barbara Eckstein observes that:

Throgmorton’s texts come as close as any I know about public decision making to enacting the role of the planner-storyteller and the definition of narrative that best serve the public trust. The storyteller is the one who actively makes space for the story(s) to be heard. An effective story is that narrative which stands the habits of everyday life on their heads so that blood fills those brainy cavities with light (Throgmorton and Eckstein, 2003: 35)

The role of the planner as storyteller is thus two-fold. Firstly, the planner is a convener and creator of space for public storytelling. In this role the planner must have the knowledge of what storytelling is, how it can best be used to create effective public dialogue, and the ability to effectively mediate between competing stories in order to ensure that space is created for all sides to be heard. Eckstein outlines the transformative role of creating these kinds of opportunities:

The will to change… has to come from a storyteller’s ability to make a narrative and physical space in which to juxtapose multiple, traditional stories so that they enrich, renarrate and transform that space rather than compete for ultimate control (Throgmorton and Eckstein: 2003: 39).

Secondly, these authors are arguing that planners, themselves, must be effective storytellers, cultivating the tools and skills necessary to communicate these stories about communities and their future in a more transformative and inspiring way.
Having outlined the analytical backdrop for this research in terms of current literature on multiculturalism, transformative learning, anti-racist education approaches and the role of storytelling, I now turn to a complementary case study in order to supply further context from which to examine the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO. AMKA (The Municipal Department of Multicultural Affairs) in Frankfurt, Germany is a key comparative example to the Hastings Institute/ EEO that has been analyzed in planning literature. John Friedmann and Ute Angleika Lehrer presented an analysis of AMKA’s work in a 1997 article entitled “Urban Policy Responses to Foreign In-Migration: The Case of Frankfurt-am-Main.” The analysis of, and lessons learned from, this initiative were then further examined by Leonie Sandercock in her discussion of urban multicultural strategies in Mongrel Cities.

The aim of AMKA when it was founded in 1989 was to foster a peaceful multicultural society, through engaging its citizens in a process of “Zusammenwachsen” or “growing together” (Sandercock, 138, 2003a). Their key objectives included “reducing the German population’s fear of the ‘Other’, encouraging public discussion of migration and social tolerance, engaging newcomers in active participation in public affairs, encouraging the cultural activities of foreign residents, and offering training for members of the municipal bureaucracy in intercultural communication” (Wolf-Almanasreh as quoted in Friedmann and Lehrer, 1997). A key aspect of their work was carrying out public hearings and forums, which were titled: A Hearing on the Situation of Foreigners in Frankfurt, A Hearing on the Situation of Migrant Women, and Suggestions and Demands for an Urban Policy Concerning Frankfurt’s Population. All of these were aimed at creating opportunities for diverse groups to listen and be heard as well as creating strategies for how diverse groups
could live and prosper together. In addition to public dialogues, AMKA focused on additional avenues for newcomers to participate in the political and daily life of the city through such initiatives as a Foreign Residents’ Advisory Board who attended city council meetings and commented on the municipal budget, as well as through supporting multicultural organizations and events. Unfortunately, these efforts came to an end when the Red-Green coalition that put them in place was voted out of office in 1995.

From this example, Sandercock outlines a number of key strengths of the organization’s work as well lessons learned that are valuable for setting the stage for the analysis of the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO. First, she summarizes what she sees as particularly significant about AMKA’s work:

- It dealt with multicultural citizenship at the level of the city and everyday life
- It was committed to a long-term perspective
- It promoted mutual learning
- It recognized and tried to address fear of foreigners, and the violence that often accompanies this fear
- It addressed the culture of municipal bureaucracy (police, teachers, judges, planners)
- It saw its main role as educational, oriented to learning and communication. (Sandercock, 2003a: 139).

To this I would add that AMKA wasn’t afraid to call a spade a spade. By this I mean, it wasn’t afraid to confront the host population with its own racism. While shallow multicultural initiatives tend to dance around the underlying issues of prejudice and racism, AMKA’s hearings clearly sought to address these difficult issues. Sandercock also outlines some insightful political conclusions that can be drawn from this example:

For a project of migrant integration at the level of the city, there needs to be multi-party support... [In addition] support from the national state is essential if conditions of becoming a citizen are to change. A third insight has to do with
the micro-politics of integration. The public forums were incredibly important symbolic events, and may also have contributed to the empowerment or confidence-building of those migrant organizations and individuals who took part, but there is also micro-sociological work that needs to be done street by street, neighbourhood by neighbourhood, and across a range of institutions (Sandercock, 2003a: 139–140).

The work of AMKA gives important insight into the kind of work that needs to be carried out at the city level in order to effectively address co-adaptation of the host society and newcomers. Analyzing its work also offers some insight into the conditions that both need to be in place and need to be created in order for this kind of work to really have long-lasting impact. These observations will inform the analysis of the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4
THE CASE STUDY

Having set the backdrop for analysis, I now turn to a discussion of the case study. This section will begin by looking at provincial and municipal policies in order to set the context for the work carried out by the Hastings Institute/ EEO. After a brief introduction to the Hastings Institute/ EEO, I will move into the heart of this investigation: a review of the Institute’s work drawn from interviews with past and current staff, trainers, and trainees as well as key documents.

Setting the Context: Provincial and Municipal Multicultural Policies

Multicultural programming in Vancouver exists within a framework of policies developed at the federal, provincial and municipal government level. These policies frame, empower, and at times restrain the work of building cross-cultural understanding. As federal policies have already been discussed above, in order to further set the context for a discussion of the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO, this section outlines the Provincial and Municipal policies and examines their limitations.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT – BRITISH COLUMBIA

British Columbia’s multicultural policies are largely restricted to the Multiculturalism Act (1996). The Act lays out broad purposes which have the potential of addressing the issue of building cross-cultural understanding. These are: to recognize that the diversity of British Columbians is a fundamental characteristic of our society, to encourage respect for the
multicultural heritage of British Columbia, to promote racial harmony and cross-cultural understanding, and to foster full and free participation of all British Columbians in the economic, social, cultural and political life of the province (Province of British Columbia, 2006). The Act outlines several policies related to reducing racism and violence as well as increasing cross-cultural understanding. These policies imply, but do not explicitly state, that the host society’s beliefs and behaviours must be addressed in order to achieve the purposes of the Act.

LIMITATIONS OF PROVINCIAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

Despite some of the Multiculturalism Act’s progressive policies, the current government’s lack of funding of programs under the Act seriously limits any impact this policy could have. For this Act to achieve its potential, the government would need to infuse it with funding and build strong partnerships with grass roots organizations able to implement the innovative programs to reach the Act’s lofty goals. In addition, by restricting its multicultural policy to one act, the province has failed to give municipalities a strong mandate to work on multicultural issues (Ley & Murphy, 2001). Without a clear mandate, municipalities have been hesitant to commit tax-payers’ money to these issues. The province’s new strategic framework, which was released in 2005, does outline some interesting directions for multiculturalism in B.C. such as asserting that the provincial government should sponsor multicultural and anti-racism training for the community leaders (Province of British Columbia, 2005: 14). However, its central flaw is that nobody is mandated to do anything (Sandercock, 2005). In addition, at a municipal level, the focus is on creating multicultural celebrations. For example, suggestions for what municipalities
could do include “promote religious and cultural days of importance within the community to highlight local diversity” and “increase sponsorship for multicultural events in a variety of public spaces” (Province of British Columbia, 2005: 10). These directions do not engage at all with the more transformative, anti-racist approaches discussed above.

**CITY OF VANCOUVER POLICIES**

City of Vancouver Mission Statement: To create a great city of communities, which cares about its people, its environment, and the opportunities to live, work and prosper (City of Vancouver, 2006b).

Largely responding to federal and provincial policies and funding, the City of Vancouver has sought to develop local multiculturalism-oriented policies, initiatives, programs, and partnerships. As mentioned in the introduction to this research, in 1977 the City adopted the Equal Employment Opportunity program that outlined the policies and guidelines for hiring a diverse workforce and offered diversity training to City staff. In 1988, under Mayor Gordon Campbell, City Council adopted a civic policy on Multiculturalism Relations. The policy addresses the need to recognize diversity as strength, freedom from prejudice, and to ensure access to civic services for all residents regardless of backgrounds, including those who have language barriers (City of Vancouver, 2003c).

In response to this policy and the needs of an increasingly ethnically diverse population, the City undertook a variety of multicultural initiatives in the 1980s and 1990s. In 1989 the Hastings Institute was created in response to a growing demand from external organizations for the kind of diversity training the City was offering internally. In 1993, the City hosted community forums entitled “From Barriers to Bridges” during which Council reaffirmed its policy of reflecting cultural diversity in all aspects of civic activity. Two years
later, Council adopted a Diversity Communications Strategy, developed by staff and community representatives that included a multilingual information and referral phone service as well as an ethnic media news monitoring service that provides overviews of key messages for staff (City of Vancouver, 2006d). The City also keeps an inventory of staff people who speak a second language and who are on-call if language assistance is required.

The CityPlan process, beginning in 1993, was one of the largest public involvement processes undertaken by the City (City of Vancouver, 2006e). Between 1993 and 1995, CityPlan staff developed strategies to involve the cultural and immigrant groups in the City. As Joyce Lee pointed out in her 2002 thesis *Visioning Diversity: Planning Vancouver's Multicultural Cities* which examined CityPlan, the City still has a long way to go in creating innovative processes that effectively engage diverse communities. However, outreach to these groups does continue to be an important part of the ongoing CityPlan Neighbourhood Visions process, and the City continues to learn and adapt its methods.

In 1994, a Special Advisory Committee on Diversity Issues was formed to advise Council on various policy-related issues concerning better inclusion and involvement of culturally diverse communities. Every year, the committee gives two categories of Cultural Harmony Awards: individual and organizational. In 1999, Council approved $513,600 or 18.5% of the City Grant program for community organizations that service immigrants/refugees or culturally distinct communities (City of Vancouver, 2003f). Priority for the funding has been given to services aimed at removing barriers to access of service for many members of ethnic communities and/or facilitating the integration of “newcomers.” Examples of agencies receiving grants include MOSAIC, SUCCESS, Immigrant Services Society, and Metropolis Vancouver. Vancouver also publishes a Newcomer’s
Guide to the City, which is available in five languages. This variety of approaches has made Vancouver a leader, at least in municipalities within the Greater Vancouver metro-region, in multicultural readiness (Edgington and Hutton, 2002).

**LIMITATIONS TO VANCOUVER’S POLICIES**

Although the City of Vancouver has certainly sought to develop multicultural initiatives to promote equality and understanding between diverse groups in the city, Ley and Murphy (2001) question whether their efforts have been consistent with the high level of immigration. Federal and provincial downloading of responsibilities have left municipalities to address multicultural, diversity and integration issues without additional resources. However, these issues continue to affect the city’s citizens everyday and must be addressed. Many years after adopting an Equal Employment Opportunity program, the staff composition of the City is still far from reflecting the diverse community it serves. As with the provincial and federal governments, the City has much more to do to prepare both itself as a corporation and the host society within its boundaries to receive newcomers. The City’s work is restricted due to the fact that funding from senior levels of government for multicultural initiatives has become increasingly scarce as well as the fact that municipalities in British Columbia have only a vague and optional mandate to work on multicultural issues (Ley & Murphy, 2001).

**Case Study: The Hastings Institute/ Equal Employment Opportunity program (EEO)**

Having set the context for the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO through the preceding discussion of multicultural policies, I now move on to a focused description and
BACKGROUND

The Hastings Institute/ Equal Employment Opportunity program is a not-for-profit organization wholly owned by the City of Vancouver. As stated above, though the focus of this research was primarily on the Hastings Institute, the work of the EEO is often closely linked with it and it was mentioned frequently by interviewees. This brief overview will, thus, elaborate on the roles of both. Both the EEO and the Hastings Institute deliver training on issues related to employment and service equity, diversity, cross-cultural relations, literacy, and harassment-free workplaces. The EEO does this internally within the City as well as providing informal and formal processes to deal with concerns of discrimination and harassment. The Hastings Institute was established in 1989 to provide the kind of internal training that the City did for its own staff externally. Currently, the Hastings Institute provides training and consulting services externally for provincial government ministries, municipalities, crown corporations, community agencies and the private sector (Please see Appendix A: Hastings Institute Client List for examples of current clients). In addition, the Hastings Institute/ EEO is also responsible for the Workplace Language Program. This is a program that operates both internally within the City of Vancouver and with outside institutions such as the University of British Columbia and the British Columbia Building Corporation. Through the City of Vancouver, employees can receive conversation and literacy training from the program at one half employee time, one half city time.

As the current head of the Hastings Institute put it, the Hastings Institute and the EEO are “separate, but closely linked” (Interviewee L). Though often talked about as two
separate organizations, they are actually one organization operating under one director. There are six permanent staff for both. Four of these are advisors, who carry out tasks such as planning, programming and budgeting. One of these advisors heads up the work of the Hastings Institute, while the rest work primarily for the EEO. In addition to these advisors there are two administrative staff (Please see Appendix B for an organizational chart of the organization). Finally, there are a number of trainers who work as consultants for the EEO’s internal harassment training and Workplace Language Program as well as externally through the Hastings Institute’s harassment training. These trainers have an array of academic training and hands-on experience (Please see Appendix C for a list of current trainers and their backgrounds.) Though the organizations are closely linked, the Hastings Institute also has its own board, chaired by the mayor, which governs its operations. This is a direct result of then mayor, Gordon Campbell’s, involvement in the creation of the organization in 1989 as well as an attempt in the early 1990s to have the Hastings Institute and EEO function as separate organizations. Both of these points will be picked up on in the following discussion.

In analyzing the role and impact of the Hastings Institute over the years, I have used a number of sources. The following discussion draws on twelve interviews that I personally carried out with administrators, trainers and trainees of the organization. In addition to my interviews, the impacts section references three reports. The first is an impact assessment report conducted by external consultants on Hastings Institute training in 1990 which was created through interviews, questionnaires and focus groups. The second is a collection of raw interviews collected for a directed studies project by students at B.C.I.T in 1992. The third is an analysis carried out in 2000 by the City of North Vancouver of different municipalities’ degree of engagement with multiculturalism. Finally, I also drew upon the
Institute’s past and current training material to further inform this discussion.

Many broad themes emerged throughout this research. As a way of structuring the broad array of data that was gathered, the information has been organized thematically to give a picture of the past, present and future of the Hastings Institute/EEO as part of the City of Vancouver’s larger multicultural work. You will also find that through the interviews a focus emerged on “the Kingswood Days” as the heyday of the organization as well as the benchmark against which all future work of the organization would be measured. As stated in a 1999 report to council:

The “Kingswood years” created a framework of knowledge, awareness and commitment in key areas throughout the province and are the foundation on which the Hastings Institute has built its current programs. (City of Vancouver, 1999: 4).

More space is, thus, given to a description and analysis of these early years as they provided the foundation upon which all future work of the Hastings Institute/EEO was built.

REFLECTION ON THE INTERVIEWS

As stated in the methodology section, self-reflection has emerged in recent years as an important component of both ethnographic research and of planning practice. In presenting the interviews, then, I feel it is important to begin with my own reflections on the interviews themselves as well as the way I have chosen to present them through this analysis. One key observation that I had when reflecting back on the interviews was that I observed many rifts and internal conflicts which centered both around ideological points of view as well as personal dynamics. At first, these made me uncomfortable, as I felt that these sometimes strongly felt emotions would taint the research in some manner. Perhaps people’s
feelings about the effectiveness of the organization would be unduly affected by their personal feelings about those who had been or still were involved in it. However, by asking myself why this made me uncomfortable, I began to recognize that personal dynamics and human emotions are part of any work we do. To try to divorce the internalized politics from the larger political picture wasn’t going to give a clearer picture of the organization’s work. Rather, it would likely give an overly-sanitized view of the process of trying to carry out social change.

Thus, I felt that omitting these conflicts would make it appear (like many retrospectives of innovations, reforms and even revolutions do) that a clear agenda was always apparent and that people were always in agreement as to how to accomplish their common goals. In trying to give a more realistic picture of the human side of social change, I decided to retain people’s articulations of the human dynamics, both positive and negative, which shaped the work of the organization. In reflecting on why this was important, I began to understand that it is key for planners to understand the personal dynamics affecting our work. Planners’ roles in creating and guiding the communities in which people live is tied to something that deeply affects people – their ideas of home. To try to divorce these feelings from planning processes is, in effect, to dehumanize them. I feel that including and accepting these conflicts and contradictions became a way to not only enrich this study, but to enrich my future work as a planner.

As a result of including these complexities, names of interviewees have been omitted to protect their anonymity and each interviewee has been assigned a letter of the alphabet. Also, rather than editing the quotes down to sound-bite size, I have left them lengthy. This was done in an attempt to avoid presenting a summary of what the interviewees
said which was overly translated through my own understanding and way of framing the issue. Rather, I wanted to present the stories and background experience in which their observations and points of view are embedded. I felt that this approach better gave voice to the many contradictory statements the interviewees had about the work of the organization.

Findings

ORIGINS OF THE HASTINGS INSTITUTE

In an analysis of how diversity policies originate in municipalities, a report prepared by the City of North Vancouver points out that cities such as Vancouver, Richmond and Burnaby, which were most affected by the wave of Asian immigration that began in the 1980s, were early proponents of policies to do with diversity. Vancouver has since taken its development of diversity and cross-cultural policies and mandates much further than other municipalities. In their analysis, the City of North Vancouver points out that the early and continuing adaptation of these policies by the City of Vancouver was greatly helped by having champions within the bureaucracy (City of North Vancouver: 200: 49). Many interviewees suggested it was the initiative and support of the then mayor (Gordon Campbell), and the City Manager (Ken Dobell) that initially gave rise to the organization. The Hastings Institute was seen as such a priority that the mayor was established as the chair of the board, something that continues to this day. Many felt the early commitment by high level staff was one of the key elements that secured long-term commitment to this kind of endeavour. A past trainer for the Hastings Institute felt that this was something that enabled Vancouver to maintain a commitment to this initiative:

Unless the city manager says it is a priority, or the mayor, then it really isn’t a priority. You do have people at mid-management and they can do small things,
but important things. But really you need people at the senior level to be saying this is significant to us. (Interviewee C)

During its initial three years of operation, the Hastings Institute received core funding from the Secretary of State – Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada and financial support for program development from provincial ministries and agencies (City of Vancouver, 1999: 3). Many of the interviewees felt that this support, financial and otherwise, for the early training carried out by the Hastings Institute arose out of a unique environment. There was commitment to multicultural training during that time from all levels of government. This, however, waned after a few peak years. In describing an offshoot of the Kingswood simulation training aimed at Crown Corporations, which was nicknamed “the Crowns”, one ex-Hastings trainer had this to say about how support for the program had tapered off:

The Crowns was a two-day training where a bunch of the Crowns came together – BC Hydro, BCBC, BC Transit, a mix of all of them. It was meant to be mostly supervisors. And we had one of the VPs who would always come and promote the training and that took place in a hotel in Richmond. This was the day when money flowed for training because we would have coffee, tea, muffins and then a fancy lunch... That was the standard. It was expected. That was a costly training. But they were up for it because at that time there definitely was commitment from the Crowns to look at this. They had equity offices and the provincial government was pushing equity... People can’t pay for things anymore. The Crowns training we couldn’t do anymore. Not with all that money for actors and fancy lunches and people getting away for two days for diversity training in this climate. There has been a shift and that’s related to the fiscal climate, the political climate, and the fact that many organizations are so concerned with the bottom line that diversity has fallen off the table. (Interviewee H)

Many interviewees talked about how it was the spirit of the times that gave rise to the possibility of the organization and to the City’s cross-cultural ambitions. It was a time in which there was, in the words of one former Kingswood trainer, “an amazing sense of possibility.” A long-term trainer with the Hastings Institute had this to say about the ethos
In some ways the work that we were doing at Hastings was challenging organizations to reflect on what does it really mean to welcome and value diversity – we say it, but what does it mean to enact it in our organization. It was a very positive and challenging time. It was also a time where people were willing to have that dialogue. That’s another reason why I appreciated being involved in that work because people were open to having conversations. Human rights law was in place but human rights jurisprudence was just coming into being. Past practices were being challenged that existed for years – that ethos was being challenged. The language that we used: firemen became fire officers; aldermen became councilors, etc. Not to say that all of these changes came easy. I would argue that it was more than the policy of the City. It was a changing ethos in Canadian society that began to challenge these practices and we just were involved in the education and training of this. (Interviewee A)

Some also cited the local political environment as particularly conducive to the emergence of the organization. A past trainee of the Hastings Institute who now heads up a local non-profit had this to say:

I think at that time Council had enough level of stability that they were able to try some new and innovative kinds of things. It was just after Expo [86] so there was some attention around the city being a world Mecca in some respects. I came from the prairies to Vancouver after Expo – the diversity of the city drew me here. Part of that may have been created through Expo and part of it may have been created by it being a diverse community at that time. My sense is that was when things really began to shift from the city’s perspective. And I think after Expo there were still a lot of residual effects. There was lots of development that happened – there was lots of housing development and Hong Kong’s time clock was ticking. So there were a number of things that were having huge influences in the community. I think the City had to react to that. Many people in our community were very resistant to these changes. They didn’t want their sleepy little community to become a big city. They didn’t want to have these strangers coming from other parts of the world and changing it. So I think that’s kind of what leads to a lot of things. And there were some good innovative things happening at that time. The children’s advocate was designated in that period, lots of interesting social housing was being developed. As far as the other levels of government I don’t remember the provincial government being very involved at that point. Everything that was really happening around inclusivity and diversity was really coming from the municipality. (Interviewee G)
THE UNIQUENESS OF THE CITY OF VANCOUVER'S COMMITMENT TO MULTICULTURALISM

Throughout the interviews and documents, there emerged a feeling that the City of Vancouver was unique in terms of the quality and length of its commitment to multiculturalism. Certainly according to the continuum of municipal multicultural activities drawn up in a study carried out by the municipality of North Vancouver, the City of Vancouver has achieved many of the more difficult to implement. In this study, the authors posit that those initiatives that are more difficult to implement are also the most likely to address systemic barriers and discrimination. (See Figure 5 below for this continuum.)

Figure 5: Municipal Multicultural Activities Continuum (City of North Vancouver, 2000: 54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Multicultural Activities Continuum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Difficulty / Resistance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Translation of single sentences on critical documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Installations of multilingual signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participation in community multicultural events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creation of an employee language bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advertising in ethnic media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multicultural awareness training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outreach to diverse communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staging of internal multicultural events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creation of a staff-based multicultural advisory body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adoption of a multicultural implementation strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete translation of critical documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multicultural skill development training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff participation in regional initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision of interpretation services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creation of a community-based multicultural advisory body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Difficulty / Resistance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intensive multicultural training for senior staff/ elected officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adoption of an employment equity policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Importantly for this analysis, the City of Vancouver has had a long-term engagement in employee training as well as an employment equity policy, both of the high difficulty initiatives outlined in the report (as featured in the above table.)

The fact that the City has run Hastings Institute and EEO programming over many years was seen as a sign of a unique commitment to cross-cultural training. One trainer for the Workplace Language Program had this to say:

My feeling... is that if you believe in something you should put your money up or you should get out of the business. So the City of Vancouver has put together their money through Council and it is known, it's on the budget, it's a line item and they've done that since 1990. So to me that means they have a serious intent there as opposed to looking for someone to pay the cost. (Interviewee D)

A current Hastings Institute trainer summed it up by saying this about the origin of the City's commitment:

Before I ever worked for them they were an organization that I looked to as being way ahead of many others in terms of their approaches. So they took it on before there was legislation that said you must do these kinds of things. This is a long-term commitment on behalf of the City that has taken different forms and shapes. For my own work I work a lot with the federal employment equity legislation which came about in 1986. The City was paying attention to equity issues in employment through EEO well before that. They came to that, I think, more from an ethical commitment than a legislative commitment. (Interviewee F)

Another unique aspect of Vancouver's commitment to training was the initial idea that the Hastings Institute should be an integral part of all of the City's work. A past director of the organization had this to say:

The organization was created to look at the benefits of an inclusive workplace and to look at how we were serving people. What is the business of the city and how can we do it better? It was seen as not an add-on but that it should be part of structure of the organization. (Interviewee I)
A current trainer with the Hastings Institute/ EEO, who also works extensively with other cities and organizations, viewed Vancouver as being on the leading edge in terms of its commitment and approach:

The City of Vancouver is, with their permission, one of the organizations I use as an example with my other clients. They have been really forward thinking in terms of union involvement. They had CUPE very involved right from the start as part of a creative team to design this intervention skills training and they always have seats for union members in the training and make a point of inviting and getting union representatives to participate. And more than that, they have had for the last number of years, a union member as a co-facilitator for the training. And that is unique... And the whole notion of having a creative team to design the training to make sure that it is relevant to the current needs and issues on the floor for people – unique. I have tried to get other organizations that I have worked with to have a creative team and they generally don't because either they don't have the time, they don't have the budget, they don't have the resources, they don't have the senior level whatever it might be. It takes a huge commitment to do what the City has done with that creative team, with the union and with line supervisor co-facilitating the training. Now this is leading edge and these are things that I try and get other organizations to embrace and it is generally very difficult to do. (Interviewee F)

This trainer felt that the City of Vancouver's strong commitment to diversity training was grounded in ideas of doing the right thing:

our goal is a welcoming, inclusive workplace. And I know we really try to emphasize that with the City's current training as well. That we are not just saying 'oh this is legislation so lets do it this way.' But there is an ethical or social justice commitment to this. (Interviewee F)

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Interviewees focused a lot of their discussion on how the organization had shifted, both positively and negatively, over time. This section will outline the changes they observed and the reasons for them.
The Kingswood Years

The first, and, as stated above, to this day the best-known program carried out through the Hastings Institute/ EEO was the Kingswood Management Training Program. A quick summary of how it functioned was outlined in a 1999 report to council:

The fictitious City of Kingswood mimicked a civic bureaucracy; participants were drawn largely from government at the municipal and provincial levels and the program was specifically structured around their needs. (City of Vancouver, 1999: 3)

The foundation of Kingswood was experiential learning principles and training techniques such as role play and simulation. Trainees took on characters for the entire five days of training and were put through various scenarios. For instance, this is how one trainee described her experience:

we went away to Qualicum on the island and stayed in a hotel. When we arrived we were each given a character. I think that I was Wilma and I was the volunteer coordinator for some organization and then I had to play that role throughout the whole week and at certain times there were particular tasks that I was called upon to do. And then through the actual scenarios there were some learning and some debriefing afterwards with the whole group and discussions and how somebody would work on issues that we were faced with. I found it very good training in that it had some very hands-on experience but it also looked at policies, city directions and visions and began to not only make you think about what you needed on the ground but also what you needed to create in terms of a vision for yourselves in your community. One scenario I was put through where we had a volunteer and someone had complained because the volunteer was a person from another culture and had some very specific views about that individual and their capacity. And through that discussion and dialogue it was my role to both advocate for that individual but also do some education with that person and also to set some parameters on what we as an organization could do and not do. We could not support his request to remove that person because we did not feel that it was substantiated and had to be diplomatic and not call that person a racist or whatever, but to kind of learn how to bring those issues forward in a way that I think created mutual respect and also modeled that. (Interviewee G)
These were well-funded, high-profile training sessions. One past trainer jokingly
referred to it as “luxury level training” and observed that these sessions were seen as a way
to climb the ladder:

at that time for many in the bureaucracies for them to have this training was the
ticket up. If you were going to this thing the anointing was saying you are on
your way up the ladder. There’s an element of that that is still true around some
of the trainings in some departments. If you are being sent to a particular
training then the word is out – you are on the way. Certainly in those days
Kingswood would have been one of the anointings. (Interviewee B)

As luxurious as it was, the training was also intended to be challenging and hard-hitting. This
past trainer went on to paint this picture of how Kingswood training looked:

what would happen is that the white well-intentioned and quite comfortable
bureaucrat is sitting up in the training room learning about employment equity
policy and about the Charter and someone will come up from downstairs and
tap them on the shoulder and say we have a situation in your department that
we need to deal with. Well, he didn’t know he actually had a department so he
was shocked to find that out. They would follow you out and you’d take them
into a room and sitting in that room is a young black woman who’s been passed
over for a promotion or has been harassed in the workplace and tells him the
story and asks him what are you going to do about it? This is your fault, this is
your department, you deal with it, you fix it, and you change it. The whole thing
was designed, yes, around role plays but not around you pretend to be this or
that. They got thrown into something. They had no idea it was like this whole
underworld was there and all of the sudden it really was like a city down there.
And she would say and it’s that guy and you better talk to him. So he’d send off
a memo saying that that person should be disciplined and all of the sudden there
would be another person [saying] I’m bringing the union in how dare you say
that. So it was very immediate, very hands on. Along with the information and
the knowledge and the learning, but the thing was it was in their face all the time
about 12 hours a day. It just went straight through. (Interviewee B)

Many pointed out that the ultimate purpose of Kingswood went beyond changing
personal opinions to shaping the organizations and communities in which city and other
employees worked. One long-term trainer for the Hastings Institute/ EEO observed:
This is a very important point. The City provided the resources and we were able to put in place a training program so at the end of the day there would be changed policies and processes that ended up serving a wider population. It was a very creative and effective time. (Interviewee A)

One key way that Kingswood operated to turn training into concrete action was incorporating plans for how participants would follow-up into the training. Participants created a contract which was an action plan for when they returned to their jobs for what they were going to do around specific things such as hiring practices and public outreach.

**Approach to Training**

Those who had been involved in Kingswood as trainers or trainees felt that the program took a unique and innovative approach for its time. A past trainer’s analysis of different approaches to training tells us a lot about the philosophical debates and underpinnings of their work at that time.

Even in those days we really knew that there were different layers of the kind of work you could do. You could do an information piece. Blast people with information: demographic information, customer information, even legal information. And that that was the way that a lot of training went. You got them in, you sat them down and you just hit them with every fact there was. During those years... Gordon Campbell did a set of community discussion forums on — it wasn’t said that they were about racism – what they were really about was what had come up in those early years of those large numbers of immigrants coming in from Hong Kong. I can remember that one of those things that they were doing was bringing out some real experts. People who knew about immigration studies, census Canada people and stuff like that. And it was a really dicey evening. I mean one night there was bunch of people from the modern version of the Klan who took up the first three rows. It was WAR primarily – White Aryan Resistance. It was pretty heavy duty anti-everybody. There were some pretty intimidating days in those forum days. But this one that I really remember that taught me an incredible lesson about the information age of teaching... There was this whole group of Kerrisdale home owners sitting behind us with their placards and signs and so on and they were really unhappy people... It was a fellow who I had great regard for had come out from Ottawa to do a whole census thing on use of welfare of unemployment insurance, prisons, all the kind of stats around immigrants. So that’s the kind of information that should change your mind about some of these things, right?
And there’s this woman sitting right behind me and as this guy is reading off the census tracts this little old woman turns to her husband and says ‘how long are we going to have to sit here and listen to these lies?’ And I thought, there’s the problem with the information approach. (Interviewee B)

Having given this example of the limitations of the informational approach, this past Hastings Institute trainer then went on to discuss what she saw as the limitations of the confrontational approach:

So then there was the other end of the scale which was you just slap them around, confront them with their racism, call them on it, humiliate them and humble them and let them be born again and we’re all okay. It’s referred to as a more confrontational approach to training… How confrontational should we be, how much do you take people on about what they are doing? In those years between my work with Hastings and EEO I was working with the police department… The confrontational piece had gone into recruit training. They would bring panels of people in to talk to the recruits but what would happen invariably on the panel would be three people – somebody who was in an anti-poverty group, somebody who was maybe a gay and lesbian support group and then there would be someone who was a speaker about different immigrant groups. But what would happen is that they would come in there and just go into attack on the police. But these are recruits, they haven’t actually done anything… I was just talking to a guy who I work with out at the academy… I had said something about this one women’s group and he said you know one of them came and they talked about men as being – that all men were abusers – and he said that ten years later in his work if he heard the name of that organization he said he would just break out in a sweat and [he was] just revolted. He said I would no more have worked with them than fly. That’s what can happen in the confrontational stuff… So they are kind of on different ends of the scale. (Interviewee B)

She contrasted these approaches to the experiential approach that the Hastings Institute took:

What we were trying to do was traverse the middle ground on this and we had lots of disagreements between us about what that was about. Kingswood was really going for an experiential piece that if people experienced it, had human to human relationships rather than just information that there was some interaction that really got you to think about what this all meant that this could really change your life. And so Hastings and the Kingswood model was a balance point around how does that best play out. And it was a very powerful piece… One of the things that Hastings was built on was hope and a belief
in human beings and in their good. See some training is really based on human beings or parts of them as being of ill-intent or bad or evil. Hastings and the Kingswood model wasn't that way. It was really based on a belief that people could change, on a belief that if people have the right experience and the right information and the right support, the Titanic will turn. (Interviewee B)

The impact assessment carried out on the Kingswood training in 1999 also underlines the balance that the training team was trying to create:

Members of the training team stressed that the program they deliver is active, experiential, designed to make participants think it is real and to operate at the "gut level." However a substantial amount of effort is put into information and content. Clearly it is not intended to be like an encounter group. The training team's objective is not just to engineer an emotional experience but to include a substantial amount of current information in a learning format that is exciting and challenging. The simulation is designed to take participants out of their real working lives and allow them the freedom to explore other ideas and ways of relating. It is demanding at several different levels: organizational, individual, small group. This is done to enhance the complexity of the training and underline the high expectations of involvement. (Berman and Levitan, 1990: 4)

**Changes over Time**

Over the years, Hastings Institute training evolved from a five day residential, to two day residential then to non-residential. It first evolved into a mini-Kingswood program called "Valuing Diversity" which borrowed many techniques from Kingswood and was made more broadly available (City of Vancouver, 1999: 4). Slowly, the focus began to shift from broad diversity or cross-cultural training to more of a focus on harassment prevention. In 1996, Hastings piloted a harassment intervention skills session. 1999 saw the creation of, and a shift in its primary focus to, a workshop titled "Working Towards a Harassment-free Workplace." This is how one of the current trainers for the Hastings Institute/ EEO outlined Hastings' current approach to training:

the last few years that [harassment training] has been the primary focus... Day one is workplace harassment prevention. Day two is workplace harassment intervention. So in the prevention we do some activities that highlight for people what their rights are as employees: to have a workplace free from
harassment and discrimination where they feel welcomed, included and valued and also what the responsibilities are of the employer, of the supervisor as an agent of the employer and of individual employees. And so as part of that they receive an overview of the prohibited grounds of discrimination under the human rights code and we also do some activities that raise their awareness of the impact of harassment. When harassment happens how do people feel? What is going on in their thinking? And we begin to get them to think about how they could deal with harassment and come up with some ideas. And so that is basically the prevention piece. And the intervention day, which is for the supervisors not for the front line employees, that’s where we actually have them identify the key human rights laws and prohibited grounds. We explore their most difficult situations as a manager or a supervisor and do problem-solving around those issues and then we really focus on when and how to intervene. We have videos, we have skills practice in small groups of three and its highly experiential in that way and really focused on skills-building – if you see this happen, if you overhear this comment, if you are aware of this going on what would you do in this situation. And actually practice what we would do – see what it feels like, what seems to work well because there is no recipe. It’s so contextual there are some certain guidelines that we can let people know about but they also need to figure out, as with any supervisory situation, how they might handle it. So it’s very much skills based on the second day. On the first day it’s more awareness, knowledge and understanding. (Interviewee F)

A content analysis of current training documents also shows a shift in training focus from the immersive, experiential kind of training which early training was founded upon. Apart from the ongoing training of the Workplace Language Program, there are currently two key one-day training sessions: Workplace Harassment Prevention and Harassment Intervention Skills. As indicated by the titles, and as articulated in the interview quoted above, the focus of these training sessions is on more overt manifestations of discriminatory behaviour rather than focusing on the systemic, underlying causes of discrimination such as societal power structures and colonial history. Part of the focus of the training is, thus, on legal frameworks which guide workplace conduct. For instance, an exercise in the first day of training, “the Harassment Game” focuses on identifying which of a number of scenarios were legally considered harassment. In the first session, there are a couple of video exercises which show people being discriminated against. The aim of these is to elicit reactions as to
how one would deal with this situation in the workplace. This is the closest that trainees come to role playing or experiential learning in the first session.

The second session, “Harassment Intervention Skills,” is meant as further skill development for supervisors only. This second day began as a follow-up for supervisors after a 4 to 6 week period, but has since developed beyond that. A current Hastings Institute trainer explained:

instead of it just being a follow up where they report out, its actually another level of training where embedded in the training they have a chance to explore their most difficult situations and that seems to work really well. I don’t know what the dynamic is about that from an educational perspective. I’m thinking that people who see something as a follow-up may not attach as much value to it as coming to a full second day of training with their commitments and difficult scenarios embedded in it. So it may just be more of a pedagogical question about how to design the training so that it is valuable for the individuals. So I think this splitting of the day one and the day two – we have only just started this in the last year – seems to make more sense than doing a half-day follow-up without other structure around it. (Interviewee F)

The focus of this day is, therefore, less on outlining examples and legal definitions of harassment than the first day. For instance, participants talk about injustice and why it is that “we often don’t intervene or speak up when we see an injustice occurring” (City of Vancouver, 2005). There are also brief role plays in which each participant gets a chance to take on the role of the harasser, the harassed and the intervening supervisor. Participants also take a look at Action Plans that they created after their first day of training and reflect on how they have or have not been able to enact it. Thus, some experiential elements from the original Kingswood training are still in the second training day, though to a much lesser degree than they were in the original training. In addition, rather than being broadly available, these training sessions are for returning supervisors only.
Some innovative additions have also been made to Hastings Institute/EEO training in recent years. One key recent innovation in the development of the training has been the use of creative teams to help target the training to specific groups of trainees. A current trainer outlined this approach:

The creative team is around 8 to 10 members. They are from all over the organization. They could be supervisors, foremen, they could be frontline customer service providers, they could be people from the community centers, union... just a multi-level cross-function range of people who are members of this team and we meet several times a year. And we review all the training that's been done, all the evaluation feedback we have received. We go through step by step the leaders' guides. What's worked in the training... are the case studies current, what are the issues out there on the ground that the people who are there can tell us about as facilitators... So [they are] very, very involved in actually creating what it looks like. (Interviewee F)

Why the Shift in Training Occurred

Interviewees offered many explanations as to why such a dramatic shift in training had occurred from Kingswoods' residential, experiential, multi-day approach to the current shorter sessions focused largely on harassment prevention and intervention. One ex-trainer who worked for the organization towards the end of the Kingswood programs had this to say about the shift in training:

Kingswood was a very effective model. Most people would say that it was very valuable and meaningful to them. The downfall of Kingswood was there was no way to build some sustainability when people went back to their organizations. They had this incredible experience at Kingswood and then they went back to their jobs and very little changed because these people were not necessarily empowered to change or given the time to facilitate change. The other element of that is that it is a very costly program. You have a big human resource component to it... They require whatever time release, etc. Plus the staffing model of the trainers was very expensive. While I am very much a supporter of simulation, a five day simulation is not cost-effective especially when you consider the first point I made about having support when they go back to the organization. But the other thing is that Kingswood didn't in a way present solutions or strategies. It presented a real learning in terms of awareness. And you could develop strategies because a lot of things you did in the simulations
focused on developing strategies but those weren’t necessarily things which you could say, “okay take this strategy you can use it back in your organization.” So while you did learn strategies there wasn’t necessarily a link as to how to apply that when you got back into your organization. And it might not have been necessarily a strategy going on in the organization. People did learn a lot about exclusion, harassment, all those kinds of things and I think it did change people’s behaviour per se but it didn’t change organizations so much. It might change the kind of environment that people were in because certain behaviour did change. I think that did assist. But I think also it maybe had run its course. Its time had come and people needed to move on to something different. And I think some of those differences were to become more organizationally focused in a very specific way. That would be my impression whether that’s training people within the organizations to do that kind of facilitation or being change agents within their group or whether it was to begin to work on some specific organizational initiatives like policy and policy implementation and strategic planning and so on. I think overall in the scheme of diversity and multiculturalism there has been that shift generally from more of that kind of generalized training to something that’s very specifically focused to help organizations do a specific task or become more inclusive in a particular way. So I think it might have been kind of an evolution process for some of it. And also it wouldn’t be funded anymore. It was just not something that people would fund so much anymore. (Interviewee C)

Another past trainer also observed that there was a need to change from focusing on training for individual change to looking at impacting broader organizational change:

Training alone is never enough. You’ve got to build in sustainability. The setting up of change committees and the working with organizations to begin to look systematically at their processes to me was all really ideologically sound. And those approaches for me haven’t changed in the work that I do. As we evolved at Hastings we were very training focused initially and then we began to see that as we moved to doing more organizational assessments that training had to be a component of the process – not the only thing. But there was a bit of a danger initially because we were all trainers. That’s what we thought mattered. You know now people come to me and I say there is not a lot of point in me doing training if you are not going to... I would personally say, let me work with you to set something up and then let’s do training to back that up. But, [there should be] less emphasis on training being the be all and end all. So on reflection I would say that that did evolve to some extent. I think there was beginning awareness to seeing sustainability [through] looking at organizational systems, systems review, and policy development...[Training] could be your entry point but it couldn’t be all that you did. (Interviewee H)
This trainer also discussed why individual training was sometimes not so effective:

One of the problems that occurred was where a participant was the only one who had gone to Kingswood and that when other people had gone it made some difference. They had someone that could be their support. But when they were the only one they were always up against the wall and being “oh, here she comes again” and so they lost heart. So it was great, ideally, as long as you could bring more people in so that there was a base of support. That just the one was not enough and that people felt very isolated. (Interviewee H)

A current trainer for the Hastings Institute/ EEO asserted that training had evolved as a result of a widespread feeling that the original diversity training had been saturated in the organization. She observed that the focus had needed to move from awareness to skills building:

I think there was a sense that diversity training had really been saturated in the organization. That we could realize that from the number of people who were enrolling or not enrolling in the programs... There’s only so many ways that you can do awareness training. The thing that is important about the harassment prevention and intervention is that it is very skills-based. And that’s what people need. They need skills. When you are looking at diversity issues there is a real challenge in building skills. You can do a lot with awareness with sensitivity, with developing empathy and understanding and giving knowledge and information, challenging biases but it is a challenge to figure out how you build skill around that, and so I agreed with the shift to something that would focus on skills building. Because after all you cannot require people to change their attitudes — you can only educate slowly and people will arrive at their own understandings over some period of time. But you can require certain behaviors in terms of a respectful workplace and you can develop skills for supervisors around how to foster that. And so I really supported that shift. (Interviewee F)

There was also a realization that, overall, people’s general level of awareness had shifted from the eighties, when Hastings was established, to now. A long term trainer for the organization described how he had seen training change accordingly:

Whereas I think about ten years ago doing this kind of training there was more of a requirement to say these are the basics – workplace cultures have changed we can’t do this anymore. Well, people generally know that now. They know that you can’t make racist jokes they know that you can’t have pinups. Whereas we can’t say ten years ago that that was just generally known and generally accepted. So now we spend a lot more time on the subtler kinds of issues and I
think that that is a kind of reflection that people have responded to and taken in an understanding of what the basic requirements are for how we treat each other in the workplace. It’s that shift in the nature of the questions to questions that show that people are focusing on areas that may be more subtle or more grey. (Interviewee A)

It was these feelings of diversity training saturation, coupled with lowered budgets and a more wide-spread diversity awareness that some interviewees felt gave the impetus to switch to shorter-term training focused on delivering specific information and skills.

However, interviewees had differing perceptions of the change of the organization from the early years of Kingswood. While some saw it, as outlined above, as a natural evolution given the changing climate, others saw it as a result of poor policy decisions and a shift in priorities. A number of interviewees cited the attempt in the early 1990s to turn the organization into a revenue generating company as an example of this shift in priorities. In 1992, three years after its creation, the Hastings Institute underwent an expansion which was shaped around the idea that the organization could generate revenue as a private company, and became quite separate from the EEO. It moved its offices and grew to more than a dozen staff, mostly trainers. These trainers were paid salaries by the City, but were expected to bring in private training contracts from outside sources such as other levels of government and business (Interviewees C and H). This was a brief experiment, and the Hastings Institute laid off many staff in 1994 and once again became more closely linked with the EEO. According to a 1995 memorandum titled Proposed 1995 Operating Structure of the Hastings Institute:

In July, 1994, the Institute informed City Council of the financial difficulties it was experiencing and that a deficit of $136,737 had incurred as of June 21, 1994... Several budget reduction measures were initiated in an attempt to reduce the deficit. Two support staff positions were phased out. A third support staff position was terminated on November 30th. All salary consultant positions have been changed to project based contracts... Anticipating a deficit of
$200,000 by the end of this calendar year, the Institute cannot afford to take any additional financial risk next year. The only alternative is to downsize it into a very small organization, merge with the EEO, with no infrastructure or overhead support and maintain minimal activity to slowly repay the deficit loan. (City of Vancouver, 1995: 2–4)

The Hastings Institute, thus, downsized dramatically, becoming an organization with fewer staff and less programming. Financial records showing the changes in funding over time for the Institute are not publicly available. However, there was general agreement among interviewees that funding for the Institute's work from the City had shrunk considerably since its expansion in 1992 and subsequent downsizing in 1994. It should be noted here that the funding of the EEO, however, whose staffing levels have stayed relatively constant over the past 20 years, has remained stable (Interviewee L).

As mentioned above, some interviewees felt that these shifts in the Hastings Institute were the result poor planning or a shift in priorities. One ex-trainer had this to say about what she saw as the failed corporatization of the organization:

You could have misread the climate. You could have misread that this was something that could develop into kind of a corporate effort separate from the City. But I think it might have been a little bit of wishful thinking. There was a lot of dough, there was a lot of people working there as staff. We were all earning pretty good money and getting a lot of work. But people had to have the money to pay for training and that money did not stay at those levels. It's sustained in the sense that some of that is still going on but on such a smaller scale. A much smaller scale. And I am still making a living at it although there has been a shift; I don’t do as much diversity training anymore because few are paying for it. So I am primarily focusing on... you know, still working on systemic change but from a different angle mostly focusing on addressing issues of access for internationally trained professionals. So the shift is because that’s where there is energy and money. And I don’t know if at the time whether there could have been a broadening of the scope but maybe that just was not possible. (Interviewee H)

One ex-trainer suggested that the decision to expand the Hastings Institute and experiment with revenue generation was not philosophically compatible with the staff at the time:
It was really the, then, City Manager and Assistant City Manager [names excluded] who were kind of the managers of that process. And they were the ones who made this decision for revenue generation to take place. And I think there is still probably hard feelings about that. People felt like they had been brought in to do one thing and it turned out to be another. And they weren’t necessarily incompatible, but there were some value conflicts that needed to be examined and they weren’t examined as such... I think when you are getting into revenue generation...[you have] a particular vision of the way you think the organization is going, that has, in a sense, capitalist values attached to it. And many of us don’t (well sure, we are all capitalists to some degree – we make money we try to own houses and cars) but many of us would go on the other side of that to believing that it is about working for social justice and coming for from a socialist agenda and less of a money making agenda. (Interviewee C)

One early Kingswood trainer who ceased to work for the organization as it changed felt the City had chosen to pursue different objectives:

I believe primarily there was a large shift in priorities. If there was a political thing about flavour of the year it was done. On their behalf, it may be that without the funding it wasn’t going to be possible to do this kind of stuff. But it looked deeper than that. Because it looked to me – and by this time I was an outsider – it didn’t look to me as though there was an attempt to reestablish a set of priorities for the next stage. I mean I’m sure they would say that that is what they have done is work directly with departments and so on. The pull back was so fast except for areas around language training... but the pullback felt so quick that it looked like it was “okay we are done here. Pull the troops back we are out of here.” So that people were still there and working in those departments but what they were doing, I haven’t seen outcome. I haven’t seen huge policy change. I haven’t seen them working by going into departments and saying how can we help you with the hiring piece. They may well be doing that but it is certainly not on a large enough scale that it would be visible to someone like me, at least. Cause I am on the outside but not totally on the outside – the world of this kind of training is quite small. So, yes, I would say reprioritizing, just a pull back. (Interviewee B)

There were, thus, a complex range of societal, financial and political factors at play which interviewees felt influenced the shift in the Hastings Institute at this time. While interviewees had differing points of view about the main drivers of this shift, they all agreed that dramatic changes took place in the nature of the organization and the training it carried out. This discussion will be picked up in the following section regarding the current incarnation of the
In terms of other challenges the Hastings Institute/EEO faced in this time period, some interviewees suggested that the organization itself had issues early on treating its diverse staff equally and respectfully. One past Hastings Institute/EEO trainer outlined this through the following example:

I am just not sure that there was that kind of self-reflection, or that there was a willingness to look at implications of decisions or how people behaved. I am sure there were times when I missed it too and colluded with what was going on. And there was a lot of debate about whether you should get the white guy to do it because that is more palatable to them or do you challenge them. We had those discussions. Our commitment to having diverse teams — I thought that was a really good commitment... But I remember sometimes when [one of the trainers who wasn’t a white male] would be upset about [how they] had been treated in a co-training situation. The feeling that people were assessed as “less than” was very disturbing. (Interviewee H)

Current Incarnation and Current Environment

Interviews expressed a range of opinions about the current incarnation of the Hastings Institute/EEO. Many felt that there is a lack of public profile for the organization right now. One interviewee, a past trainer, observed that “they are a shadow of their former selves. People think they don’t exist anymore” (Interviewee B). A past trainee similarly commented:

It was shocking when I heard the other day that the Hastings Institute was still around. It just has a very low profile. And I also think that the City is in a much different place than it was in 1980. What was interesting in that time was that not only was the training happening but also governments and funders were taking on different ways of getting people to multiculturalize their organizations and they did that primarily by using funding as the tool and so if you were reaching multicultural populations you would be higher priority for receiving funding under certain pools and those kind of encouragements and policies really moved a lot of organizations. (Interviewee G)

There were many ways in which interviewees felt that the current work of the organization
did not go far enough. Both the ethos of the time as well as a shift in funding priorities (as mentioned in the above quote) were seen as the reason for the decline in programming. One ex-Hastings trainer painted this portrait of the current funding climate:

There is a little bit of anti-racism money coming out of the province, but it is a shadow of its former self... Neither Heritage [Canada] nor MCAWS [the Ministry of Community, Aboriginal, and Women's Services] have many resources... So the money's not there. Heritage has cut what it pays for and they have to be so accountable for every cent that it is like a pain in the neck to go for the money. Sometimes you just get tired. And Heritage said they wouldn't pay for any train-the-trainers anymore because they felt that they had been there, done that. Again people's priorities changed in terms of foundations and federal government what they want to see in place. How they want their money to be spent... It was a big vision and it was brilliant while it lasted but it couldn't have been sustained. (Interviewee H)

Another long-term trainer with the Hastings Institute/ EEO felt that the current societal climate was at the root of the shift:

To some extent what has happened — we've hit a... not a wall but at plateau — some people say there is kind of a backlash. I don't know if I would use the word backlash. But more of a reflection. An example that I used in some of the training I do — it harkens back to the time that I was going to school in Vancouver. Currently my son is in the same school. During the December period there was a Christmas concert — I am Christian... I look at my son's concert — it's very diverse and multicultural. But people are looking back and asking, "have we lost something?" And I think that is where the plateau happens. I think we are being re-challenged. (Interviewee A)

**IMPACTS OF HASTINGS INSTITUTE/ EEO TRAINING**

Despite their differing opinions about the current incarnation of the organization, all of the interviewees spoke highly about the impact that the training carried out by the organization had had over time. One of the authors of a 1990 impact assessment of early Kingswood training had this to say about her findings:

People who we interviewed talked about transformation as a result of Kingswood. There was a lot of words like that... I think that in the immediate Kingswood was incredibly impactful and probably I would say that in a deep
emotional way it got people in the gut. We are talking intense. And you create a sense of uncertainty for people who work in a world where they are in control and certain of outcomes. They are the ones running the show. The positive feedback we got (we didn’t get all positive because for some of the people it was very negative they didn’t feel safe, particularly the women, and that wasn’t good because the Kingswood facilitators did not adequately address that according to them.) But for the deputy chief of police and the fire chief it opened their eyes in a very dramatic way. (Interviewee H)

The impact study outlined the specific elements of the training that trainees felt were most impactful as the simulation experience, the harassment scenarios and the panels from specific communities such as the disabled. Using information gathered from focus groups, questionnaires and interviews, the report outlined that:

For a majority of participants the simulation model was the key element in the success of Kingswood as a training program. The simulation models provided a context in which participants could challenge themselves and take risks as a means to enhancing their learning experience (Berman and Levitan, 1990: ii)

Later in the report, they go on to say:

The harassment scenarios appeared to have left the strongest impression of the graduates interviewed… It was felt by some, that the best learning occurred during the high intensity or highly stressed periods such as the harassment scenarios. The anonymity was pointed out as conducive to good learning as it provided participants with the opportunity to take greater risks (Berman and Levitan, 1990: 15)

The role-playing component was also seen as key:

The role playing became very real for some of those interviewed and they experienced difficulty shedding the role when they came back. Many interviewees indicated that they often could not remember the “real” name when meeting another graduate from their group. As one participant said ‘the problems of the City of Kingswood were real. You were held responsible for what you did. They were especially real if you didn’t deal with the issues, because they just weren’t going to disappear. You had to be responsible and take it seriously.’ (Berman and Levitan, 1990: 23).

Of particular interest in this report is the fact that participants felt that the length of the training was appropriate (Berman and Levitan, 1990: 19). In fact
A clear majority thought it was the most cost efficient training program in this area. Although there was agreement that the program is expensive, participants felt the cost of not running the program would be higher (Berman and Levitan, 1990: 46).

Despite this, training was shortened in the following years, suggesting that the decision to do so may have been based on budgetary restrictions rather than on the actual needs of effective training.

The report further highlights the impact that the training had through discussing the way trainees felt upon returning to their workplace:

On returning to work participants reported recognizable changes in their individual perceptions. These ranged from personal changes in attitude and perspective regarding equity issues to a significant emphasis on the urgency of implementing equity in the workplace... All spoke of a clear commitment to take on a more proactive role with regard to equity issues in their departments and/ or organizations. An indicator of greater “equity consciousness” was an increased awareness of incidents of discrimination in their organization. In addition, a majority of interviewees remarked that they became more concerned with organizational policies and practice regarding the physically handicapped, ethnic minorities, and women. (Berman and Levitan 1990: 34).

One of the interviewees for my research, who had been a trainer for Kingswood, gave a specific example of how one high-ranking government employee transformed his ministry after the training he received, expanding the impact from the personal to a policy level:

there was one fellow who I will call John who’s quite high up in [the Ministry of] Forestry for the province. He came to the training and he was one of the people who was really a guiding light out of that because he went back into his ministry and I always felt that he stood and looked at it with new eyes. He started creating programs – he created trainings up in the interior. I actually took part in some of them... But it wasn’t the training as much as the way he changed policy and the way he put in programming that was different. He started doing pieces with aboriginal firefighter units that hadn’t been done like that before. He started hiring things that were different. So what can come out of that piece is a bit of the scales falling off your eyes. (Interviewee B)

A series of interviews carried out by B.C.I.T. students in 1992 with trainees from
City of Vancouver departments as diverse as the engineering, finance, health, planning, and parks also highlight many specific impacts of the training they had received from the Hastings Institute/EEO. Many mention the emotional impact that the training had on them and how it has affected their point of view and actions since. One interview summary from an employee from the engineering department states that in the past, the interviewee would have run away and ignored a case of sexual harassment. After going through Kingswood she had learned about her responsibility as an employer to deal with and correct the situation. (Mackinnon et al., 1992: no page number)

Another interviewee from the Housing and Properties Department felt that the majority of the education of Kingswood has passed through him to the supervisors he manages. Before [interviewee’s name]’s attendance at Kingswood in 1987, his department had complaints of human rights abuses and discriminatory practices based on race or disability. Since then, there have been no complaints of discrimination. (Mackinnon et al, 1992: no page number)

As another example of the impacts documented through this report, an account from an interviewee in the planning department gives a specific story regarding how he has felt more able to take on discriminatory behaviour:

In past public meetings, there have been comments about monster houses being built. Comments like ‘it’s the people from Hong Kong that is [sic] causing all this.’ It’s the Asian immigration. Our immigration should not allow these people in. They are destroying our neighbourhoods.’ [interviewee’s name] has taken these people to task saying, ‘Those people have nothing to do with the issue. Most of the monsters have been built on spec and not for a particular client. You can not blame them for bringing the monster houses into the neighbourhood. It’s the spec builder who has done it. And that type of racial comment is unacceptable.’ (Mackinnon et al, 1992: no page number)

In one of my own interviews, a past trainer for the Hastings Institute/EEO outlined specific changes in the library system that occurred in the period after the training began:

I can remember working with the public library system. I’m not suggesting that the training should take all the credit for this – it was a piece of a larger shift. But if you look at the Vancouver public library system now – you go to any branch there is an elaborate selection of materials representing a number of
backgrounds and in languages other than English. Looking back 10 or 20 years ago that was not the case. So I like to think that the training that was done in the early 90s had some impact into the kinds of services they offer and how they provide those services. (Interviewee A)

In terms of other tangible impacts on trainees, many of the interviewees talked about the connections they made during the course as being valuable. One trainee said:

I think the other thing that was really good about the training is that we were trained together with a number of people who worked in the municipality and as a result of that there were champions. I remember there was a woman there from the Cultural Affairs department and I know that when we engage the Cultural Affairs department around doing some work in our community there were people that you could talk to that really understood the kind of work you were doing and what you were trying to accomplish in your community. (Interviewee G)

Continued connections and support from Hastings Institute/ EEO, itself, were also seen by this past trainer as a positive impact of the training:

We did an incredible amount of continuous training and learning within the organization after that. We did a lot of in-service where we would bring people like Normajean from the Hastings Institute and begin to really look at ways that we could increase our capacity in that area. We used the Hastings Institute after that training, as well, as a resource. We had some situations when we were doing our language training—English language training—and we had a situation where we had different cultures who would not integrate within the classroom. They were very separate. So we did some work with staff and the actual class and really found ways to look at integrating them. And that was through some really hands-on training. We came across particular challenges that we had to deal with that the Hastings Institute and the people that were working for the Hastings Institute helped with. Even after they left they continued with us in a consulting basis. (Interviewee G)

Other programs of the Hastings Institute/ EEO, apart from diversity training, were also highlighted by interviewees as having a positive impact. A past trainee of the Workplace Language Program who went on to be a trainer for the program felt that that contextual literacy program had really helped her and others:

going to class at the beginning I didn't really like it because it's something different. Because some people just like me—I am not an open person. I didn't
really want to share with a group of strangers. But once you get to know each other you get more open and you have the confidence to share. I think that is very important when you can have a group of people talking together to share experience and it is safe in a way. This is very important it is safe. You don’t have to worry that it will spread everywhere. So I think most of the city employees have a similar situation. When they work, they work and they didn’t have much time to talk with their co-workers. So once they come to the class they have opportunities… When you go back you be a happier person… And we see promotion after people come to our programs. They get opportunities. For instance a person could be working as a clerical worker because she had no opportunity to take notes because in her job that is not a requirement. So within the class she could just take minutes and then she had the experience so it’s a little bit helping her when she gets the promotion later on. I think the city is changing quite a bit now. When I first got into the city almost all those department heads are males. So you can see now there are some women who are getting the higher positions and you can see that it is different groups. You can see the last name and you know that there are from different groups not just Caucasian. I think the city is changing in a good way. (Interviewee E)

She also had this story about one employee who experienced quite a shift from participating in the program:

One of the students who came to our class he was very quiet. He wrote about the sprinkler system at the beginning. After he left our program he became a lot more outgoing. He came several times and after he set up a chi gong class for all city employees where they can go. In his group I think he has over a hundred employees… He’s been doing that for years now. Quite interesting because he says if he had never been to the class he never would have done that. (Interviewee E)

Though trainees felt that there were many positive impacts of the Hastings programs, some also had criticisms. For instance, some felt that adequate follow-up did not exist after the training to help them with the multiple barriers to implementing change that they faced. The 1990 impact assessment report outlines this feeling in this summary of its interviewees’ comments:

Many felt blocked on their return to work either by senior managers, their own enthusiasm diminishing, or because they did not have enough decision making power to effect change. The inability to acquire funds and the lack of priority given to the equity issues were also seen as major blocks to implementing goals. (Berman and Levitan, 1990: 35)
According to the report, the largest amount of participants (43%) felt isolated upon returning to work. As one of the interviewees in their report outlined:

I felt I could walk on water when I got back but then I didn’t realize that I had to work with the unions and personnel (Berman and Levitan, 1990: 39)

The report goes on to comment:

The EEO saw Kingswood as a way to educate senior management. However, there has been a disparity across departments in their receptivity to the principles of the EEO. (Berman and Levitan, 1990: 42)

It was barriers like these that many felt gave rise to the need to focus more on organizational structure as a whole, rather than on individuals. Past trainees, thus, felt that, overall, more needed to be done in addition to training in order to create truly sustainable change. This point will be picked up in the following section.

ELEMENTS OF GOOD TRAINING AND OTHER APPROACHES TO CREATING CHANGE

Throughout the interviews, trainers and trainees alike highlighted many of the elements of effective training and other approaches to creating change. I will now turn to a discussion of some of the key elements that they brought up.

Ongoing Impact

Firstly, the importance of training not being a one-off but, rather, being part of a longer-term initiative was stressed by many interviewees. One past trainer for the Hastings Institute commented:

You need some kind of ongoing mechanism to keep the issue on the table, to keep it alive for people, to keep reminding themselves about what they have learned and how they can maintain that learning and how they can share that in
their organizations... If you look at training alone you are going to see positive impacts after training generally speaking. People come up with new insights about themselves and about the issues and understanding of people's context and their organization and willingness to do something. Over the long term [with Hastings] I think there are people who sustain that and were helped by the resources that were there. But when those resources don’t exist anymore, then I just don’t know. I hope that it wasn’t a meaningless exercise [and] that that shift can be sustained. But I think you’ve got to work at it. Particularly in organizations that are in survival mode and not willing to give it the time of day. Because I’m not sure we have moved to place where people truly understand that issues of diversity are about all that you do in the organization not just something off the side of your desk or some extra you have to get funding for. (Interviewee H)

Another past trainer who has gone on to do training for a number of municipalities had this to say:

You know at the end of a training you usually fill out some evaluation sheet about how you liked the training and this and that, but that really isn’t a reflection of the impact of training. That’s more like a kind of a happiness index about how you felt about it at the time. And they can say some useful things about whether a role play was effective or helped them think about things. But the real test is six months or a year or two years. And people can say that really changed my behaviour. That really made me think I have to go back to my organization and write a policy or work with a committee or work with my board or whatever. Its not like you take training and it’s a pill and then your headache is gone so to speak. You have to see it on a continuum. And on a continuum with your own organization as well as your own learning. And that’s how I talk about training with people who take training from me. I am there to do a particular kind of job with them in terms of raising awareness but also getting them to think about things beyond the time I spend with them. You know, what are they going to do about x, y and z when they go back to their organizations. And if they want help with that, will there be help from the organization to do that. (Interviewee C)

Many interviewees stressed the importance of follow-up to training. One past Hastings Institute trainer who went on to work for a number of different private and public sector clients summed it up in this way:

Training has its pitfalls because it is invariably something between a rifle and a shotgun. It’s got one load in it. One of the oil and gas companies [I work with] – they instituted hiring teams so that everyone had to be on the hiring team for their co-worker. If you can go in and do ongoing work with that hiring team you can change a lot of stuff... Invariably what we’ve learned is that training...
without follow up [is not effective]. And the follow up needs to be over time, over levels of experience, involve different components of practical and emotional and spiritual and actual intellectual shift because humans can’t do a one time over and then salvation. For the most part people don’t like change, don’t want change and fight it. (Interviewee B)

A current trainer with the Hastings Institute outlined that the atmosphere in which training occurs was also very important to its impact:

Training that gets parachuted in a vacuum where there isn’t policy support and not consistent messaging from senior management does not, in my experience, have the kind of impact that we would like it to have. Training within the environment of the City [of Vancouver] where there are consistent messages from the council members, the senior management, and the planning department... diversity is just embedded and integrated and infused in the way the City does business and I think training in that kind of environment is very effective. (Interviewee F)

Interviewees generally stressed the importance of longer range rather than one-off approaches to change. Types of longer range initiatives that were suggested included continual check in with the organization that has received training including follow-up sessions where they can discuss issues which have arisen. A second suggestion was to facilitate the set up of committees with regular meetings whose role is to look at all aspects of their organization from a diversity lens. Also discussed was the idea that diversity shouldn’t just be put on one person’s plate in an organization. A past trainee had this to say about the importance of having ongoing, long-term avenues from which to look at issues of diversity in her organization:

There isn’t a day goes by that we aren’t working on those issues. We just recently started a homeless showering program and we are having the same level of challenges as we did working with our culturally diverse community [which] is just getting people to the place where they get comfortable establishing human relationships with people that they may have seen very differently before. And our communities are constantly transient – we have new people coming and going. For people who may be living in a very diverse community their sensitivity might be very different than someone that comes from something that is a bit more homogeneous. I really do think that having something that is sustainable and ongoing and continues to build on capacity so it doesn’t
start from a place where people have no knowledge but recognize that knowledge changes and the communities grow and change and the kinds of support will change with that. (Interviewee G)

Focusing on tangible goals in training was also seen as vital to having training be effective. One past Kingswood trainer had this to say about how he would now approach the training:

I think one of the things that I would want to do differently is to be more cognizant and focused on the kind of change practices and change behaviors we would like to see. I think of it this way – I know it is simplistic – someone once told me be really clear in telling people what they are going to learn and be really clear what they are going to learn in a very pragmatic way. So it's not saying ‘I am going to teach you how to be a better tennis player.’ You've got to be clear that in being a better tennis player, ‘you are going to be able to do these things. You are actually going to take place in a rally’… And I think that that's one of the things, when I look back, that we weren't clear enough about. I think that people came into the sessions, particularly with people who are what I call reluctant participants… They say ‘oh they’re going to play with my mind’ and I regret that. It should have been much more clear that the purpose was not to play with people’s minds but to give them information, to give them knowledge and understanding of the issues and the concepts and to give them tools and skills so that they could do their jobs in a congruent fashion to whatever the policies may be… I would like to be more clear, [more] up front with participants. At the end of the day here are the tools, skills and knowledge – what you will gain, what you will learn and how you will be able to implement them in your workplace. That’s the key, I think. (Interviewee A)

The Co-learning Approach

In addition to the above ideas about the importance of having ongoing initiatives, interviewees had many ideas about what approaches to training were most impactful. One past Hastings Institute trainer had this to say about some of the more extreme training techniques:

I think shaming is spiritually irresponsible. I think that there are some people who believe there is a value in it because how are people going to learn? Kingswood hit hard at people because it was trying to shake people up to get to that vulnerability. And I understand that, but you have got to make it safe. We used to do some stuff that used to really shake some people up and I’m not sure what the gain was. Because when you really reflect on this, it can’t be this
alone. You can instill in somebody a need to learn but you have to help them pursue that. They can't go back to the organization and no one knows what they are talking about and it ends up feeling like they are talking to a wall. So ultimately we have to be very responsible in how we are doing training. I probably have lower expectations about what I want to have happen out of training. I want people to be self-reflective and I also want people to think concretely about their responsibility and how they are going to do it. Whatever we are covering in training we are really trying to say you can do this because it has been done or you can do this because it's the right thing to do. There's training stuff in the states... the Reevaluation Counseling people — the Prejudice Reduction model — you couldn't pay me money to go to their training. The problem is that they are using people who have experienced racism to trigger white people? I think as trainers you have to be very responsible that you are not having white people learn off the backs of people of colour or non-heterosexuals. You have to be very balanced. You want to challenge white people but you don't want to do it in such a way that it creates a lack of safety for people of colour or you are putting them in a position to be the ones who tell their stories so that white people can start to think. I mean you have got to find a way where you can do some of that but also in a way in which you get white people to connect with the same experience some other way. (Interviewee H)

Co-learning was seen by many to be an effective way of getting people to learn with, not at the expense of, others. One trainee of the Hastings Institute looked to the importance of more informal co-learning, where cultures were able to interact through contributing to their community through the arts:

I think around race relations... some of the things that we have really found to be extremely beneficial is when we can create environments where people are given the opportunity to contribute their skills and their knowledge. There is a focus on the assets rather than the needs so that there is a shift of thinking. Part of this goes along with the shift of community development thinking around not being necessarily needs based but to balance that with the assets in communities. And I know that that was a huge shift in our organizational development that we, for many years, saw our role as being able to provide services — English language services, services around interpretation and translation. Not that we don't continue to see that as our role but we also recognize that we need to do a lot more attitudinally around our changes in attitude in order to create an environment that is open to other people contributing. One of my greatest examples is when we did the aboriginal carving out here at the neighbourhood house and it was an initiative that came from the aboriginal community that they wanted to do a carving and wanted us to help to get that happening. And we were very excited to do that. In my discussions with them I had talked about how it would be really nice for them to create
what they were creating in a more public venue so that people in the community could actually see the creation. So as people got engaged in that process — they carved it out here [in front of the neighbourhood house] — there was lots of traffic. People would stop and see maybe some similarities between the work the aboriginals were doing and their culture. We had people who were Japanese saying this is very similar to how we carve and animistic belief systems got shared. It was just very powerful in that way. From the community perspective that project alone really shifted people’s attitudes to see the aboriginal community as not so much a community that really needed child protection, addiction services, all kinds of social housing support but they saw the aboriginal community as a just an extremely talented and thoughtful and creative people and the work that they did contributed to our community substantially both in building positive relations but also in beautifying our community with those beautiful carvings. And that’s the kind of shifts around policy and activity and how we are approaching things that are much different. So not just seeing ourselves as providing service but that it has to be a whole atmosphere and environment that encourages inclusivity and contribution. So there’s both a receiving and giving aspect. (Interviewee G)

One current trainer with the Hastings Institute/EEO talked about the importance of creating atmospheres in training sessions which were conducive to co-learning because people were able to learn much more effectively from each other than from abstract examples:

I had another situation where there was an African-Canadian woman in the group... we were looking at issues of what does stereotyping mean and we looked at the diversity wheel and we had said what assumptions do we make about these characteristics. When we see an individual that looks like this, what do we assume about their education, their marital status, their employment opportunities. And it was amazing that we were able to come up with the same kind of immediate assumptions. So as we explored this, a woman in the room said, “you know I have this experience when I go shopping in stores where I am followed and I am stalked and people want to look in my bags. And this doesn’t just happen once. It happens over and over.” And her co-workers just said, “we can’t imagine this. It never occurred to us.” And it was much more powerful than some theoretical example that I would give or some statistic that I would give on racial profiling. So I would say that it is the stories that people in the sessions tell that have the impact on others in the room. And that’s when I know there’s a shift. If I can create the environment where people will share genuinely what their own experiences are. We’ve had a number of occasions at the City doing this kind of training where someone will say, “Oh yes I had this experience” and then others in the room will say, “Well what did you do? Didn’t anyone step up to support you?” And this great because we are talking about bystanders who don’t do anything and now they are horrified that no one stood
up to be one this person’s side. (Interviewee F)

The Workplace Language Program was also highlighted as offering an interesting approach to this kind of co-learning. This is what a trainer for that program had to say about the program:

It's not really ESL... It's really around language and around the idea that most of us when we meet each other we talk about stories. By telling stories we can make connections with people. So in the City of Vancouver there are people from all over and also people who are born here. So when they come to a class they are asked to write. It's a psycho-linguistic methodology. It's based on contextual literacy. Meaning that people write and what they write becomes the exercise. Whatever they put down on the paper that’s what we look at. We look at the structure of the grammar and the mechanics, punctuation, spelling. So people are asked to write. Then they are asked to share their writing around the table. So it’s quite multicultural because people come from all kinds of backgrounds and what they write is, in many cases, around their family. They write about family, children at school, about job issues and then they share that stuff around the table. It’s confidential. In doing so they are exposed to other people’s cultures, other people’s belief systems and the way other people see the world. I personally think that it’s an ideal way to learn of other people’s lives and if you can learn around other people’s lives I believe that you can make connections... It’s pretty simple and we very seldom do it. (Interviewee D)

This Workplace Language Program trainer went on to specify how he has seen this co-learning approach impact City employees:

We don’t often see people start out by saying, “I am different than you.” Mostly what we see is people showing each other how they are alike and in that process I think that they become stronger. I've had people say that. That they didn’t really realize that other people thought that way. Cause they weren’t really seeing people as people. I've had managers who have been part of our classes say that they, for the first time in twenty-something years of knowing people, they could finally see that people actually thought. It becomes a realization that their employees were actually thinking human beings instead of seeing them as janitors or whatever... What we find is that when people do that they actually grow and they change. It's quite interesting to see a manager that is quite closed and dictatorial put himself out there. It's also interesting to see people who have been hiding out for twenty years living a marginalized life because of lack of language grow and become confident enough. Even if they don’t have the structure down or they don’t have all of the mechanics down the fact is that they start to find their own voice in English and even though they might still be translating or whatever the fact is that they are strong enough to express themselves and that’s one of the things we believe strongly is that literacy is
not about discrete sets of skills. It's about finding your own voice and expressing yourself... The other thing is [you have to] believe in it as an institution. If you really believe that you aren't going to lose anything by sharing power. Because language really gets down to power. (Interviewee D)

**Evolution over Time**

Another key aspect of good training that many interviewees talked about was the need of training to change as the needs of communities changed and evolved over time. One past Hastings Institute trainer pointed out:

I think that the evolution of the training — there's a mirroring of the inside and the outside. The communities change and evolve. The inside has to evolve and then the training has to evolve to meet the needs of how the inside has evolved and how the community has evolved. Because we are into so many more of the visibly different communities we are into second and third generations. So the experience of a second or third generation youth is totally different. We are coming on to forty years from when the act went through — the change in the immigration act. For a long time we acted as though this was something that would pass and Hastings was really about “it ain't going to pass so let's get down to it.” At this point in this city nobody in their right mind has any expectation of it passing. It's a reality of everyone's' life. People sometimes still ask for the cookbook — tell us how to deal with them. But that was another thing that Hastings was about — that there is no cookbook so lets get down to what is actually going on here. (Interviewee B)

This trainer had a specific example of how she had seen an evolution in a group she did training with over a number of years:

And I know from the police — these guys who are ready to retire who I worked with 10 or 15 years ago. During those years it was a really struggly time but they would have been young sergeants. And it was like, “we have to have our sense of humour, don’t mess with our sense of humour”... And then a couple of years later I met a few of them for coffee and they said the weirdest damn thing happened. About three of them had gone down from the Vancouver department to the Canadian police college in Ottawa — so there are police there from all over Canada doing higher level training. And they said that about the second night there they went out to the pub for a drink and as the night went on, I guess the conversation got a little rough around the edges and they said at one point they looked at each other and they had all pulled themselves back from the circle and were sitting there looking back and forth going “holy shit these people are really saying this.” And then they said to each other, “what happened to us? That was us.” But at this point it was so foreign and
offensive and yet that had been where their own brotherhood was. But that shift occurred to the point where people don’t talk like that here. (Interviewee B)

It was as a result of these kinds of shifts that interviewees felt that training needed to evolve over time.

**Self-Reflection**

A key ingredient for keeping training current which was discussed was the trainer’s own ability to be reflective about their work in order to be able to adapt it to changing circumstances. Thus, the trainer’s own skill-set was also seen as a vital component of good training. A number of past trainers commented on the importance of self-reflection in their work. Self-reflection was seen to be key for both being able to handle difficult situations as they arise as well as to being aware enough to make the kinds of ongoing shifts in training that keep it relevant. One past Hastings Institute trainer commented:

You have to be continually self-reflective and you have to look at how the internalized racism that we all have exhibits itself. I remember one incident where I learnt significantly. [Another trainer] and I were working on a Crowns and [she] is an excellent trainer. After the first day we got feedback that they [the trainees] were uncomfortable with [that trainer - a woman of colour]. I moved into rescue mode. It was such racist behaviour on my part protecting [her] from these guys and [she] was like, “screw this I am coming in.” And that was a real lesson to me. (Interviewee H)

Another long term trainer for the organization had this to say:

What constitutes professional work is professional reflection. In other words, I have the professional skills and tools but what makes me a professional is that I am always doing reflection. I do an intervention, I make a decision but I also look at what happens. Because I know from the theory that not every drug works on every person. So I observe, I question, I look and you talk to me… that’s the reflection part. As a trainer there is no difference. You have to do the same thing. You know you are training a group of 20 people – not every person is going to be impacted the same way by the training. (Interviewee A)
LOOKING AHEAD: SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

In addition to detailing the past successes and struggles of the Hastings Institute/EEO, interviewees had a number of suggestions for how the City of Vancouver could become more effective in its training and diversity initiatives in general. As training at the City changed over the years, some felt that it had lost some of its initial transformative learning-style focus and impact. While many said that this was a sign of the times and a response to the kind of training that people would now be impacted by, others felt that it would be beneficial to bring some of this style of learning back into Hastings’ approach. A current trainer with the City of Vancouver who had been there for years and, thus, had seen the evolution in training styles commented:

diversity training when I first started doing it at the City was really about sensitivity, awareness, understanding, responsiveness to people from different backgrounds on that broad wheel of diversity — sex, geography race, gender, age, all the multiple dimension on which we might be different or similar. And we haven’t been doing that kind of training. What we have really been focused on is harassment and respect particularly on the prohibited grounds under the human rights code which is very valuable training and has a huge impact. I would like to see – and Ann [the current director of the Hastings Institute] and I have already talked about this a little bit – if there is a way to bring back something that’s related to diversity and one of the ways to do it that I do in another organization is to do something around diversity and respectful workplace as one kind of a program... The program as it is now just really focuses on the legislation. In my personal work I like to focus on building inclusive cultures and that means whether I focus on human rights legislation or employment equity legislation or accommodation legislation — which is part of human rights... I begin with having people look at diversity first and do some examination of their own identity and what it means to interact with someone who is different from themselves in whatever ways that might be. And I think we are going to find a way to see if we can bring that back in somehow. (Interviewee F)

Some interviewees felt that the City’s approach to diversity had to begin to have a more systemic approach. One past Hastings Institute trainer commented:

I personally think that in all organizations (and Hastings I believe has worked towards this philosophy at least initially), that it is everybody’s business not just
the EEO's, that it is every manager's, every front line worker's... everybody is responsible for creating an inclusive environment. And I think they still hold to that. So that has to be pushed within the organization and people need to be held more accountable. Like performance evaluations need to be tied in — are managers measuring that as a competency? Is it a skill that people are required to have? I'm not sure how systemic it is. I think that they [Hastings's employees] do good work, they sit on a lot of committees and bring the issue up and with this council... But [do the work] systemically? (Interviewee H)

One past trainee who currently heads up a local non-profit, voiced these two concerns about the City's lack of innovation and systemic approach to issues of diversity:

I have a couple of concerns about the City. One is in the whole cultural development. We had a very positive experience where we were able to amass quite a few resources towards cultural development in our community and we found it to be the best community development tool that we have found in working cross-culturally and it has been extremely difficult to get the cultural affairs department within the City to understand that and recognize that. We found 150 artists that live locally in our community and most of them were from other cultures and countries where they just had absolutely no ability within the context of what's happening here to engage and bring their cultural assets to the table and be seen and supported in the same way. And Cultural Affairs has a couple of diversity funding kinds of tools, but they just are not supporting the whole community building approaches that are needed in communities that are culturally diverse. The [cultural community development] work that we did... was funded by everyone but the City and we managed to reach people who had never been reached before. There is still this traditional idea of what arts and culture is and it has to be of this professional caliber in Canada in order to be recognized when in fact many of the artists that live in our communities have that recognition in the cultures and countries that they came from but when they come here they have to start at the bottom. And whatever is there is snippets of support its not anything that's ongoing or sustainable and I think that's a huge mistake because they are such a huge asset... Really using arts and culture in the ways we used it really did bring our community together in a much stronger way and many of the people who participated are now teaching arts or are connected through our links in the community. So that's one area that I think the City could really be looking at improving. When you think about attitudes that police — I hear this more from the community not from the police — where certain cultures really feel they are being targeted. What was the headline the other day? One of the police was doing his Masters and found out that most of the people who were drug dealers were actually people that came from Canada not immigrants from Honduras. When you think those kind of attitudinal things, I mean those would be the things that are not challenged as much as they should be. Social planning can be really progressive around that but as I say, Cultural Affairs is not very progressive, the police... not very. (Interviewee G)
Interviewees also felt that the City, and other organizations, did not do enough to address the systemic barriers to employment faced by immigrants. One past trainer for the Hastings Institute had this to say on the subject:

I don't believe that mainstream organizations are doing enough. It's like, here I am working with regulatory organizations and it's a surprise to them that they have some responsibility to address this issue... For some of them it's like a wake up call when you tell them that they are liable because of the Charter. I mean, today, you wouldn't expect that I would be saying that about an organization. So we have a long way to go. We still are putting the responsibility on immigrants to get the skills that match Canadian standards as if these ethnocentric standards are superior. We are still stuck. And it's heartbreaking when you see the impact of that. (Interviewee H)

Many interviewees felt that the Hastings Institute/ EEO had to look beyond training initiatives to other cross-cultural initiatives. A few looked back to a past initiative undertaken by the City – the Barriers to Bridges community dialogue – as the kind of thing they would like to see the City undertake once again. One past Hastings Institute trainer had this to say:

If the question is, “is the Hastings model an effective way of dealing with this?” I really don’t think so. I don’t think it does enough. I think what they do is fine. I just don’t think it is enough... There was a very successful project a long time ago – probably 10 or 12 years ago called Barriers to Bridges. And it was a community dialogue. They had these dialogues in community centers and people met in various community centers in the city of Vancouver... And it was just getting people to talk about living in diverse communities. And one of the things that they did was to get new immigrants to talk about the immigrant experience. Sharing their stories and trying to use that to facilitate community awareness and understanding of the issues that we face. That kind of community building is very useful in these kinds of diverse communities. And also doing them in places like Dunbar where people don’t think it’s very diverse but then you have all these ethnic groups and cultural communities come out and you go “oh, it is diverse”... Those kind of things could be partnered in terms of Hasting is working on a part of it and EEO is working an element... And then you got other people in planning or social planning who are working on elements of it. Make it a multi-layered, multi-level City initiative. (Interviewee C)

Many interviewees mentioned that they would like to see more diversity at the City as
well as at the Hastings Institute/ EEO itself. A current trainer for the Hastings Institute/ EEO commented:

I would like to see different people involved. I would like to see for Hastings to bring in some of the people who have been through the training doing some more training. Cause sometimes what happens is that is seems like the Caucasian middle class takes over stuff and that’s kind of how it is. But it doesn’t have to be that way. There can be other trainers and not just based on the fact that they happen to be from one group or another but I mean there are people out there with merit and I think that being true, you also need to waive so called academic and formal learning to bring people in. (Interviewee D)

A past trainer for the organization commented:

I go out to the Justice Institute and the clerk is this young guy with Down Syndrome and is as happy as can be and is a joy to everyone who is there. Do you see anyone like that around the City? What happens to the ability to expand our ways of thinking of how people can be of service and be needed and come out of isolation... I believe it is their mandate to continue to expand those horizons of possibilities of how we can be together on more effective, efficient and relational ways... I was in New York at a celebration at Police Square One in lower Manhattan and this was several years ago and we went in and there was this whole picture gallery of police officers on both walls and it was all the gay and lesbian officers and I was like what does it take for them [the City of Vancouver] to work with the police department to start honouring that community... It feels in some ways, certainly not entirely, that we have gotten stuck on the “let’s have a little festival and celebrate our diversity,” that it hasn’t progressed to people’s day to day experience of working together... I don’t see a lot of female firefighters. I don’t see a lot of disabled workers around. I don’t see issues of access being on the table the way that they were. We are talking twenty years here. So just really getting at the nitty gritty of it I would like to see them keep pushing the envelope. I think that is their job to keep pushing the envelope. I don’t have a sense of them pushing the envelope anymore. (Interviewee B)

Along with suggestions for how the City could expand its programming and impact, most of the interviewees felt that more funding should be designated from all three levels of government towards these kinds of initiatives. One trainer also stressed that training could not be impactful unless funding was provided to do upfront work to see what kind of training was needed:
We gotta find some middle ground where we can actually do that upfront work to determine what kind of change practices, behaviors, will be required. It would be nice to get back to that kind of environment where resources were provided for that. (Interviewee H)

**Summary of Findings:**

In order to bring the myriad of comments and suggestions provided through the interviews and document analysis together, I will spend a few paragraphs outlining the central findings that emerged from this research. It was agreed that the Hastings Institute emerged at a special time in terms of commitment to multiculturalism by local government and broader society. Vancouver emerged at this time as a leader in multicultural programming and training and the Hastings Institute enjoyed a high profile as a key driver of this innovation. Unlike many other municipalities, the City of Vancouver has shown a long-term commitment to diversity programming and training, despite the apparent lack of public profile of the current incarnation of the Hastings Institute/EEO.

**Shifts over Time**

Key themes regarding the evolution of the Hastings Institute/EEO's work over time were that the organization's approach to training had shifted through the years due to external factors such as funding, changing government priorities, changes in societal support for diversity issues, and the need to advance to a focus on the development of specific skills rather than on general awareness building. Many highlighted the failed attempt at developing the Hastings Institute using a business model as a shifting point for the organization's role and status. A few key contradictions developed in interviewees' discussions of the evolution of the organization. For instance, while many felt that there was a need to evolve the training, it was also felt that some important elements of the early Kingswood training had
been lost. Also, while many interviews highlighted the highly collaborative nature of the Hastings Institute, some also pointed out internal conflicts which impacted their work.

Elements of Good Training and Other Approaches to Change

Interviewees outlined many positive impacts that the training had on them and others. In discussions of training, role playing and experiential learning were identified as the most effective elements of the early Kingswood training. However, it was also pointed out that these elements are largely not part of the current training. Additional elements of effective training that were identified by interviewees included the idea that training could not be a one-off, that effective follow-up had to be done as part of training, that co-learning was key, and, finally, that self-reflection by trainers was essential.

Current Environment and Suggestions for Improvement

Overall, it was felt that there was a certain lack of leadership and innovation by the City compared with the past. Interviewees had a number of recommendations for future directions the City could take to improve upon their multicultural work. Many felt that the City needed to refocus its diversity training on the more transformative approaches which were a central feature of Kingswood training. Also, the idea that the City needed to focus not only on training of individuals but on more systemic transformation of organizations emerged. It was felt that the City needed to make more efforts to have its own staff reflect the true diversity of Vancouver residents. A related point was the idea that all levels of government had much more to do in terms of reducing barriers to employment currently faced by new immigrants. Many also outlined the need for community dialogues, such as the City’s earlier Barrier to Bridges dialogues, and other community level initiatives,
focused on diversity. Finally, it was widely felt that all three levels of government had to make a stronger commitment to multicultural initiatives.
CHAPTER 5
RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hastings Institute/EEO represents an innovative step taken by a local
government to begin to engage its inhabitants, and, specifically, members of the host society,
as active participants in multiculturalism. As such, it provides a rich case study from which to
make recommendations both to further inform Vancouver's own multicultural work as well
as that of other cities with a similarly poly-ethnic citizenry. The following recommendations
will look at key strategies that Vancouver could undertake to improve its work as well as
focusing more broadly on what other emerging poly-ethnic cities around the world could do
to engage in effective multicultural work. The recommendations have been divided into five
general sections: organizational recommendations, training recommendations,
recommendations for other municipal multicultural initiatives, recommendations for
planners and, finally, recommendations for provincial and federal levels of government.

Organizational Recommendations

REENERGIZE MULTICULTURAL INITIATIVES

One of the key recommendations that came out of this research was that the City of
Vancouver needs to rekindle the energy, innovation, and excitement that set the tone for its
early multicultural initiatives such as the Hastings Institute. While it is important to note that
the societal mood around diversity and multiculturalism may not be as engaged and receptive
as it once was, the City has a role to play in creating and reinvigorating this societal dialogue.
Instead of relying on its tried and true approaches, the City needs to be pushing boundaries
and engaging its citizenry in an active multicultural dialogue. Recently (in 2005), the City introduced the Mayor’s Working Group on Immigration which is linked to the Federation for Canadian Municipalities Big Cities Mayors Caucus Immigration Working Group. This working group represents an exciting opportunity for the City to reinvigorate its multicultural initiatives through critically reflecting on its own work. It also represents an important vehicle through which the City (in partnership with the other organizations and businesses which make up the working group) can take positions and make recommendations on important issues such as barriers to employment faced by immigrants or the need for Canada as a nation to rethink its approach to multiculturalism in order to engage all citizens in mutual co-adaptation.

The need to keep multicultural work fresh and engaged is an important observation for other cities or municipalities wanting to carry out similar work, as well. Both the example of the Hastings Institute/ EEO and the example of AMKA discussed above benefited early on from political will and energy committed to the initiatives from high-ranking officials. While the Hastings Institute did not suffer the same fate as AMKA, which ceased to exist when the party that initiated it was voted out, the Hastings Institute/ EEO has still had problems maintaining the initial drive and enthusiasm behind its work. An understanding that the building of a truly multicultural city and society is a long term, multi-generational task, should be built into organizational planning for these initiatives to ensure that steps are in place to move the work forward and to keep its approaches relevant and engaging. Some more specific ideas for the kinds of approaches the City of Vancouver, and other cities wishing to undertake this kind of work, might take in order to keep their multicultural initiatives fresh will be looked at in the recommendations for training and recommendations
for other municipal multicultural initiatives sections.

**DIVERSIFY CITY STAFF**

Another key organizational recommendation that came out of this research was the idea that the City of Vancouver, and the Hastings Institute/ EEO itself, needs to further focus on the diversification of staff. While it was acknowledged that the City had gone a ways towards diversification in the last 20 years, a number of interviewees felt the City still has a ways to go in terms of modeling the kind of approach its citizens could be taking to welcoming diversity. The Equal Employment Opportunity program is valuable in its work towards ensuring that applicants for positions at, and employees of, the City of Vancouver are not discriminated against and have a vehicle through which to launch a complaint if they are. However, there is still much to be done in terms of explicit policies which aim to incorporate those with barriers to employment into the organization, from people with physical disabilities to new immigrants whose foreign professional accreditation is not being accepted.

**Training Recommendations**

**FOCUS ON TRANSFORMATIVE AND ANTI-RACISM APPROACHES**

The key recommendation concerning training that comes out of this research is the need to focus on more transformative training approaches. Approaches used in the early Kingswood programs such as role-playing and scenarios were largely seen as the most effective approach by past trainees. Currently, the harassment intervention approach of Hastings Institute/ EEO training focuses only on the most in-your-face aspects of
discriminatory behaviour. It doesn’t get into underlying societal racism nor the assumptions and biases that are part of our day-to-day lives. These sessions tend to focus on case law, legal definitions and policies which address extreme cases rather than systemic racism and discrimination. In order to address these issues, as outlined in Patti DeRosa’s discussion of anti-racism education, training needs to focus on broader historical and societal issues. It also needs to incorporate self-reflection which enables trainees to critically examine their own behaviour and understanding and to work towards cultivating what bell hooks has termed a ‘radical openness’ to difference. A key way identified to get trainees to do this was through co-learning, meaning putting people together (for example having training groups which are composed of members of the host society as well as new immigrants) to learn from each other’s experience. This mutual learning approach was also one of the key strengths that Sandercock outlined in similar work undertaken by AMKA. A note of caution for this approach which was raised by one interviewee is to ensure that this is a true sharing of experience rather than a voyeuristic one-way process where members of the dominant society hear tales from “Others” perspectives.

FOLLOW UP AND ONGOING EVALUATION

Another key finding of this research was that training should be seen as part of an ongoing process rather than a one-off event. Follow-up to training, for example, taking the next step after awareness-building to look critically at the policies of an organization, is the most effective way to ensure that real organizational transformation occurs. The City of Vancouver, and other organizations undertaking training, should develop long-term plans for how training will be followed up in different departments and areas. Evaluation of
training programs is also an important ongoing aspect of training. In order to gauge the effectiveness of their training initiatives, it is key to develop strategies for follow-up evaluation with participants. A key precursor to training should, therefore, be to develop clear goals and objectives of training programs and strategies for evaluating these. Data gathered from evaluations can help to inform future training initiatives. One approach to this is to have programs evaluated by an outside body which can more objectively evaluate its effectiveness. A similar recommendation to this was made in the 1990 impact study of Kingswood training discussed above. It suggested that an external consultant be hired to collect qualitative and quantitative data 6, 12 and 18 months after completion of the training (Berman and Levitan, 1990).

**Recommendations for other municipal multicultural initiatives:**

**CIVIC RE-NARRATION THROUGH DIALOGUE**

Creating community dialogue around issues of diversity, immigration and multiculturalism is another key recommendation that emerges from this research. Many of the interviewees talked about a past initiative carried out by the City of Vancouver, the Barriers to Bridges dialogues, as something that should be attempted once again by the City. Both formal and informal occasions for dialogue should be a key objective for the City of Vancouver and other municipalities hoping to engage their populace in active multiculturalism. As the authors in the above section on storytelling outlined, changes in attitude and behaviour come out of lived experience. Creating public dialogue events as well as less-formalized opportunities for what Sandercock calls “banal transgressions” where
groups can mix and share their stories, experience, and ideas is key for getting groups to communicate and collaborate across difference. Cities need to focus on opportunities for dialogue to re-narrate the idea of a city as a place where diverse cultures enrich each others lives, rather than create incompatible enclaves. Opportunities for the host society to renegotiate their own cultural narratives in order to see their shifting role in a polyethnic society is also a key part of this. As outlined above, approaches such as community cultural development are key ways in which this can be accomplished. In addition, as community based non-profits such as Neighbourhood Houses are often the loci of such community-based multicultural initiatives, it is vital for cities to work actively with the non-profit sector to create opportunities for dialogue, to support transformative programming, to train their employees and to provide long-term support to successful cross-cultural projects at the neighbourhood level. Ultimately, this would strengthen the city’s initiatives through dispersing them more effectively throughout the city in order to carry out what Sandercock terms “the micro-sociological work that needs to be done street by street, neighbourhood by neighbourhood and across a range of institutions” (Sandercock, 2003a: 139).

**Recommendations for planners:**

**BUILD SKILLS FOR MEDIATING ACROSS DIFFERENCE**

If civic re-narration of poly-ethnic city spaces is a key goal, it follows that city-building professionals need to look at their roles as mediators of public dialogue across boundaries. Planners need to be educated to effectively work in cross-cultural settings and negotiate competing narratives. This means that, as interviewees suggested for diversity trainers, planners need to cultivate their skills of reflection, deep awareness and listening.
These skills need to be cultivated as part of planning education and ongoing life-long learning for planners.

BEYOND PLANNERS

It is important to add to this recommendation a recognition that planning is not the only profession that works actively to shape the day-to-day lives of urban citizens. The focus of the Hastings Institute/ EEO and AMKA in targeting the whole City bureaucracy and, specifically, the Hastings Institute's approach to doing training for other organizations and level of governments is key. All city workers, from the police, to teachers, to clerks, to social service providers are central to shaping how a city functions. It is vital for senior government and other funding agencies to re-consider the benefit of having all those who shape our cities – including city employees as well as those in non-profits and other levels of government – trained to effectively interact cross-culturally.

Recommendations for provincial and federal levels of government:

PROVIDE ONGOING DIRECTION AND FUNDING FOR CROSS-CULTURAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

As touched upon in the above recommendation, in order to create a climate of acceptance for multicultural policy innovations as well as to have the resources to make them happen, it is vital that there is a multi-tiered approach in which all levels of government play a role. Senior levels of government must offer cities, which are the loci of immigration, both direction and the long-term funding needed to create effective programs. This finding is consistent with Dunn, Hanna, Thompson’s 2001 research on local multicultural initiatives
in Australia discussed above. It is also consistent with the analysis of AMKA’s work in Frankfurt. In the absence of multiple party support and funding from the national state, that city’s multicultural initiative ceased to exist. As outlined in the interviews, the attempt to turn from government funding to private funding to carry out their cross-cultural training work was less than successful for the Hastings Institute and led to the downsizing of the organization’s role and status in the city.

It is, therefore, clear that governments need to look at strategies for the creation of long term engagement in cross-cultural dialogue between members of the host society and immigrant populations. Senior levels of government, particularly the federal level, have been the drivers behind immigration policy and the creation of opportunities for new immigrants to come to Canada. As part of their responsibility towards seeing this strategy through, the federal government needs to focus energy and resources on effectively co-integrating new immigrants and current residents. In order to accomplish this, the federal government needs to explicitly support programming in cities which attract the most immigration. In addition, the federal government should directly engage with the issue of professional accreditation for new immigrants, working with accreditation boards of various professions to determine if, and what kind of, additional training would enable them to practice their professions in Canada. This would be a vital step towards creating an environment conducive to immigration.
ONGOING DIALOGUE REGARDING THE CONCEPT OF MULTICULTURALISM

In order to keep the concept of multiculturalism relevant to an evolving citizenry, it needs to be seen as an emerging dialogue rather than a strictly defined concept and set of policies. As outlined in the above discussion on multiculturalism, Canadians pride themselves on being a multicultural nation. However, in order to have the idea of multiculturalism benefit current residents and newcomers alike, it can’t have a static definition. As outlined above, a disengaged multiculturalism can lead to a situation where Canadians become blind to the racism and barriers that groups such as new immigrants (as well as First Nations, and non-Anglo-Saxon long term residents) face. Multiculturalism can no longer be defined by the host culture on its terms and in a manner that exempts it from engaging actively. This means that Canada and other multicultural societies need to open up to a true discussion about the kinds of racism that are very much alive in their societies. In order to truly move forward on these issues, the federal government needs to make a commitment to keeping the definition of multiculturalism fresh. This entails keeping ongoing discussion alive in communities in order to make multiculturalism a concept that can shift with emerging realities and hybridities. This kind of dialogue should be carried out across the country and could partly be carried out at a community-level as part of the community forums recommended above.

ACTIVE PROVINCIAL ENGAGEMENT WITH MULTICULTURALISM

The provincial government needs to take a more active role in multicultural policy and programming. The province could demonstrate a commitment to multiculturalism by moving the multiculturalism branch to an influential location such as the Premier’s Office.
This would give it the authority it needs to ensure all provincial ministries are integrating the ideals of multiculturalism and participating in the discussion of a renewed and re-defined multiculturalism. The province should also work towards providing an explicit mandate for municipal governments to implement multicultural programs and policies. They should develop explicit policies to help local governments make the move from the assimilationist to radical multiculturalism as discussed above by Dunn, Hanna and Thompson. As well, in order to facilitate the skills needed to foster intercultural coexistence, the province should, through the Ministry of Advanced Education, support universities and colleges in offering programs in diversity training, multicultural programming and inter-cultural communication. In addition to this, the Province should implement required elementary and high school curricula that explicitly address multiculturalism, the roles that both the host culture and newcomers play, and ways for both to co-adapt.

**Issues Requiring Further Study:**

A case study is a snapshot of events that happened within a certain time period that were aimed at addressing a specific issue or a specific set of issues. Like any snapshot, what the case study reveals is only part of a much larger picture. Some issues are answered but other questions are also opened up. In the case of this analysis, there are two central questions that I am left wanting to explore further. The findings of this study begin to point towards some initial answers to them. However, there is still much that needs to be learned about these issues and further inquiry would add greatly to planning’s body of knowledge regarding building effective multicultural communities. The first is the idea of public storytelling. Barbara Eckstein points out that “carefully told and carefully heard, stories do have the potential to act as a bridge between engrained habits and new futures, but
their ability to act as transformative agents depends upon disciplined scrutiny of their forms and uses” (Eckstein and Throgmorton, 2003: 13). In *Mongrel Cities*, Leonie Sandercock comments:

> The search for community requires us to deal with fear; since the very attraction of community is its potential sense of belonging; however, the dark side of the desire for belonging is the potential to exclude others who are deemed not to belong. The search for community is very much alive in the cities that we are all familiar with, but implicit within this search are negative as well as positive energies. The challenge is to know how to bring out and to work with the positive energies. (2003a: 150).

The question I am left with is: how exactly can we use stories effectively to help bring out the positive energies but also deal effectively with the negative ones? There is still much work to be done to scrutinize the forms and uses of stories so that they can act as “a bridge between engrained habits and new futures.” Some initial insights into this can be gained through interviewees discussion of public dialogues such as the Barriers to Bridges sessions, and through the example of the hearings that AMKA ran. Other insights can be gained through the (not yet discussed in this research) therapeutic approach that Sandercock details Wendy Sarkisian undertaking in Redfern, where emotional embodiment was brought into the usually solely “rational” discourse of planning processes (2003a). Sandercock’s analysis of this example highlights a key aspect of many discussions of transformative learning and transformative planning practice – that of bringing in the whole person, emotions and all. However, a critical analysis of a representative sample of public processes that have attempted this approach needs to be carried out. Where have some processes succeeded and, just as importantly, where have some failed in doing this? What are the key approaches that planners and other facilitators can use for making these processes safe and productive? Are there situations in which this kind of approach should be avoided? Multicultural planning
enquiry and practice could benefit greatly from an in-depth comparative analysis of cases where public story-telling has been used.

The second question is one that could also benefit from an in-depth comparative analysis. In *Postmetropolis*, Edward Soja takes a look at the most homogeneous and heterogeneous communities in Los Angeles to see what they are doing wrong or right in terms of building intercultural urban citizenship. It would be highly instructive to do the same in a Canadian context. What are the key factors that enable some communities in Toronto or Vancouver to function well with a diverse populace while others do not? What role do city initiatives, non-government organizations and other civic institutions play? What do local residents in that community feel are the successes and failures of their community? Also, has physical planning played a role? Do public gathering places, community walkability or other factors play a role? Looking at the issue of building effective multicultural societies from this community focus might give some further insight into the kind of institutions and programming at the local level which will enable polyethnic communities to flourish.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION

The Hastings Institute / EEO Through a Phronetic Research Lens

As outlined in the methodology section, Bent Flyvberg’s key aim for phronetic research in social sciences is social commentary and social action. He summarizes the fundamental questions that this kind of research should answer as:

1. Where are we going?
2. Is this desirable?
3. What should be done?

Based on this line of questioning, then, the key issues which needed to be addressed through this study were identified as:

1. Where are we going in terms of creating viable multicultural societies? Namely, where are we going in terms of implementing multicultural policy at the local level and in the urban centres where most new immigration is occurring? Specifically, for the sake of this study, what kinds of policies are being implemented which prepare the host society for the demographic/cultural/social shifts that are occurring? Even more specifically, is the kind of training offered through the Hastings Institute and EEO an effective way to engage the host society as co-participants in multiculturalism?

2. Is the direction we are heading, given the current level of programming for members of the host society, desirable?

3. What could be done to improve upon efforts to prepare the host society for immigration?

4. Who is gaining and who is losing through the current approaches?
As laid out in the methodology section, in following the phronetic research approach, this study has been set up to answer those four questions. In order to make this connection explicit, I will focus this conclusion on answering each of them in turn.

The answer to the first question, where are we going, is offered through the case study and analysis sections of this research. What can be concluded from this discussion is that we are a long way from creating truly viable multicultural societies. While there is a framework of multicultural policies in existence, little has been done to directly address the need to prepare the host society for co-adaptation. The lessons and insights gained from initiatives such as the Hastings Institute/ EEO are invaluable in informing the kind of policy directions that should be carried out to deal with this issue. So while the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO does not alone offer the answer for engaging the host society as co-participants in multiculturalism, it offers some strategies as well as some lessons for improvement.

The answer to the second question, is this desirable, is closely linked to this. Overwhelmingly, feedback from interviewees and analysis of the literature pointed to the fact that there is not enough programming currently to address the rising issues of racism, discrimination and economic inequity that form part of our society. If this continues, we may be faced with increasing division and segregation as well as the possibility of violence. The insights outlined in the recommendations section such as increased inter-governmental responsibility and funding for multicultural initiatives, transformative learning and mutual learning approaches in training for the host society, and an engaged dialogue on the meaning of multiculturalism offer strategies to overcome these threats to our social fabric. The recommendations also offer some answers to question number three, what
should be done, by providing some concrete suggestions for what could be done to improve upon efforts to prepare the host society for immigration.

It is the final question, who is gaining and who is losing through the current approaches, that has not yet been directly addressed in the writing of this research. I will now, therefore, devote a few words to answering it. I would argue that it is Canadian society as a whole that is losing through the current approaches. Arguably, it is new immigrants to Canada who face systemic barriers employment and overall acceptance in Canadian society who are facing the biggest losses in the current climate. They are faced with the expectation that they should integrate into a society that hasn't yet come to terms with their existence and participation within that society. However, I would argue that Canada's host society loses out too. Firstly, a national schism exists. There is a tension between who we think we are as Canadians, our core story of being a welcoming, tolerant nation, and increasing evidence that points to this being far from the truth. When problems arise within this context, without ever having been exposed to the idea that multiculturalism is about two-way co-adaptation, it is easy for the host culture to blame any friction on newcomers. It becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy: if certain people are seen as a challenge to existing order, then they likely will be. If the predominant concept of Canadianess doesn't expand, then increasing racism, exclusion and ghettoization will lead to further social unrest. Fear and misunderstanding will likely dominate. It will become painfully obvious that we aren't the Canada we thought we were. What this clearly points to is the need to address these issues now. Our social policies need to be in sync with our immigration policies. If we want people to come to this country, we have to build a society that makes their coexistence with the existing population possible, even fruitful. We need to lay the groundwork now to change
fear to curiosity, to see difference as a strength rather than a weakness, and to see the hybridities that emerge from cultures mixing as the foundation for new, exciting, truly cosmopolitan societies.
EPILOGUE

There are a thousand and one urban reconciliation and regeneration stories and urban ecological dreams that can be dreamed, and a thousand tiny empowerments that can emerge by pursuing each of these dreams. This is how we build the sustainable city. It is grounded in and inspired by some exemplary models and practices.


As I look back over this research, I am left with the feeling that our ability to reinvent society is fundamentally about our ability to change our stories. Not only the larger societal stories such as national identity, but individual stories that we enact in our day-to-day lives about who we are, who our people are, who belongs in our circle of friends, our circle of co-workers or in our society. The Hastings Institute/ EEO, with both its successes and flaws, has been one attempt to get people faced with a changing society to adapt through changing their stories. Through its short time as an organization, the Hastings Institute/ EEO has supplied the kind of exemplary models discussed in the opening quote. It has also supplied some food for thought about some of the limitations of its work as well as some of the barriers that need to be overcome to achieve the goal of building a cohesive multicultural society.

So where do I find myself at the end of this investigation? What about my original question about how best to accomplish social change? I fret about the intangibility of what I have ended up reflecting on and recommending. While government innovations such as policies and programs are what I have been able to offer by way of recommendations, the ultimate goal is so hard to gauge and measure—a change in the mindset of individuals and, in turn, in society as a whole. Perhaps part of my inspiration for coming to planning school was to try to have some logical certainty about how to bring about individual and social change.
Perhaps I wanted to be presented with immutable laws of human interaction and evolution while at the same time knowing full well that these did not exist. So rather than answering my original question, what I may have ended up uncovering is that this question is a lot harder to answer than I had originally thought.

And yet, there have been some insights and hope gained along the way. I started this thesis off with a recollection of the place I grew up in – the kind of place that I wanted to get away from. Reflecting on these questions has given me a better idea of the kind of place that I would like to be in, and some insights into how working towards building that kind of cohesive city could be approached. One story that sticks out in particular to me from this research is the story a planner told to the investigators from SFU, which I quoted in the analysis section. He talks about being at public meetings where the issue of monster homes is brought up and framed in the light of “those people” are destroying our communities. He recounts the story of taking people to task on this issue and educating them about the fact that most of those homes are bought on spec and goes on to say that “that kind of racial comment is unacceptable.” This is coming from the mouth of a planner who is part of a department that twenty years earlier was involved in a process to remove the “blighted” community of Strathcona from Vancouver. Thus, while Vancouver’s planning and other departments are still far from perfect, I was heartened by this planner’s insight into the underlying issues at play. It offers me hope that it may well be possible to build a cohesive, multicultural city – one story at a time.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Hastings Institute Client List

Client List

As a result of our relationship with the City of Vancouver, The Hastings Institute has the unique opportunity of working with a client on an ongoing basis. We are challenged to develop and be accountable for strategies at every stage of the change process. We are aware of the day to day realities of making change in a large organization with many varied priorities. With this depth in our experience, we are able to take a holistic approach to valuing diversity. We have been retained by many organizations to be part of their change process.

Some of our recent clients include:

- BLJC-Workplace Solutions Inc. (previously B.C. Buildings Corporation)
- City of New Westminster Fire & Rescue Services
- City of North Vancouver
- Coast Foundation Society
- Coquitlam Public Library
- Corporation of Delta
- District of Maple Ridge
- District of West Vancouver
- E-Comm
- Health Canada, B.C.-Yukon Region
- Liquor Distribution Branch
- North Vancouver Recreation Commission
- Pacific National Exhibition
- The Laurier Institution
- Township of Langley
- University of British Columbia
- Vancouver International Airport Authority
- Vancouver Maritime Museum
- Vancouver Parks & Recreation
Appendix C: Trainers List

Our Trainers

Stephen Hammond - diversity; workplace harassment
Stephen Hammond is a trainer, consultant, author and speaker specializing in workplace human rights since 1992. He has worked extensively with the City of Vancouver’s Equal Employment Opportunity Program and The Hastings Institute. Within the municipal sector alone, Stephen has provided training on harassment-free workplaces for several large departments, including Fire, Police, Parks and Engineering. He is also the author of the book Managing Human Rights at Work: 101 Practical Tips to Prevent Human Rights Disasters and holds a Professional designation with the Canadian Association of Professional Speakers. Stephen was called to the Bar in 1988 and is now a non-practicing member of the Law Society of B.C.

Rhonda L. Margolis - diversity; workplace harassment
Rhonda Margolis is the principal of RLM Learning Innovations Inc., a leader in the design and facilitation of corporate education programs. Rhonda focuses on creating respectful, inclusive and dynamic workplaces through the facilitation of programs in valuing diversity, performance coaching, building teams, and leadership development. Rhonda has a Doctorate in Educational Leadership and Policy and a Master of Arts degree in Counselling Psychology, specializing in cross-cultural counseling. She is a Certified Executive Coach and member of the International Coach Federation.

Gary Pharness - workplace literacy
Gary Pharness started literacy work in 1965 in the U.S. Army and has worked with The Hastings Institute since 1989 as a workplace language consultant. In addition to ongoing community-based programs, Gary has worked extensively in contextual and communicative literacy as well as diversity with various long-term clients in municipal and corporate workplaces. Gary’s expertise is in bringing different stakeholders within a work setting together to build a culture of learning that acknowledges all employees as having the capacity to think and to express their personal voice. In 1995, the Workplace Language Program was a finalist in the IPAC (Institute of Public Administration of Canada) Award for Innovative Management and in 1997, was given the Ethics in Action Award.
Eric D. Wong - diversity; workplace harassment
Eric worked many years in B.C.'s education system as a teacher and multicultural education consultant with the Vancouver School Board and has taught in the Faculty of Education at U.B.C. From 1990 - 1994, he was the Manager of Training and Programs with the Hastings Institute and continues in a consulting capacity. As an educator in diversity and human rights, Eric has worked for a wide variety of organizations, including Vancouver Police Department, Canadian Auto Workers' Union, Canada Department of Justice and B.C. Workers' Compensation Board, and is currently on contract with the First Nations Education Steering Committee in B.C. as their Anti-Racism Coordinator.

Monica Kay - E.E.O. Program/ The Hastings Institute, City of Vancouver
Monica Kay is currently the Director of the Equal Employment Opportunity Program and Executive Director of The Hastings Institute for the City of Vancouver. For the past seven years she has been the Human Rights Advisor in the Labour Relations Department at the Greater Vancouver Regional District. In those roles, Monica has provided advice and support to municipal employers with respect to human rights and related issues, including: the prevention, investigation, and mediation of workplace harassment complaints; supporting workplace diversity; 'best practices' in disability management and accommodation, and a variety of other issues in human rights.

Monica has also provided training for GVRD municipal workforces in the areas of harassment prevention and conflict resolution, as well as facilitating training for supervisors and managers. She writes and presents regularly on a variety of human rights-related topics for human resource management professionals in the municipal sector. Prior to her present role, Monica was an Officer with the Human Rights Commission, and a lawyer in general practice. She has also served her community as a Community Coroner.

Anne Nickerson - E.E.O. Program/ The Hastings Institute, City of Vancouver
Anne Nickerson is an Advisor with The Hastings Institute and has worked in the City of Vancouver's Equal Employment Opportunity Program (E.E.O.) since 1995. She provides training and advice to City employees and managers on issues related to human rights and diversity, investigates complaints of harassment or discrimination and participates in projects and initiatives to foster a welcoming workplace. Anne oversees the day-to-day work of The Hastings Institute, coordinating training and consulting services for external clients in the areas of diversity, literacy, harassment and human rights.

Anne has many years of experience in the field of Human Resources, both as a generalist and Manager. She is a Certified Human Resource Professional (CHRP) with specific expertise in the areas of recruitment and retention, planning & development and union/management relations. Anne holds a Bachelor of Social Work degree from U.B.C. and a Certificate in Conflict Resolution from The Justice Institute of B.C.
Appendix D: Interview Guide

The interviews conducted for this study were unstructured, in-depth interviews. These were the following subjects that were explored with interviewees:

1. What has your involvement been with the Hastings Institute/ EEO?
   • When and for how long were you involved
   • Were you an employee or trainee
   • If you were a trainee, what sort of training did you receive

2. What has been the impact of your involvement with Hastings Institute/ EEO on the way you have approached your subsequent work with the City or other institutions?

3. Are you aware of the kind of policy influences that have shaped the work of the Hastings Institute?
   • If so, what sort of policies have shaped the work carried out by the Hastings Institute/ EEO?
   • What have been the affects of these policies on the Hastings Institute/ EEO over time?

4. Do you think the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO is an effective way to address issues of diversity and cross-cultural communication?
   • If so, what aspects in particular?
   • If not, how could the approach be improved upon or are there different approaches that could be more effective?
Appendix E: Definitions

Many of the terms used to talk about diversity and multiculturalism are defined in different ways by different authors. Following is how a few of the key terms have been employed in this paper.

**Immigrant and Non-immigrant**

In Canada, the only citizens who are not immigrants are First Nations people. However, immigrant is often used to refer to people who have immigrated to Canada in either their or their parent’s lifetimes. In addition, it tends to be applied to visible minorities regardless of how many generations their family has been in Canada. In this paper immigrant is used to refer to people who have moved to Canada within their lifetime.

**Host Culture**

For the purposes of this paper, the host culture in Canada is the Euro-Canadian culture. Our institutions, laws and policies are built on the language, concepts and traditions of this tradition. Also referred to as the dominant culture (Mahtani, 2002; & Sandercock, 2003), members of the host culture are often perceived by politicians, planners and many others to be ‘the norm’ for which society is designed. I have chosen to use host culture instead of dominant culture to reflect a need to reduce the dominance of Euro-Canadian culture in Canadian society.