

LOST IN TRANSLATION?
ASSESSING THE INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY LEVELS
OF PLANNERS IN THE DALLAS–FORT WORTH AREA

by

EIHUA CORINNE OLIVIA SHAW

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at
The University of Texas at Arlington
December 2019

Arlington, Texas

Supervising Committee:

Jianling Li, Supervising Professor

Guoqiang Shen

Rod Hissong

ABSTRACT

LOST IN TRANSLATION?

ASSESSING THE INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY LEVELS OF PLANNERS IN THE DALLAS–FORT WORTH AREA

Eihua Corinne Olivia Shaw, Ph.D

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2019

Supervising Professor: Jianling Li

The inclusion of minorities in the public participation process is one of the greatest challenges within the field of planning. However, the political structures around public participation make it difficult for practitioners to respond to the challenges and needs of an increasing number of cultural minority groups in urban regions. Scholars have advised planners to be more sensitive to the needs of minorities, but there are no tools in the planning field to evaluate cultural sensitivity in practice. This dissertation examines public participation related to intercultural sensitivity. In particular, this research adds to a better understanding of the role of planners and the role of intercultural sensitivity in public participation. The research draws on data from multiple methods including the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS), a demographic questionnaire, and four semi-structured interviews. Findings suggest that planners have high levels of intercultural sensitivity and are sensitive to the needs of socio-cultural and economic minorities, but the political structures of the planning process often pose constraints around

which planners must adapt. This research contributes to understanding of public participation and provides recommendations for improving public participation. It suggests the use of the ISS as a benchmark tool to measure intercultural sensitivity in the planning field. Furthermore, the planners' discourse on public participation, intercultural sensitivity, and inclusivity helps illustrate challenges provides new approaches to pursuing this issue across the United States.

Copyright by
Eihua Corinne Olivia Shaw
2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I give glory to God for His everlasting faithfulness, for making a way during my graduate school years. The race is indeed not to the swift.

I am also grateful to Mr. Arturo Del Castillo and the entire PUD department of the City of Dallas for the internship which has allowed valuable discussions and proved useful in drafting a research topic. I also thank my dear friends, Asma Saik and Amy Albright, for making that experience invaluable.

I am thankful to the individuals who participated in this research by taking the surveys and participating in the interviews. This project would not have been possible without their assistance. I thank He Qian, Betty Tonui, Kristen Ravi, and Dr. John Connolly for their help with the data; Dr. Rod Hissong, who agreed to be a committee member in-extremis and who has provided me with the necessary feedback to explore the broader implication of my research questions; Dr. Guoqiang Shen, for his valuable assistance with the methodological aspect of the research; and Dr. Jianling Li, my dissertation chair, for being an outstanding mentor. I am deeply thankful for her feedback and support as it greatly contributed to my academic success.

I thank my father for always providing me with the best to be the best. I also want to thank the following people for their love and invaluable support: my Meme, Papa Aime and Maman Olga, Papa Dogbo, Pastor Assi and Maman Esther, Apostle Guy and Maman Eliane. To my family and friends, my support system—Maman Eliane, Bintou, Proph. Stephanie, Grace Sare, Maureen Boka, Christopher, Krishan, Jeffrey, Fabrice Mbale, Charles, Linda and the entire green team., I thank you. To Patrick, Stephanie, Fabrice, Henri-Michel, Pierre, Isa, Joanne for loving me and always praying for me, I thank you. To the intercessory group for their prayers and to my entire Church Family of Overcomers for their endless love, I thank you.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my best teacher, my mother, Bahi Annie Marie-Genevieve, for her selfless love, unfailing support, and sacrifices. She encouraged me to rise above any limits, but most importantly, she has always believed in me. Thank you for teaching me everything.

To my spiritual Father, Apostle Guy-Joseph Tanoh, who taught me the things of God and the things of life, I dedicate this work.

To my godchildren, nieces and nephews, Christian, Elijah, Halle, Ethan and Ariella, for their unquestioning love, this work is also to show you that with God all things are possible. To all the people who have believed in me and who continue to do so, to my vast and extended biological and spiritual family, my circle of friends, here and everywhere in the world, who always lift me up and challenge me to be a better person, I dedicate this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	12
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY.....	32
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS.....	57
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, SUMMARY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	74
APPENDICES	
1. APPENDIX 1: REQUEST TO FORWARD EMAIL.....	86
2. APPENDIX 2: SURVEY CONSENT INFORMATION.....	87
3. APPENDIX 3: INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY SCALE.....	89
4. APPENDIX 4: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE.....	90
5. APPENDIX 5: INTERVIEW INVITATION.....	92
6. APPENDIX 6: INTERVIEW INFORMED CONSENT.....	93
7. APPENDIX 7: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	94
8. APPENDIX 8: FOLLOW-UP PHONE CALL SCRIPT.....	95
9. APPENDIX 9: REQUEST TO TAKE SURVEY.....	96
REFERENCES.....	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Sample and Population Characteristics.....	48
2. Regression Level of Measurement.....	56
3. Descriptive Statistics of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale Items	59
4. Public Participation Frequency	60
5. Percentile Ranking of the Sample.....	61
6. Difference Means in Groups.....	62
7. Summary of the ISS Score T-tests	64
8. Years of Experience.....	65
9. Predictor Variables of ISS Scores among Planners	66

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

If we “live” and form our lifeworlds in different cultural communities, within which we develop different “languages” and different “systems of valuing,” how do we get to talk to each other about matters of common concern? And, when we get to talking across these divides, how do we get to decide what is right? (Healey, 1997, p.63)

Planners, in general, are concerned with meeting the needs and improving the general welfare of individuals (Burayidi, 2003). Ideally, planners seek to obtain and integrate public input in decisions concerning the population they serve through a process called public participation (EPA, 2018). Public participation refers to “any process that directly engages the public in decision-making and gives full consideration to public input in that decision. Public participation is a process, not a single event” (EPA, 2018).

The concept of public participation originates from the Greek notion that citizens should decide in the affairs that concern their daily lives. Several scholars parallel this aspect of public governance to a democratic ideal because it advocates for the sharing of power between the public and the government (Arnstein, 1969; Carp, 2004; Connelly, 2010; Pickering & Minnery, 2012). It requires public officials to actively seek and consider the input of the public in their policies (Carp, 2004; Connelly, 2010; EPA, 2018; Seltzer & Mahmoudi, 2012; Smith, 1933).

Participation takes many forms including voting in elections, contributing in political campaigns, protesting, or engaging in local government issues (Berry, 1981; Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995; Gormley, 1981; McClurg, 2003; Weber & Khademian, 1997). However, this paper restrains public participation to what “largely occurs at the administrator-citizen interface” (Yang & Pandey, 2011, p.881).

Public participation serves several purposes. First, it allows officials to assess the public’s preferences and improves local decisions (Adams, 2004; Burby, 2003; Neshkova, 2014).

Officials recognize that identifying local solutions for local challenges without citizens' contribution is likely to be ineffective (Gittell, 1972; King & Stivers, 1998; Myren, 1972; Thomas, 2013; Potapchuk, 1996) because local groups provide input to local problems that planners alone may overlook (Burby, 2003; Laurian, 2003; Van Herzele, 2004). Therefore, an incorporation of local knowledge allows residents and planners to reach creative solutions for local issues (Rydin & Pennington, 2000; Innes & Booher, 2004).

Secondly, public participation facilitates the implementation and the development of policies (Adams, 2004; Wang & Van Mart, 2007). In fact, citizens' involvement especially in the early stages of the process, leads to collaboration (Rydin & Pennington, 2000) and development of project ownership, which makes them likely to monitor *their* project, even post-implementation, because plans are reflective of citizens' values and opinions (Shepherd & Bowler, 1997; Rydin & Pennington, 2000; Wang & Van Mart, 1996).

Thirdly, public participation bears a democratic ethic and the goal of empowerment. Public participation responds to the democratic assumption that people should have a say in public decisions which affect them (Fiskaa, 2005). By inviting citizens into the planning conversation, public participation advances the ideals of justice and fairness because it accounts for the needs and preferences of minorities, which may have otherwise been excluded (Innes & Booher, 2004).

Fourthly, public participation improves the overall well-being of society (Barber, 1984). People who participate usually evolve into mature and responsible citizens because they have an increased knowledge of citizenry (Potapchuk, 1996). Participation activity also fosters a learning opportunity for all participants (Hanna, 2000); contributes to building social capital; and solves and reduces conflicts (Berry, Portney, & Thomson, 1993) through a transparent, inclusive, and

fair decision-making process for all (McLaverty, 2002; Potapchuk & Crocker Jr., 1999a; Innes & Booher, 2004; Halvorsen, 2003).

Finally, public participation meets legal requirements. The Title VI federal requirement prohibits government and non-profit agencies, recipients of federal funds, to exclude the public from the decision-making process (Brody, Godschalk, & Burby, 2003).

However, critics assert that participation opportunities are not equal (Evans-Cowley & Hollander, 2010) and that representation is not reflective of the entire community spectrum (Day, 1997; Evans-Cowley & Hollander, 2010; Ebdon & Franklin, 2006; Roberts, 2004). Research suggests that a selected minority participates (Barreto, Segura & Woods, 2004), and that these participants have incomes and levels of education higher than that of the average (Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Verba et al., 1995). Therefore, groups with time and discretionary income influence the planning process in their favor (Lowndes, Pratchett, & Stoker 2006) because their level of education contributes to their understanding of participation issues (Abel & Stephan, 2000; King, Stivers et al., 1998; Lowndes et al., 2006).

The costly formula of participation—money, time, and education (Carp, 2004; Leighninger, 2013; Vogt, King, & King, 2004)—automatically excludes some groups from the process (Abel & Stephan, 2000). Furthermore, planners traditionally hold public meetings during times and at locations unlikely to be accessible to groups working evening shifts and residents lacking reliable means of transportation or supplemental income to contract out household chores (CAMPO, 2019). Thus, with limited resources and access, the poor and the working poor typically prioritize providing for their families over volunteering their time in public participation (Russel & Vidler, 2000).

Critics also accuse public officials of cheating participation, reinforcing exclusion, and promoting elitist interests because officials use artificial avenues of representation to deceive socio-cultural minorities and disfranchised community members with a semblance of decision power through board appointments (Arnstein 1969; Kakabadse, Kakabadse, & Kouzmin 2003). Yet, another group of scholars attribute the issue of citizen representation to the use of ineffective methods of engaging the public, which regardless of their inefficiency, are still enshrined in public participation canons (King, Feltey, & Susel, 1998; Innes & Booher, 2004; Rowe & Frewer, 2000). “Legally required methods of public participation in government decision making in the US—public hearings, review and comment procedures in particular—do not work. They do not achieve genuine participation in planning or other decisions” (Innes & Booher, 2004, p 419). These approaches do not provide planners with any fundamental guideline on conducting effective participation: the requirements are largely too vague, too general, and too old (Brody et al., 2003).

Since genuine participation requires the affected people to influence policies through their input (Brody et al., 2003), practitioners are now turning to non-traditional approaches, which are based on communication, collaboration, and consensus building built on the ideals of Communicative Action. The Communicative Action model improves public participation through participatory planning and offers a “more democratic, more socially fair and more accessible” process for all (Damurski, 2015, p. 1568). It fosters understanding and agreement for all participants, opens the process and welcomes arguments from all stakeholders (Sager, 2009). More specifically, communicative approaches unfold the process for traditionally excluded groups and advance social justice and fairness in areas of public services, built infrastructures or spatial development (Albretchs & Denayer, 2001).

Problem Statement

During the past decades, the influx of immigration from non-western nations to the regions of Europe and North America have brought immigrants whose diverse ethnic needs often challenge the status quo of unitary, top-down, planning practices (Hou & Kinoshita, 2007; Umemoto, 2001). As American cities become more racially and ethnically diverse, planners must engage with cultural groups who speak in several languages (Umemoto, 2001). This situation gives rise to inequalities in the planning process (Umemoto, 2001) because planners are often challenged when they deal with a communication style other than their own (Hou & Kinoshita, 2007) and may unintentionally discard the inputs of participants (Umemoto, 2001). Moreover, in some communities, participation intimidates citizens because they do not understand the material and perceive themselves as not having adequate knowledge to contribute to the discussion (Halvorsen & Jarvie, 2002).

In fact, communication nuances such as those of body language, facial expressions, and voice intonations (Albu, 2015) contained in each culture, when misinterpreted, add to minorities' feelings of being discriminated against (Umemoto, 2001) and forfeit sincere efforts towards participation (Umemoto, 2001). In an environment that expects planners be more inclusive and sensitive to the voices of all (Listerborn, 2008), designing and facilitating planning processes to accommodate cultural differences is a difficult task (Umemoto, 2001).

The term multicultural planning refers to the “sensitivity of the planning process to cultural diversity” (Qadeer, 2009). It is “a strategy of making reasonable accommodations for the culturally defined needs of ethno-racial minorities on the one hand and reconstructing the common ground that underlies policies and programmes on the other” (Qadeer, 2009, p.10). It recognizes, integrates, and welcomes the contribution of socio-cultural differences and serves as

a means of empowerment (Sandercock, 1998). Scholars advocating for multicultural planning (Sandercock, 1998, 2003; Burayidi, 2003; Forester, 1999, 2000) have created a basis for cultural competence in the field of urban planning.

Intercultural sensitivity is the affective dimension of cultural competence in intercultural communication, which requires an interest in other cultures and a willingness to modify one's behavior to adapt to other cultures (Bhawuk & Brislin 1992). Since the primary role of planners is to meet the needs and improve the general welfare of individuals (Burayidi, 2003), through public participation (EPA, nd), they need to be interculturally sensitive and incorporate that sensitivity into planning practices (Sandercock, 2003a) in order to also meet the needs of socio-cultural groups.

In fact, the literature suggests cultural competence and sensitivity methods and techniques for engagement (Qadeer, 2009; Sandercock, 2003b; Forester, 2000; Burayidi, 2003) proposing that planners' roles should build on stories and be people oriented to create more empowerment opportunities for traditionally excluded groups. Forester (2000) and Sandercock (2003b) suggest using storytelling to negotiate and discuss issues among different stakeholders. This approach allows parties to share their experiences and suggestions in a climate of mutual learning, because individuals adjust their values according to their experiences. Sandercock (2004) presents a therapeutic approach to planning to foster social learning and improve the planning process to include the perspective of minorities and suggests that planners play a role in social learning and healing. Burayidi (2003) and Qadeer (2009) exhort planners to be sensitive to other cultures by acknowledging differences in engagement techniques and designing planning policies which account for cultural needs (Qadeer, 2009). Forester also (2000) suggests the

creation of safe spaces, platforms conducive to collaboration and trust where individuals freely share and discuss ideas.

However, planners are often depicted as being insensitive and discarding cultural differences in their practice (Qadeer & Agrawal 2011; Zhuang, 2013). If that is the case, it means that planners themselves obstruct public participation. Yet, there is not enough evidence to conclude that. Despite the considerable attention given to multiculturalism in planning practice and research, the field of evaluation of the efforts struggles in the United States. The literature on multicultural planning has not addressed how sensitivity is evaluated in practice. Evaluations are rare and rely on few case studies, most of which are from Canada (Qadeer, 2009; Qadeer & Agrawal, 2011; Wallace, 2000; Zhuang, 2013). In spite of the solutions and engagement techniques discussed and proposed, the planning field lacks the criteria and tools necessary to assess intercultural sensitivity specific to 21st century American needs. The amelioration of multicultural planning must build on a knowledge and understanding of planners' current states of intercultural sensitivity. However, without a point of reference, it is impossible to compare results across individuals or groups, over time, and across agencies to determine influential factors in order to make recommendations to improve intercultural sensitivity.

To begin to address this knowledge gap, this research proposes to use Chen and Starosta's (2000) Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) as a tool to measure planners' levels of intercultural sensitivity. The ISS is an empirical, quantitative tool to serve as a shared evaluation instrument, a point of departure for judging cultural sensitivity in urban planning practice. This study focuses on planners' intercultural sensitivity as well as the demographic factors affecting intercultural sensitivity and how planners discuss the public participation of socio-economic minorities in planning.

Contribution

With cultural differences existing in planning, both in terms of changing demographics of planners and the population they serve, it is imperative for planners to examine their own attitudes toward cultural differences. Scholars argue that intercultural sensitivity is crucial to individuals to live and work with others from different cultures (Landis & Bhagat, 1996). It is essential to accept different cultures in order to plan effectively within culturally diverse communities. If planning is also devoted to considering the needs of ethno-racial and socio-economic minorities, then having culturally competent planners is *sine qua non* to this task. Since planning professionals play a crucial role in determining the outcomes of public participation (Connelly, 2010), an objective assessment of intercultural sensitivity is vital to implement appropriate changes adapted to the increasing cultural diversity of urban regions. However, these goals might be difficult to achieve without first measuring planners' sensitivity to cultural differences and then taking action to address their lack of sensitivity, if necessary. Hence, the results from the survey and the interviews contribute to reconciling the gaps found between theory and practices in order to improve public participation approaches.

Although the hypotheses tested in this study have not lead to any statistically significant results, they are still relevant to improving the reliability of the multicultural planning literature that uses the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale. Because this is the first time that the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale is used in planning, the findings are informative as they might encourage future research to replicate the study with a different population of planners to in order to test the reliability of the scale in planning and re-test the hypothesis in order to determine what demographic factors, if any, affect cultural sensitivity. Finally, this research, in spite of the lack of statistically-significant findings, sets the tone for future research intercultural sensitivity in

planning and makes the planning literature more compete and improves the reliability of future research.

The research uses a mixed method approach to reveal opportunities and challenges of public participation in a multicultural environment. The quantitative part of the research measures the intercultural sensitivity of planners while the second part examines the findings of the survey through planners' personal experiences in order to unveil the realistic scope of issues in planner-citizen communication for decision-making, to eventually reconcile theory with practice. This study reveals that the missing link is that academe does not emphasize the political nature of planning that oversimplifies the intricate web of public participation that planners navigate daily. It also provides empirical grounds to revisit planners' roles, functions, and expectations in today's era of public participation. The knowledge and understanding of planners' levels of intercultural communication and the possible factors therein are to reshape the concept of public participation in how it is taught, practiced, and discussed in academic and professional circles.

Significance

This study provides baseline data for orientation to intercultural sensitivity and its relationship to various demographic variables in the Dallas–Fort Worth (DFW) area. The findings may lend to discussions within the region. An understanding of intercultural sensitivity can assist planners in helping the communities that they serve, since greater levels of intercultural sensitivity lead to greater intercultural competence.

Cultural differences exist in planning institutions and the competencies of an effective planner include being sensitive to various cultures. In fact, cultural diversity in metropolitan areas has affected planning processes (Umemoto, 2001; Forester, 1999, 2000). “When minorities

are becoming majorities, new challenges of inter-minority relations and mutual recognition are arising” (Qadeer & Agrawal, 2011, p.139). In the DFW area, the number of people born in foreign countries has increased by almost 50% from 2000 to 2013 and this trend is expected to continue to grow in the future (NTCOG, 2019). Furthermore, in this region, 239 languages are spoken at home (DFW International, 2014), and 13% of the total population in the region has a limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English (NCTCOG, 2019).

This study plays a significant role in understanding of the role and functions of planners in public participation. Such a study has never been performed on planners in general or on planners in public institutions. Therefore, the results may lead to other studies in other metropolitan areas to examine the intercultural sensitivity of their planning professionals. The DFW area’s rapid growth and immigration rates, growing urban poverty, and limited transportation options are characteristics shared by other metropolitan regions of the United States. Therefore, it makes DFW a useful case study to examine the role of planners in genuine public participation efforts. Such understanding proves helpful in designing fair and inclusive participation programs. The results provide a foundation and direction for continued research within the DFW area and in the United States.

Organization of the Study

The next chapter reviews and discusses the relevant literature in order to provide an empirical and theoretical framework. Specifically, Chapter Two gives an overview of public participation, provides an overview of public participation, presents the benefits and problems of current practice and proposed solutions.

The third chapter presents the methodology and the theoretical framework, describing data sources and analytical techniques for both phases of the research.

Chapter Four presents the data collected in the survey and in the interviews. The findings presented in this chapter answer the overarching research question of whether or not planners are culturally sensitive.

Chapter Five discusses the key findings and links the data back to the literature review in order to answer the three guiding research questions. This chapter includes future research that might enhance and further this study as well as the research's broader implications for the fields of planning and multicultural sensitivity assessment.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter provides a common understanding of the terms and concepts used in this paper and presents the reader with a portion of the theoretical and academic work toward the roadblocks that planners encounter when designing participation programs.

Overview of Public Participation

The term public participation lacks clear definitions (Rowe & Frewer, 2005), bears a variety of definitions (Martin, 2009; Yang & Callahan, 2005) and conveys different meanings to different people depending on the spatial and temporal context in which it occurs (Sanoff, 2000). The concept is still vague and contested (Arstein, 1969; Day, 1997; Yang & Callahan, 2005) and as a result, it raises consistent concerns within the planning community (Carp, 2004).

Public participation is “a general concept covering different forms of decisions-making by a number of involved parties” (Wulz, 1986, p.153). According to Langton (1978), public participation is “initiated and controlled by government to improve or gain support for decisions, programs, or services” (p.21). It is a set of methods aimed at consulting, involving, and informing the public and those affected by a policy to have a say in that decision (Smith, 1983). Participation is “the expectation that citizens have a voice in policy choices” (Bishop & Davis, 2002, p.14) and that “interested citizens, residents, or stakeholders have the right to contribute to decisions that affect them” (Pickering & Minnery, 2012, p.250). Participation is also the sum of efforts citizens put together in order to influence the decisions of policy implementing agencies (King et al., 1998). As such, it is considered by several scholars to be an empowerment tool and a democratic right (Arstein, 1969; Day, 1997; Yang & Pandey, 2011). It is “the central element in unleashing the power of people to control their own destiny” (Poptachuk, 1996, p.55).

This research aligns with Creighton's (2005) definition of public participation as being "the process by which public concerns, needs and values are incorporated into governmental and corporate decision making. It is a two-way communication and interaction, with the overall goal of better decisions that are supported by the public" (p. 7).

The Benefits of Public Participation

Theorists and practitioners support public participation for several reasons but mostly because of the benefits of the process (Irvin & Stansburry, 2004). There are five purposes associated with public participation (Innes & Booher, 2004). First, it allows public officials to gather information about the public's preferences, by means of consultation, surveys, or representative groups (Burby, 2003; Van Herzele, 2004; Adams, 2004; Rydin & Pennington, 2000). Rydin and Pennington (2000) state that the public are key resources of knowledge that officials need in order to achieve policy goals. Adams (2004) has reached a similar conclusion while exploring the functions of city council and board meetings in Santa Ana, California and has found that, while public meetings may not fulfill their primary functions, the citizens comments are useful in providing city officials with information to set the agenda.

Furthermore, because citizens are more familiar with their own community, they are more likely to provide relevant, layperson knowledge to the planning process (Brabham, 2009; Van Herzele, 2004). Citizens bring the type of information that planners could have missed or excluded while generating holistic and creative solutions (Burby, 2003; Laurian, 2003; Van Herzele, 2004). Van Herzele (2004) conducted a study on the value of local, non-professional knowledge in an urban renewal project in Belgium and noted that regardless of the difference of opinions between planners and the public, citizens' opinions were necessary to adjust the proposed planning solutions, although the input did not serve in formulating new interpretations

of the planning issue itself. It is in similar cases that participation creates a learning opportunity for all stakeholders (Hanna, 2000). Consequently, “local knowledge should never be ignored by planners seeking to improve the lives of communities experiencing the greatest risks” (Corburn, 2003, p.420).

Second, public participation increases the legitimacy of decisions and guarantees the support of stakeholders (Meier, 2000; Barnes, Newman, & Sullivan, 2004). According to Seltzer and Mahmoudi (2012), plan implementation relies on the degree to which citizens’ view plans as a legitimate basis for acting and invoking public purposes. Neshkova (2014) validates that notion through a study on public participation in public budgeting where she observed that public administrators are more likely to involve the public in order to gain support, validate policies in terms of practicality and legitimacy, improve the compliance rate, and enhance the overall quality of decisions. In fact, if planners hold public hearings and give everyone the opportunity to speak, then “whatever is decided is, at least in theory, democratic and legitimate” (Innes & Booher, 2004, p.423). Furthermore, the public favors projects in which they have worked and are more likely support it even post its implementation (Gittell, 1972; King & Stivers, 1998; Myren, 1972; Thomas, 2013). Extending this idea, Fiskaa (2005) asserts that “[t]he purpose of public participation is of course to obtain better plans, meaning that they are well accepted by most, and therefore easier to carry out” (p. 160-161).

Third, public participation also embodies a democratic ethic and empowerment ideal (Barnes et al., 2004). Adams (2004) asserts that providing participation activities to community members reinforces their political power and raises the citizens’ levels of awareness of local issues. Participation helps improve policy and draws excluded citizens back into the political

arena (Bishop & Davis, 2002). This aspect of public governance is democratic because it encourages planners and the public to share power (Arstein; 1969; Carp, 2004; Connelly, 2010).

Fourth, public participation improves the well-being of society. When stakeholders organize to solve issues directly affecting them (Potapchuk & Croker, 1999a), it builds social capital (Putnam, 2000; Innes, 1998), solves conflicts, and helps transform relationships among them (Potapchuk & Croker, 1999b). Likewise, studies have showed that the involvement of the public in the early stages of the decision-making process reduces conflicts, simplifies the development of policies (Rydin & Pennington, 2000), and fosters trust between citizens and policy actors (Berry, Portney, & Thomson, 1993). Wang and Van Wart (2007) studied the effects of public participation and discovered that the public's involvement in the decision-making process improves the trust that citizens have in public officials, especially when the process shows integrity and professional ethics. Furthermore, Halvorsen's (2003) study of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Services (USFS) supports the idea that a transparent, inclusive, and accessible participation process improves trust, reduces conflicts, and brings consensus among stakeholders.

Fifth, public participation is a federal mandate. The Title VI federal requirement of public participation prohibits agencies recipients of federal funding to exclude the public from the decision-making process (Brody et al., 2003). Dalton and Burby (1994) analyzed the effect of land-use regulations on areas at risk of natural disasters in 176 local governments in five states. The study revealed that mandated participation causes local governments to produce better plans through the establishment of a more comprehensive assessment of risks of natural hazards, which accounts for community needs and alternate solutions. However, public participation is not

devoid of flaws, the next section discusses the problems in current practices and the solutions devised to address them.

The Problems in Current Practice

The concept of public participation is problematic (Day, 1997; King et al., 1998). Public participation is not clearly defined, and the growing number of participation mechanisms causes an ambivalence among practitioners and theorists as to the type of activity that public participation should entail (Grizez Kweit & Kweit, 2007; Hendriks, 2009; Rowe & Frewer, 2005).

In their attempt to create a typology of public engagement mechanisms, Rowe and Frewer (2005) have referenced more than one hundred mechanisms, which, while being similar to one another in process, also lack proper definitions, which exacerbates the issue of conceptualization. There are various methods of participation, which encompasses surveys, focus groups, citizens juries, conferences, (Rowe & Frewer, 2005; Adams, 2004, Laurian & Shaw, 2008) taskforces, workshops, and charrettes (Innes, 1998). In fact, for the same concern, based on the conception of an issue, some agents would decide to include public services users, others active stakeholders, and others as individuals in the participatory space (Martin, 2009). As a result, the lack of clear definitions hinders the breeding of specific research questions, affects participation design (Bherer & Breux, 2012) and provides no evaluation criteria (Laurian & Shaw, 2008; Rowe & Frewer, 2005).

A second problem is the institutionalization of participation, which according to scholars, has turned public participation into a series of meaningless activities and mere rituals to fulfill legal mandates (Innes & Booher, 2004; Evans-Cowley & Hollander, 2010). Critics contend that public participation activities do not genuinely seek input and creative solutions and that

participation rituals do nothing but compel citizens to accept pre-decided policies, convey information to policymakers and fulfill legal mandates (Evans-Cowley & Hollander, 2010; Adams, 2004; Cole & Caputo, 1984; Rowe & Frewer, 2000; Innes & Booher, 2010). This is what Arnstein (1969) termed “token participation.”

In fact, conventional forms of participation, such as public hearings, have been found to be ineffective and, instead, to reinforce conflicts and antagonism among stakeholders, especially because each group feels compelled to bring an opposite view to get a point across (Innes & Booher, 2004). Furthermore, public meetings seldom attempt to reach consensus among parties and score low on empowerment (Fung, 2015). They are outdated by at least thirty years but persist because they are engraved in the legal framework of participation (Innes & Booher, 2004; Leighninger, 2013; Rowe & Frewer, 2005). Yet, they do not always provide opportunities for all views to be expressed, can be intimidating, lack transparency and fairness, or happen too late to truly influence the process (Baker, Addams, & Davis, 2005; Laurian & Shaw, 2008).

Among all participation methods, public hearings are the most widely used form of public participation because of the legal framework by which participation is conducted (Adams, 2004; Rowe & Frewer, 2000; Leighninger, 2013; Wang & Van Mart, 2007). However, since public hearings are scheduled so late in the process, when citizens voice their comments, the likelihood of influencing decisions is very small (Fiorino, 1996). Furthermore, the existence of sunshine laws often prevents officials from commenting or responding to any issue not placed on the agenda 72 hours prior the meeting (Leighninger, 2014). Additionally, the time restriction on individual interventions does not allow citizens to thoroughly explore complex problems, thereby limiting the extent to which community members can learn about a topic (Adams, 2004; Evans-Cowley & Hollander, 2010). The meetings allow three minutes for citizens and officials to ask

questions or to make a comment about an issue (Leighninger, 2013). “Citizens march up to the podium, give their two minutes speeches...and then officials proceed with their business irrespective of the arguments made by citizens” (Adams, 2004, p.44). In other words, public hearings give limited power to citizens (Abel & Stephan, 2000) and invalidate the purpose of public participation because such processes do not guarantee that citizens will influence the outcomes of decisions (Adams, 2004; Buchy & Hoverman, 2000; Cole & Caputo, 1984; Evans-Cowley & Hollander, 2010; King et al., 1998).

Thirdly, citizens lose trust and become frustrated with the government because of the lack of interaction with officials and a perceived inability to genuinely influence policy through participation (Fung, 2005; Leighninger, 2014). Community members often view public participation as a monologue rather than a dialogue (Baker et al., 2005). This unilateral communication style generates a decline in public trust and causes cynicism and apathy toward public participation (Berman, 1997; Fung, 2015; King et al., 1998). Citizens then view public servants as corrupted agents (Fung, 2015; Gilens, 2012; Johnson, 1993) who use public participation only to make the public cooperate with previously decided outcomes and solicit comments about proposals to comply with federal mandates about public participation (Burby 2003; Innes & Booher, 2004; Halvorsen & Jarvie, 2002; Wiedman & Femers, 1993)

A fourth and ubiquitous critique of public participation is representation (or lack of thereof), the *sine qua non* of genuine participation (King et al., 1998). As pointed out by Evans-Cowley and Hollander (2010) all participation opportunities are not equal. Research confirms that socio-economic status (SES) is a powerful predictor of participation (Verba et al., 1995). Furthermore, Verba, et al., (1995) states “The central tenet of the SES model is that people of higher socio-economic status—those with higher education, higher income and higher status

jobs—are more active in politics” (p.281). Studies have confirmed that differences in participation are related to gender, education age, political persuasion, race, and previous activism (Midden, 1995). Therefore those who actively participate are Whites, upper or middle-class, college educated, and members of advisory boards (Abel & Stephan, 2000). In fact, elites control the participation process because they have the necessary resources (Lowndes et al., 2006) such as education and civic skills which fosters their understanding of the information provided and allows them to actively participate, and their socio-economic status affords them time and income to devote towards participation (Abel & Stephan 2000; Lowndes, et al., 2006).

On the contrary, low-income groups and socio-cultural minorities refrain from participating because they lack resources, such as education, time, and money which are necessary to participate (Hou & Kinoshita, 2007). Havlorsen and Jarvie’s (2000) public participation research on environmental issues confirms that minorities groups and blue-collar workers are less likely to attend public meetings because they do not have access to reliable transportation nor the financial resources to afford childcare services or contract help for household chores as opposed to active community members. Thus, “classic groups to be excluded from 19:00 h meetings are women and young parents who cannot afford alternative childcare” (Burchy & Hoverman, 2000, p.21).

Furthermore, Rowe and Frewer’s (2000) assessment of public participation methods has revealed that public hearings are commonly held during weekdays and working hours in locations inaccessible by public transportation. The meeting times also prevent cultural minorities and low-income individuals to participate because this segment of the population usually works at times when meetings are held (Burchy & Hoverman, 2000). Members of the public are also intimidated and often exclude themselves from participation when think that they

do not have the required skills and knowledge to effectively communicate with the decision makers (Halvorsen & Jarvie, 2002).

The current work on participation depicts planners as having a negative attitude toward participation, but with little evidence to contribute to that conclusion (Clifford, 2013). While public servants, politicians, and citizens are interested in citizen involvement, there is still significant evidence to show that efforts toward participation are not effective (Crosby, Kelly, & Schaefer, 1986; Kathlene & Martin, 1991; Kweit & Kweit, 1981). Some authors have described planners as ambiguous towards public participation (King et al., 1998). Therefore, even when planners believe in the ideals of democracy, they are skeptical about it (Day, 1997; Gruber, 1987). The conundrum of participation is explained through Arnstein's (1969) famous claim: "The idea of public participation is like eating a spinach: no one is against it in principle because it is good for you" (p. 216). In the article "Putting more Public Policy in Policy Analysis," Walters, Aydelotte, and Miller (2000) boldly assert that decision-makers are reluctant to share their power. The literature attributes this unwillingness to past experiences in which citizens have portrayed themselves as not being interested in public issues (Halvorsen & Jarvie, 2002) or at best shifting their interests (Brody et al., 2003; Yang, 2006) either due to a lack of experience in a specific area or based on a perceived importance of an issue (Brody et al., 2003). Hence, citizens catch the "window of opportunity" through their increased participation during a specific event and decrease it afterwards (Birkland, 1996, 1997; Prater & Lindell, 2000). This fluctuation of interests presumably decreases officials' willingness to promote participatory agendas (Yang, 2006).

Furthermore, public participation is costly. Citizens who accept an invitation to a focus group or citizen jury must usually receive compensation in terms of cash or gift certificates

(Vogt et al., 2004; Waterton & Wynne, 1999). Furthermore, skilled professionals such as interpreters or facilitators must also receive compensation (EPA, 2018). In terms of time and energy, the amount of red tape and interpersonal complexities required for policy-making also affects planners' autonomy and efficiency (Carp, 2004; Walters, Aydelotte, & Miller, 2000). Moreover, the time and resources required to collect and process information negatively affect employees' productivity (Leighninger, 2014). Therefore, when an issue does not guarantee benefits, officials are likely to forfeit participation (Ryding & Pennington, 2000).

Issues requiring technical knowledge and preparation generally deter administrators from seeking participation (Neshkova & Guo, 2012). Friedman has suggested in the past that that planners perceive their knowledge as being superior to that of local citizens (1973). In fact, most entry-level planning positions require a minimum of a master's degree in the United States (US Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017). Therefore educated planners believe that the average public cannot realistically assess the socio-cultural, economic, and political factors necessary to an effective decision making and as a result they do not include the public's opinions in decisions (Yang, 2006; Innes & Booher, 2004; King et al., 1998). This kind of attitude exacerbates existing dilemmas between planners' expertise and mandated public participation requiring the public's input (Yang & Callahan, 2005). In such, Zanetti suspects that the rational planning model, which has for a long time portrayed the planner as the technocrat and value-devoid expert, has contributed to the current attitudes of planners in discarding local knowledge (1998).

Yet, Burby (2003) suggests that practitioners' communication style can encourage or hinder participation. In fact, Carp (2004) has interviewed public art planners and has discovered that planners' attitudes and personal style significantly shape public participation outcomes. In fact, when meetings are too formal, the public is likely to not attend or when they do, they do not

voice their opinions (Hou & Kinoshita, 2007; Innes, Connick, & Booher, 2007). For some attendees, they might not understand the steps, mistrust participation methods (Newing et al., 2008), or feel intimidated by the formal communication style used during public meetings (Hibbard & Lurie, 2000). In a natural hazard mitigation case study for instance, citizens felt intimidated by the formality of the process and have reported feeling not capable of providing input on technical issues such as engineering and building codes (Godschalk, 2003).

The literature suggests that cultural barriers between planners and planning subjects may deter participation (Carp, 2004; Clifford, 2013). While the current context of participation requires the inclusion of minorities' opinions in plans, it does not provide sufficient guidelines on planning in a culturally diverse environment (Milroy & Wallace, 2002; Qadeer & Agrawal, 2011). There is a “growing recognition on the part of administrators that decision-making without public participation is ineffective” (King et al., 1998, p.319). Therefore, government entities have taken proactive and inclusive measures to increase civic engagement in their decision-making (Young, 2001). The next section reviews the proposed solutions to change the status quo of public participation.

Proposed Solutions

King, Feltey, & Susel, (1998) suggest that accessibility is key to achieving representation. Research shows that barriers to participation include transportation, time constraints, family and childcare, lack of financial resources, and the realities of everyday life (Halvorsen & Jarvie, 2000; Rowe & Frewer, 2000). Halvorsen (2003) and Rydin and Pennington (2000) stress the importance of holding meetings at strategic hours—in the evening, rather than in the middle of the day—in accessible locations, such as schools or churches, and reducing meeting times in order to increase attendance. Baker and others (2005) reinforce the need for accessibility by

recommending officials select venues accessible by public transportation. Furthermore, King, Feltey, & Susel (1998) suggest that the provision of free, on-site childcare and food are vital in creating opportunities of participation.

The literature on public participation asserts that when individuals do not think that they have the proper skill sets to communicate effectively, they refrain from participating (Halvorsen & Jarvie, 2002). Therefore, Hou and Kinoshita (2007) propose using informal means of communication to engage citizens. Halvorsen and Jarvie (2002) expand on this notion and suggest that planners always frame the issue in a language that participants can understand. Furthermore, scholars such as Halvorsen and Jarvie, (2002) and Godschalk and others (2003), suggest that connecting issues at stake with elements of quality of life can help citizens to relate and understand concepts.

Hibbard and Lurie (2000) advise using a skilled facilitator to communicate to the audience in a simple language and receive their points of view. Federal mandates also require public agencies to expand participation opportunities to non-English speakers through translation and meaningful activities in their native language.

Studies confirm that informal activities improve relationships between planners and members of the public (Hou & Kinoshita, 2007; Innes et al., 2000) and lend opportunities to bypass socio-cultural and political barriers. Indeed, studies on public participation link the lack of citizen participation to a lack of trust in government (Walters et al, 2000; Halvorsen, 2003). Halvorsen and Jarvie (2002) suggest that highlighting successful participation outcomes in the local media has the potential to rekindle the flame of participation among citizens.

Additionally, Shipley and Utz (2012) promote education as a way to breach the gap between citizens and experts by establishing a common knowledge base. King, Feltey, & Susel

(1998) propose to educate citizens in the areas of research and organization, in learning centers, to encourage people to be involved and make a difference in their local communities. Scholars point out that planners often come unprepared and unable to select the right mechanisms of participation (Shiple & Utz, 2012; Michaels, Mason, & Solecki, 2001). Therefore, scholars suggest educating and training planners in the area of public participation (Utz & Shiple, 2012), communication and interpersonal skills, team building, facilitation and listening, small areas workshop, and contextualization of participation (King, Feltey, & Susel, 1998; Brody et al., 2003).

The academic community has yet to develop teaching approaches to prepare future planners for public participation. A brief survey on planning programs in the United States and Canada has revealed that more than half schools do not offer meaningful courses on public engagement (Shiple & Utz, 2012). In professional circles, however, the International Association for Participation in Planning (IAP2) provides courses and training sessions to practitioners on how to conduct effective public participation (Shiple & Utz, 2012)

Novel Approaches

Public participation methods are not a one size-fits-all formula and must be adapted contextually for the purpose of participation and the nature of the issue considered (Bherer & Breux, 2012; Walters, Aydelotte, & Miller, 2000). In some cases “full citizen control can work, while in other situations consultation is more preferable” (Fung, 2006, p.66). Forester (2006) warns us of the difficulty to practice such an easy-to-preach participation message and appeals to planners’ sense of creativity to find more ways to involve the public. As a result, more theorists and practitioners are leaning toward collaborative approaches of decision-making with the public, although this remains an exception rather than the rule (Innes & Booher, 2004, p.422).

The following section briefly discusses some of the techniques supplementing the conventional methods of participation.

Citizens' Juries

Citizens' juries represent a community's profile, through random or stratified selection, rather than selecting volunteers (EPA, 2017; Utz & Shipley, 2012; Young, 2001). It mirrors the jury system in law and places decision making into the hands of citizens (Utz & Shipley, 2012). The "jury" chooses the most attractive solution for the community and presents recommendations in a form of a report to the given agency (Environmental Protection Agency, 2017). Practitioners and scholars support this method for its notable successes and for genuinely delegating power to citizens (Keyon, 2005).

Focus Groups and Facilitated Discussions

Facilitation consists of guiding a group in a problem-solving process discussion managed by a facilitator, where participants discuss all points of view, select the best policy options, and incorporate them into a recommendation for the government (Leighninger, 2013). Professionals support this method of participation because it leads to empowerment and consensus building (Leighninger, 2013).

Focus groups are small group discussions led by a professional facilitator (EPA, 2018). Focus groups are a tool used to explore public opinion when little or no information is available on a given issue (US Department of Transportation, 2018). This method explores attitudes in depth to redirect policies or resources allocations (US DOT, 2018). Focus groups also incite planners to reconsider issues they may have omitted in the process of using quantitative methods (Vogt et al., 2004; Waterton & Wynne, 1999). A typical focus group session is composed of 4 to 12 selected participants, generally lasts from 2 to 4 hours, and takes places at a neutral and

comfortable location to facilitate the flow of ideas and opinions (Simon 1999; Shipley & Utz, 2012). Hollander (2004) cautions about the exclusive use of focus groups because participants' pressure may limit the objectivity of the debate, depending on the sensitivity of the issue at stake.

Visualization Techniques

Planning professionals use visualization to convey information to the public in an easily understandable format. Formats include maps, graphs, pie charts, pictures, displays, photo composites and simulations, artists' drawings, 3D illustrations, maps, and interactive maps (U.S. DOT, 2018). Planners also use interactive maps in coordination with copies of images, text, audio, or graphic annotations to convey information to stakeholders (U.S. DOT, 2018).

Visualization also enables the public to have a better understanding of the project and its impacts because residents explore "what if" scenarios and possible changes (U.S. DOT, 1998). Before and after photographs, for example, show different scenarios and present the project from multiple perspectives. Simulation models also use the community's input to generate comments and recommendations on plans or residential codes because residents view simulations and understand how changes could affect their future. Visioning exercises provide a platform for mutual understanding between planners and the public (de Groot, Winnubst, Van Schie, & Ast, 2014) and engage citizens in the creation of community plans (Shipley & Utz, 2012).

Several planners brand visioning as a tool to reach a more collaborative planning (Graffikin & Sterrett, 2006; McCann, 2001). Participants reach consensus by creating future images of their community and using these images to guide the creation of a shared plan (Moore, Longo, & Palmer, 1999; Shipley, 2002; Morrison, 2003). Through visioning, the public feels more confident in knowing that they play a significant role in the future of their community (Graffikin & Sterrett, 2006). Visualization can reach a wider audience, hence the diversity of

participants allows officials to consider and include values that could have easily been overlooked if the planning process only included experts (de Groot, Winnubst, van Schie, & Ast, 2014; Shipley 2002).

However, visualization techniques have some drawbacks. Visualization can be costly and time consuming because of the level of skills required to appropriately convey the information to the public. Furthermore, visualization can confuse the public and lead to false expectations if the visuals are too complex or too technical. Therefore, agencies and professionals need to ensure that the renderings are realistic and true. Furthermore, because visualization efforts are usually led by agencies and professionals deciding the information, the content, the level of detail, and the simplicity of the renderings, visualization techniques could be considered biased toward one alternative, forcing the public to pick a pre-determined choice. If the public perceives this technique as being deceptive, it can limit participation.

Tony's Nelessen's Visual Preference Survey

The Visual Preferences Survey (VPS) is a visualization technique developed by Anton (Tony) Nelessen in the 1970s. The VPS is a technique used by planners where citizens react to a set of images, rather than words. It typically asks participants to view a series of images then score them based on their preference. It contains scenarios that provide the community with a wide range of options and allows participants to express their opinions and reach consensus. Planners show images of urban elements such as streets, houses, architecture, storefronts, and ask residents to give a score to each slide and then averaging the responses. The residents then review the images and explain their reason for giving the image the score. The images with the highest scores, negative or positive, determine the community's preference. The VPS enables the public to define its preference for the urban design elements of their community, including

architecture style, parking size areas, signs or building setbacks, transportation analysis, and large-scale planning regional efforts. To be most effective, images in the VPS must be viewed from the same angle. Therefore, putting together a VPS is time consuming because someone must drive around to take the pictures from the same angle to provide comparable images.

Collaboration and Consensus Building

Consensus building is a means of deliberation allowing for debate among people representing different stakes in the problem (Shiple & Utz, 2012). Innes (1998) posits that, when properly designed, consensus building takes into account the needs of others and produces decisions that benefit the public interest. In theory, consensus makes participants reach the best alternative (Utz & Shiple, 2012). Furthermore, contrary to the traditional methods that are more confrontational, this method deflects conflicts, because the consensus building tools help people realize that “success is possible even when people disagree” (Halvorsen, 2003; p.537). It permits interactive conversation (Utz & Shiple, 2012) and fosters mutual learning among participants, (Halvorsen, 2003; McCool & Guthrie, 2001). Consensus building requires a diversity of interests to allow officials to estimate the preference of the public at large. It also requires participants to be committed over the duration of the process, a process which cannot be rushed (EPA, 1998).

Crowdsourcing and Computer Approaches

Technology and Internet-based tools offer citizens new possibilities of participation in the planning process (Hanzl, 2007). There is an overall recognition that computer-based methods of participation facilitate public participation (Utz & Shiple, 2012), offer citizens new possibilities of participation (Hanzl, 2007), and enable planners to assess the collective interests in ways that face-to-face meetings cannot (Brabham, 2009). Conroy and Gordon’s (2004) study of a technology-based approach in public meetings within an environmental policy setting has

revealed that the use of technology enhances participation experience in terms of learning and satisfaction for participants and officials.

Practitioners also take advantage of the accessibility of web-based computer applications to create participation techniques (Shipley & Utz, 2012). Crowdsourcing is “a mechanism for leveraging the collective intelligence of online users toward a productive end” (Brabham, 2009, p. 250). Studies have suggested that online methods of participation, such as crowdsourcing, are likely to engage the public and improve knowledge among citizens (Evans-Cowley & Hollander, 2010). Advocates of crowdsourcing posit that it draws a more diverse crowd and enables those who cannot usually participate to do so as freely and openly as they wish because the Internet is anonymous and devoid of the body language, face-to-face interactions, and interpersonal dynamics that usually encourage people to participate (Brabham, Sanchez, & Bartholomew, 2009).

However, Seltzer & Mahamoudi (2012) assert that the social aspect of plan constructions requires a face-to-face interaction, rather than the unspecified Internet interaction. Therefore, crowdsourcing does not offer citizens the ability to identify the different stakeholders. Planners should consider crowdsourcing methods as “complements to, rather than replacements for, more traditional citizen involvement activities” (Seltzer & Mahamoudi, 2012, p.14).

The current literature suggests that Internet participation has a positive effect on public participation (Weber, Loumakis, & Bergman, 2003). Moreover, Wang and Van Mart (2007) have conducted a study on public participation and have discovered that an increasing number of cities are using the Internet to reach out to the public. Yet, Peng (2001) asserts that while the Internet can encourage local participation, it does not necessarily guarantee it. Furthermore, the use of the Internet is only profitable in some contexts (Evans-Cowley, 2010). A study on

communication between citizens and the State of Georgia officials revealed that despite the availability of Internet tools to facilitate the communication with the local government, the number of people who have used the Internet was lower than that of those who have not (Thomas & Streib, 2003). Such results might be explained by the fact that members of the community may not have access to technological resources because they lack the financial resources and skills that allow them to contact the government through such means (Chadwick & May, 2003; Zhong-Ren, 2001).

Geographic Information System (GIS) is a computer-based technique used by planning professionals to facilitate participation. Participatory Geographic Information System (PPGIS) “pertains to the use of geographic information systems (GIS) to broaden public involvement in policymaking” (Sieber, 2006, p.491). GIS can “integrate spatial and attribute data, conduct analysis, construct scenarios, and disseminate results” (Zhong-Ren, 2001, p.889). GIS is a significant tool for planning analysis (Zhong-Ren, 2001) because it enables officials to collect information on citizens’ perceptions and preferences (Talen, 1999). Planners and community members utilize GIS to produce spatial decision-making tools and coordinate priorities for a plan of action. Zhong-Ren (2001) points out that some of the citizens do not have enough knowledge to read maps or understand intricate spatial models, therefore Innes (2005) warns practitioners about the use of technology in the participation process because computer-illiterate citizens have, in the past, accused planners of using technological tools to manipulate them.

This section has presented a review of the literature concerning public participation. Public participation allows officials to know the community’s preference in order to improve local decisions, facilitate the implementation of policies, advance the ideals of justice, improve the overall well-being of society, and fulfil legal mandates. However, there are issues with the

current practice because opportunities to participate are not equal, given that the avenues of participation favor the wealthy and educated to the detriment of socio-economic and cultural minorities who lack the necessary resources to participate. Additionally, the traditional approaches of public participation are not conducive to meaningful public participation. In order to palliate the issues of public participation, scholars and practitioners resort to non-traditional approaches which are mostly based on communication. Yet, increasing immigration raises issues for planners who constantly communicate with socio-cultural minorities in their daily practices. However, when communication clues are misinterpreted, even authentic efforts towards participation can fail. Planning scholars encourage cultural competency by exhorting planners to be sensitive to the needs of socio-cultural minorities. Despite the proposed solutions for engagement techniques, the planning literature lacks a benchmark tool to objectively assess the sensitivity of planners across time and space. Without this starting point, it is impossible to evaluate sensitivity in planning and determine viable policy recommendations. In order to fill this gap, this research suggests the use of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) as a validated evaluation tool to evaluate cultural sensitivity in urban planning. The following section presents the methodology of the paper and discusses the ISS.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The goal of this research was to measure the levels intercultural sensitivity of planners in the DFW region as well as determine whether variables such as age, gender, race, education levels, field of practice, years of experience, third culture status, and multilingualism influence the intercultural sensitivity of planners. The following section presents the theoretical framework, the research design, the research instrument, the hypotheses, the data collection process and the data analysis.

Theoretical Framework

Participatory Planning

Participatory planning is a planning model rooted in the theory of communicative action. Communicative action encourages an open dialogue to solving conflicts, building consensus, and improving public participation (Healey, 1996, 2003; Innes, 1996). This approach employs non-traditional planning techniques that rely on professional and local knowledge to not only foster dialogue but to engage community members during the entire participation process (Nasca, Changfoot, & Hills, 2018).

Participatory planning has several virtues (Forester, 2000; Miraftab, 2003) such as efficiency, effectiveness, and empowerment (Miraftab, 2003). In fact, when community members are solicited on a project for either efficiency or effectiveness, immediate community concerns are solved, but participation is unlikely to continue after the duration of the project. Critics assert that participation is only in token because community members do not have a real influence on the participation process and that planners engage citizens on a set of predefined alternatives (Miraftab, 2003).

On the other hand, when the community shifts from passive recipients of outcomes to active agents of change by initiating projects, it builds and reinforces participants' sense of empowerment because it enables them to mobilize their own resources in order to foster change (Miraftab, 2003).

However, successful participation is not a one-size-fits-all recipe; it is rather contextual because "[it] depends on the condition within which the collaboration is established" (Miraftab, 2003, p. 229). According to Miraftab (2003), institutions and structures often create roadblocks to participatory planning, and programs offered do not always lead to citizen's empowerment nor do they trigger any socio-economic change in the community because these participatory planning approaches do not address the complexity of power dynamics; hence, community efforts often replicate injustices of traditional involvement approaches. Therefore, to achieve successful collaboration, there remains a need to achieve synergistic relations between community members and external agents (the government, the public sector, and the private sector) and the way these partnerships are achieved is very important.

In fact, when engagement programs are designed with external agents only, without involving local citizens, the likelihood of success is low because citizens do not have a sense of ownership (Poptachuck, 1996). On the other hand, when initiatives emanate at the grassroots level but lack external support, the potential to form and establish a partnership between citizens and external actors is limited because citizens lack access to legal, administrative, and financial assistance because the government or the private sector are those who generally provide such resources. Yet, when the government sponsors participation activities, it strips local citizens of empowerment because the government takes the charge to lead the conversation, selects who

participates, determines relevant information, and sets the rules for how citizens intervene and participate.

Multiculturalism and Planning

Multiculturalism is a principle that recognizes “ethno-cultural identities, accommodates differences, and seeks integration through a common ground (Kymika, 2007). Planners work with residents and elected officials to guide the layout of the community. Successful planning is one that is inclusive and reflective of the comprehensive values of the entire community (American Planning Association, 2019). However, immigration has brought people with different cultures and languages, and the challenge of planners rests in designing and facilitating programs to accommodate these cultural differences (Umemoto, 2001).

Since planners have the power to decide the communication and language tools to employ during participation, they must be sensitive to other cultures by acknowledging the differences in engagement techniques (Burayidi, 2003; Sandercock, 2003). Instead of choosing highly technical and complex tools that obtrude participation (Nasca et al., 2018) the communication channels should be akin to what citizens use every day (Wilson, 2001; Listerborn, 2008). Consequently, planners should be flexible in their practice and find ways to improvise during the planning process in order to create opportunities for collaboration, to facilitate collaborative inquiry by asking questions and building trust (Forester, 2000) and to allow different groups to provide their input (Umemoto, 2001).

Therefore, Forester suggests the creation of “safe spaces” in which various actors or stakeholders engage without any threat of violence or abuse (2000); these are platforms where individual freely share and discuss ideas. The successes or failures rest on planners’ abilities to judiciously selecting stakeholders to discuss their interests and commitments as well as that of

others. Planners can find interested parties on a project (community members or external agents) and involve them from the beginning through a series of open-dialogues to foster synergy. The creation of safe spaces fosters an atmosphere of collaboration as opposed to the traditional public hearings which usually antagonizes parties.

Furthermore, the pedagogy of storytelling also creates additional opportunities for empowerment and facilitates planning in multicultural settings (Forester, 1999; Sandercock, 2000). Storytelling teaches important lessons about negotiation and conflict resolution. Storytelling also fosters progress because it allows involved parties to consider the issues at stake under different angles and to explore new practical options. Telling detailed stories yields practical results. Therefore, Forester (1999) stresses that the stories people tell are relevant to the planning process for planners as well as community members. Hence, planners must actively listen without presuming that cultural differences are unsurmountable (Forester, 1999). Thus, for planning to adopt participation approaches adapted to multiculturalism, planners must have the skills to communicate effectively across cultures. This ability is the “intercultural communication competence” (ICC) (Chen & Starosta, 1996).

Intercultural Communication Competence

ICC is the nexus of planning, participation, and multiculturalism. ICC is the “ability to negotiate cultural meanings and to appropriately execute effective communication behaviors that recognize each other’s multiple identities in a specific environment” (Chen & Starosta, 1996, pp-358-9). It refers to “an individual’s ability to achieve their communication goal while effectively and appropriately utilizing behaviors to negotiate between the different identities present within a culturally diverse environment” (Portalla & Chen, 2010, p.21).

Intercultural Communication Competence and Intercultural Sensitivity

The concept of intercultural communication competence includes elements necessary to foster communication and create and nurture meaningful interactions between planners and citizens. The “Intercultural Communication Competence is an umbrella concept which is comprised of cognitive, affective, and behavioral ability of interactants in the process of intercultural communication” (Chen & Starosta, 2000, p.3). Intercultural sensitivity, which is the affective component of intercultural communication (Chen & Starosta, 2000) is one of the central tenets of this paper.

Prior studies have addressed the concept of intercultural sensitivity. According to Bhawuk and Brislin (1992), intercultural sensitivity requires an interest in other cultures, a sensitivity to notice cultural difference, and a willingness to modify one’s behavior to indicate respect for individuals of other cultures. Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) have designed the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory Scale (ICIS) to measure intercultural sensitivity by examining individuals’ responses to items reflecting individualist-collectivist orientations. Yet, when evaluated by Kapoor and Comadena (1996) the ICIS has been found unreliable due to ambiguity in tone and direction.

Furthermore, Hammer, Bennet, and Wiseman (2003) define intercultural sensitivity as one’s “ability to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences” (p.422). According to Bennett (1986, 1993), intercultural sensitivity is the communicators’ abilities to transform themselves affectively, cognitively, and behaviorally from the ethnocentric stages to reach the ethno-relative stages in the development process of intercultural communication. Bennett (1993) created the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) to serve as framework to explain how individuals experience and engage in cultural differences within the field of cross-

cultural adjustment and adaptation (Tamam & Krauss, 2017). The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is a tool that measures worldview orientations toward the cultural differences as identified by the DMIS (Hammer, 2008). It is a valid and reliable measure of intercultural competence cross-culturally (Hammer, 2008).

However, Chen and Starosta (2000) denounce the conceptual ambiguity in the previous studies due to the lack of clarification of the concept of communication competence and its related constructs (Fritz, Mollenberg, & Chen, 2001). They assert that this confusion leads to difficulties in the evaluation measurement of ICC. Therefore, Chen and Starosta (1996) have suggested another model of intercultural communication competence that integrates three dimensions: intercultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity, and intercultural adroitness. Each of these three dimensions contains a set of defined components. Intercultural awareness refers to the cognitive dimension of intercultural communication competence as an individual's capacity to recognize similarities and differences from other cultures (Fritz et al., 2001). Intercultural adroitness is the behavioral dimension of intercultural communication competence. It is someone's ability to attain communication goals (Fritz et al., 2001). Intercultural sensitivity is the affective dimension of intercultural communication (Chen & Starosta, 2000), it is the "active desire to motivate themselves to understand, appreciate and accept cultural differences among cultures (Chen & Starosta, 1998, p.231).

Chen and Starosta's (2000) Intercultural Sensitivity Model

Chen and Starosta (2000) assert that intercultural sensitivity should be the prerequisite for an effective intercultural communication competence and should be restricted to its affective elements in order to be most valid. Therefore, when discussing the need for a more precise understanding of intercultural sensitivity, Chen and Starosta (2000) acknowledge that cultural

sensitivity should mainly deal with its affective aspect (Petrovic, Starcevic, Chen, & Komnenic, 2015) and be kept separate from intercultural awareness and intercultural adroitness (Chen & Starosta, 1997).

Intercultural sensitivity is “a mindset that helps individuals distinguish how their counterparts differ in behavior, perceptions, or feelings in the process of intercultural communication” (Chen & Starosta, 2000, p.4). It a person’s “ability to develop a positive motion towards understanding and appreciating cultural differences that promotes appropriate and effective behavior in intercultural communication” (Chen & Starosta, 1997, p.5). It is also “an attitude that reflects the degree of willingness to interact with people from different cultures” (Ruiz-Bernado, Sanchiz-Ruiz, & Gil-Gomez, 2014, p. 318). It focuses on emotions or change in feelings, resulting from settings and environments different from those of one’s own culture (Ruiz-Bernado et al., 2014).

The Chen and Starosta Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS)

The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale is an instrument to study the concept of intercultural sensitivity (Fritz et al., 2001). In a preliminary study, Chen and Starosta (2000) have developed 73 items that represent the indicator of the six components of intercultural sensitivity. The six constructs or elements are self-esteem, self-monitoring, open-mindedness, empathy, interaction involvement, and non-judgement (Chen & Starosta, 2000, p. 4).

- Self-esteem is a measure of how one sees oneself. People with high self-esteem are more likely to deal with issues such as frustration, alienation, and stress provoked by the confusion arising in intercultural communication.
- Self-monitoring is the capacity to identify ambiguous situations and to adapt one’s social behavior in order to communicate effectively.

- Open mindedness refers to people who are open-minded and who not only express themselves but are also open and accepting of countering opinions.
- Empathy is one's ability to see things from the perspective of their cultural counterpart. Empathy is an important component of intercultural sensitivity because an emphatic person is more prone to actively listen, show affection, and understand others during intercultural communication.
- Interaction involvement refers to people's ability to maintain an appropriate conversation procedure during intercultural communication.
- Non-judgment is the quality of someone who sincerely listens to his or her counterparts rather than judging them and hastening to conclusions.

The authors used a five-point Likert scale to respond to each of the items: 5= strongly agree, 4= agree, 3= uncertain, 2= disagree, and 1= strongly disagree. In the pre-study, the researchers administered the instrument to a sample of 168 American students. Although the questionnaire was made of 73 items, the purpose was to reduce the number of the items. After a preliminary analysis, the researchers selected 44 out of the 73 items.

After the preliminary study, the researchers administered the first (actual) study to 414 college students enrolled in basic communication courses. The population was 63% female and 37% male, and the average age of participants was 20.65. The scale consisted of 44 items for the purpose of scale construction. The purpose of the first study was to determine the factor structure of the 44-item version of the scale.

The five factors used here are interaction engagement, respect of cultural differences, interaction confidence, interaction enjoyment, and interaction attentiveness. *Interaction engagement* concerns the participants' feelings of participation in intercultural communication.

Respect for cultural differences concerns how participants orient to or tolerate their counterpart's culture and opinion. *Interaction confidence* deals with the confidence of participants in intercultural settings. *Interaction enjoyment* concerns the participant's reaction to communication with people from other cultures, whether these reactions are positive or negative. *Interaction attentiveness* refers to the efforts that participants make at understanding what is going on.

The second study evaluated the validity of the five-dimensional scale with other associated measures. The researchers administered the survey to 166 students. The higher scores suggest a higher cultural sensitivity. The reliability coefficient yielded .86. In addition to completing the 24-item version of the scale, participants took other scales: the seven-item Interaction Attentiveness Scale by Cegala (1981), the 10-item Rewarding Scale (Wheless & Duran, 1982); a 10-item Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), and a 13-item Self-Monitoring Scale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). Respondents also filled out a 14-item Perspective Taking Scale (Davis, 1996), a revised 13-item Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman, 1978), and a 22-item Intercultural Communication Attitude Scale (Chen, 1993). The authors chose these measures because of their likely relationship with the concept of intercultural sensitivity. The correlation between the ISS and its related instruments validated the study. In fact, the results indicated that people that are intercultural sensitive are more likely to have a high self-esteem, be more attentive and emphatic, and be people who can self-monitor themselves during the process of intercultural communication (Chen & Starosta, 2000).

Overall, the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale showed strong reliability and validity (Dong, Day, & Collaco, 2008; Peng, 2001). At the time of the scale's production, the potential limitation was that more studies were needed to explore the structural validity of ISS in a non-American sample. The scale was later validated for use on a German population (Fritz et al., 2001).

However, critics assert that the scale “is not a generic model that is culture free” (Tamam, 2010, p. 181) and claim that it has implicitly been designed to fit a western population.

Research Design

This study uses a mixed-methods approach in order to investigate planners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity and associated variables, in the DFW region. As the name implies, a mixed method approach includes both quantitative and qualitative methodologies (Creswell, 2003). According to McKay (2009), mixed methods account for the fact that human behavior is complex and cannot be explained using a single method. This methodology reinforces the research with detailed explanation of research questions which could not have been possible with a sole reliance on one type of method (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). Furthermore, a mixed-methods approach improves the data’s accuracy because it compensates for the strengths and weaknesses of its sister research approach (McKay, 2009). Therefore, the research produced by mixed methods begets a superior product (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). A mixed methods design was used in this study in order to broaden the understanding of the topic of intercultural sensitivity within the planning field by building the qualitative approach on the results of the quantitative one (Creswell, 2003).

There were two phases in this research, Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase 1 consisted of quantitatively assessing planners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity and determining the relationship between demographic characteristics and the ISS level. According to Babbie (2007), a quantitative approach is “the numerical representation and manipulation of observations for the purpose of describing and explaining the phenomena of that those observations reflect” (p. 405). According to Terenzini and Upcraft (1996), “quantitative studies give us a very firm foundation for describing and analyzing what ‘is’ and offer some insights into ‘why’ it is the way is” (p.85).

Moreover, the aim of this research is to determine the correlation between the demographic variables and the intercultural sensitivity of planners; therefore, quantitative methods are appropriate when the purpose of the study is to assess variables affecting an outcome (Creswell, 2003).

Phase 2 focused on qualitative interviews of planners to confirm the quantitative assessment results and to gain insights and possible explanations about the findings. The main purpose of the second phase was to gather additional data to confirm or refute the quantitative data. Furthermore, this phase helps the researcher gain insights into the “why” of the results of participants’ intercultural sensitivity scores and their possible relationships to the demographic variables that may allow deeper insights into the experiences and perceptions of planners. Interviews can help measure attitudes and gain in-depth information about the research topic (Johnson & Christensen, 2007). Furthermore, according to McKay (2013), “interview approaches provide information about participants’ internal meanings and ways of thinking – these insights generally are not possible to gain through quantitative questionnaires” (p.94). Furthermore, in-person interviews help identify concerns that could have been overlooked by the research (Halvorsen & Jarvie, 2003). This research study used semi-structured, face-to-face interviews in lieu of structured interviews. This was to prevent the interviewer from biasing the question so that the interviewer could clarify a question if asked (Jaques & Povey, 2007) and give the respondent the opportunity to further clarify and explore in detail their expressed views (Cassell et al., 2001; Jain et al., 2008).

Participants were selected based on the results of the quantitative phase. I interviewed them based on their ISS score. All the prospective interviewees were emailed. Interested

candidates contacted me back and expressed their willingness to be part of the study.

Respondents were interviewed based on a script of four main questions.

- 1- Do these results align with your own observations?
- 2- How do you explain the results, in light of public participation?
- 3- What do you think the implications of the findings are?
- 4- What recommendations would you provide?

The entire interview script is, with probing questions, is presented in Appendix 7.

The interviews were conducted at each respondent's place of work. One interview was conducted in a food court according to each interviewee's preference. The interviews lasted 1 to 2 hours, there was no time limit set to allow the conversation to continue and participants to express their views until the topic was exhausted. At the beginning of the interview, the purpose of the study was reiterated. A digital recorder was prepared to record responses along with a notepad to allow the researcher to take notes.

However, some limitations to the interview method is that participants may choose to provide socially desirable answers to stay conventional (Alshenqeeti, 2014); "what people say in an interview will indeed be shaped, to some degree, by the questions they are asked. The conventions about what can be spoken about;...[...]...by what time they think the interviewer wants; by what they believe he/she would approve or disapprove of" (Hammersley & Gomm , 2008 p. 100). When using the qualitative approach, researchers must be cognizant that they can influence the data through their choice of words and expression; therefore, they should make efforts to minimize influence on participants (McKay, 2009).

Rationale for Using Chen and Starosta Intercultural Sensitivity Scale

This research study used Chen and Starosta's (2000) 24-item Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS). It is a valid and reliable quantitative tool for assessing intercultural sensitivity (Fritz et al., 2001). The ISS responses were entered in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software to measure the different scores and analyze the relationship between variables. SPSS is a software package used for statistical analysis. Therefore, the ISS fits the quantitative research methodology because quantitative research "employs strategies of inquiry such as experiments and surveys and collects data on predetermined instruments that yield statistical data" (Creswell, 2003, p. 18).

Although Bennett's (1986) IDI is a reliable measure of intercultural sensitivity, the instrument was not used in this research because of its proprietary character. In fact, permission to administer the survey is only given to trained individuals from the Intercultural Communication Institute. There is also a fee to hire a trained consultant to administer the IDI (Wabash College, nd). Furthermore, the IDI measures intercultural sensitivity in stages (Hammer, 2008) while the ISS measures intercultural sensitivity in general. Since the purpose of this research was not to measure the stages of intercultural sensitivity, but to measure intercultural sensitivity in general, the ISS was the most appropriate tool. Furthermore, the ISS did not require any special training, was available on the Internet, and was free of charge.

Context for the Study

This study took place in the DFW metropolitan area. DFW is the fourth largest Metropolitan region of the U.S. as well as the fastest growing one, with about 7.3 million residents (NTCCOG, 2017). The influx of immigration greatly contributes to Dallas's diverse

racial and ethnic makeup, mostly composed of Hispanics (40%) and Blacks (23%) (United States Census Bureau, 2018); thereby representing more than half of the total population.

Regardless of its unprecedented growth, the region faces some socio-economic challenges including concentrated poverty, inefficient public transportation, and a growing number of residents with limited English proficiency (NTCOG, 2019). DFW residents face unprecedented levels of poverty as 22% of the population lives below the federal poverty level (United States Census Bureau, 2018). In 13 years, the percentage of people living below the federal poverty level increased from 11% in 2000 to 15% in 2013 (NTCOG, 2019). Furthermore, the DFW area is the fourth of fifteen metropolitan regions with the highest number of unaffordable housing in terms of transportation costs (City of Dallas, 2017). While residents spend more than 50% of their income on transportation (NTCOG, 2017), less than 20% of jobs in the region are accessible by transit in under 90 minutes (Dallas City Hall, 2016).

Population and Sample Characteristics

The population for this research is made of planners from the DFW area, more specifically, those working at the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG), the DART agency, and the 13 cities serviced by the DART network. The study also includes planners from the Trinity Rail Express, the commuter rail service between Fort Worth and Dallas known as the T. I chose these institutions because they constitute the main players in public transportation in the DFW metroplex, and they make major decisions related to public transportation policies. The sample for this study included participants from different races, ages, genders, education levels, field of practice, years of experience, third culture status, and multilingualism. The participants for this research were expected to be N=100. The number was limited by the availability of participants, time, and funding constraints. This was a purposive

sample because this research sought to know the intercultural sensitivity level of planners in the DFW area.

The survey had 102 responses. According to the results, most respondents are young and belong to the generation described as Generation Y or millennials. Millennials constitute 51% of respondents. Millennials include people born between 1996 and 1981 (Pew Research Center, 2019), but the “generational cut off points are not an exact science” (Pew Research Center, 2019), therefore, for the purpose of this study, I extended the millennials to also include people born in 1979.

The second group, described as Generation X, comprises 33% of respondents and includes individuals within the age range of 41 to 55 years old. The remaining percentage of the respondents, 17%, are Baby Boomers, individuals 55 years or older. Their smaller number indicates that they are exiting the labor force. There was no respondent that was 20 years or younger.

There was an equivalent proportion of males and females who responded to the survey. While the percentage of males and females is almost the same, males are still the predominant gender within the planning profession. This result also aligns with the national trend which indicates that 57% of planners are males (American Planning Association, 2019).

Moreover, the questionnaire revealed that 77% of the participants are White, which made them the most common race in the sample. Non-Whites constituted 25% of the sample population. These results corroborate the national trend, according to which Whites represent the predominant race among American planners (American Planning Association, 2019).

Fifteen percent of respondents indicated that they grew up in a country other than that of their parents, and the other 85% indicated not having grown up in a country other than that of

their parents. Likewise, of the respondents surveyed, 72% of respondents do not speak another language, while the remaining 28% does.

Of the 102 people surveyed, 65% of respondents have a master's degree. In fact, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2019), the typical entry-level education, that is the typical level of education that most workers need to enter the occupation of urban and regional planners, is a master's degree. Additionally, 30% of respondents hold only a bachelor's degree, 4% hold a doctorate degree, and 3% have another degree that has not been specified in the questionnaire. These results show that most urban planners are highly educated individuals with specific field knowledge and professional expertise. Of the degrees that were not specified, one respondent mentioned having a high school degree, and another mentioned having an associate degree and being a state-licensed therapist.

Additionally, 48% of respondents practice in the field of land use, and 38 % practice within the field of community development. Fifteen percent of respondents practice in other areas of planning. However, for this category, respondents indicated one or more specializations. Finally, the average year of experience is 14 years for this sample. Table 1 outlines the results the population sampling and compares some of the demographic and professional categories with the national trend.

Table 1

Sample and Population Characteristics

Categories	Sub-Categories	Sample	National Trend ^a
Age	Age Category	20-40 year-old	42 year-old
Gender	Males	52%	57%
	Females	48%	43%
Race	Whites	75%	79 %
	Non-Whites	25 %	21%
Education Level	Masters' Degree	64%	70%
	Bachelors' Degree	30 %	25 %
	Doctorate Degree	4 %	2 %
	Other	3 %	3 %
Field of Practice	Community Development	38% ^b	58% ^b
	Land use and Other	64% ^b	48% ^b
Years of experience	Average Year of Experience	14%	14 %

^a The American Planning Association

^b Respondents indicated one or more specializations led by land use and community development

Description of Research Instrument

Research Questions

The research questions were designed to assess the levels of intercultural sensitivity of planners and associated variables. This dissertation used the DFW region as a case study to measure the intercultural sensitivity of planners in the region. The research mainly sought to

answer the following question: are planners culturally sensitive? Subsequent questions are as follows:

- What is the level of intercultural sensitivity of planners, as measured by the ISS (Chen & Starosta, 2000) in the DFW region?
- Do planners' levels of intercultural sensitivity vary in relation to the following variables?
 - Age
 - Gender
 - Race
 - Education level
 - Field of practice
 - Years of experience
 - Third culture status
 - Multilingualism
- To what extent do the qualitative results align with the observations and experiences of planners and how do they make sense of the results?

The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS)

The data was collected using Chen and Starosta's (2000) ISS scale. In general, researchers have used this scale to test people's feelings during their communication with people from a different background (Soltani, 2014). This instrument is effective in measuring cultural sensitivity with a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of .86 (Chen & Starosta, 2000).

Moreover, the ISS is a valid research construct, and it has been found to be valid in various studies measuring intercultural sensitivity (Fritz et al., 2001). The scale consists of five factors on which statements are based: interaction engagement (7items), respect for cultural differences

(6 items), interaction confidence (5 items), interaction enjoyment (3 items), and interaction attentiveness (3 items) (see Appendix 1 for a copy of the scale).

The scale consists of 24 items and participants' responses are ranked in terms of levels of agreement or disagreement, using a five-point Likert scale, where 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3=somewhat disagree, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree. The total score is the sum of all item scores. The sum of the responses gives a score ranging from 24 (the lowest) and 120 (the highest); a higher score signifies a higher intercultural sensitivity.

However, since the ISS questionnaire contains positively keyed items as well as negatively keyed statements, items 2, 4, 7, 9, 12, 15, 18, 20, and 22 have been reverse coded before summing the 24 items (Chen and Starosta, 2000). Reverse score items are coded so that negative keyed statements are such that 1= strongly agree, 2= agree, 3= somewhat disagree, 4= disagree and strongly 5= disagree (the positively keyed items keep the same code, in such that 1= strongly disagree ... 5= strongly agree). Transform mode is the SPSS function that performs the reverse coding (1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1). "Reverse-scoring the negatively-keyed items ensures that all of the items—those that are originally negatively keyed and those that are positively keyed—are consistent with each other in terms of what an 'agree' or 'disagree' imply" (Moralles, Preston, Chen, & Berberian, 2016, p. 527).

Research Variables

There are eight socio-demographic variables in this study: age, gender, race, education levels, field of practice, years of experience, third culture status, and multilingualism. The research variables data were collected with a demographic questionnaire (see appendix 2 for the Demographic Questionnaire). Since the intercultural sensitivity scale has not been used in planning, this research used intercultural sensitivity studies in different disciplines like nursing

and education in order to design the various hypotheses. The study incorporates efforts to correlate the various demographic variables to intercultural sensitivity.

Age. Previous research (del Villar, 2010) on students' levels of intercultural sensitivity suggests that age is an influential factor affecting intercultural sensitivity. The respondents agreed that their level of maturity has made them feel more comfortable in the presence of strangers. Hence, the level of intercultural sensitivity increases with age.

Gender. Some research suggest that men and women score differently on intercultural sensitivity. In a study on intercultural competence, women presented higher intercultural sensitivity scores than men (Tompkins, Miller, & Lepeau, 2017). Fabregas, Kelsey, and Robinson (2012) assessed the intercultural sensitivity among agriculture college students and the findings indicated that women have a higher level of intercultural sensitivity than men because women in most cultures women are more likely to be attentive to feelings and nuances as opposed to men (Goleman, 1998).

Race. In a study assessing first year pharmacy students' intercultural sensitivity and other predispositions, there was a significant relationship between cultural sensitivity and race. In this study, Asian students scored a higher intercultural sensitivity compared to Caucasians, while other races did not differ (Ekong, Kavookjian, & Hutchison, 2017). Furthermore, studies suggest that Whites and non-Whites have different levels of intercultural sensitivity (Bonilla, 2009). The literature suggests that interracial interactions are stressful for Caucasians and that Caucasians feel anxious during interracial interactions due to "negative racial attitudes and /or concerns about appearing prejudiced (Trawalter & Richeson, 2008, p.1214)

Education levels. Studies on levels of intercultural sensitivity and education show a correlation between education backgrounds and levels of intercultural sensitivity. In a study on

the intercultural levels of foreign language teachers, senior students showed the highest level of intercultural sensitivity (Yetis & Kurt, 2016). Furthermore, a study by Ruiz et al., (2014) showed that higher levels of education contribute to higher levels of intercultural sensitivity.

Field of practice. The study by Yetis and Kurt (2016) showed that among teachers, there are statistically different rates of intercultural sensitivity among teachers of different languages.

Years of experience. A study among teachers revealed that professional qualifications and years of experience do not affect intercultural sensitivity (Drandic, 2013). However, a research on intercultural sensitivity, using the IDI, showed that participants with longer years of experience scored higher on intercultural sensitivity scores.

Third culture status. Third culture individuals are those who have lived in a country other than that of their nationality during their developmental years (Lyttle, Barker, & Cornwell, 2011). A third culture individual is “a person who has spent a significant part of his or her developmental years outside of their parents’ culture” (Pollock & Van Reken, 2001). Research has shown that people living in a host country demonstrate a higher level of intercultural sensitivity (del Villar, 2010). Furthermore, Christmas and Barker’s (2014) study has found that second generation immigrants are more intercultural sensitive than the first-generation immigrants. To fit this study, the term “third culture” was adjusted to include people who have grown up in a country other than that of their parents.

Multilingualism. Previous studies demonstrated that knowledge of one or more foreign language increases levels of intercultural sensitivity (Uzun & Sevinc, 2015; Ruiz-Bernardo, 2012; Rahimi & Soltani, 2011). Furthermore, a study performed by Banos (2006) on students in Catalonia, using the ISS, revealed that those who only spoke one language had a lower intercultural sensitivity score as opposed to those who did not.

Hypotheses

Determining the research hypothesis is one of the most important steps in quantitative research analysis (Lavrakas, 2008). “A research hypothesis is a specific, clear, and testable proposition or predictive statement about the possible outcome of a scientific research based on a particular property of a population” (Lavrakas, 2008). Based on a review of the literature, there are eight hypotheses for this study:

1. The older the planner, the higher the level of intercultural sensitivity is to be (Del Villar, 2011)
2. Women planners will have a higher level of intercultural sensitivity than men (Tompkins, Miller, & Lepeau, 2017; Fabregas, Kelsey & Robinson; 2012)
3. White planners will have lower levels of intercultural sensitivity than other races (Ekong, Kavookjian, & Hutchison, 2017; Bonilla, 2009)
4. Planners with more education will have a higher level of intercultural sensitivity (Yetis & Kurt, 2016; Ruiz et al., 2014)
5. The intercultural sensitivity levels is to vary according to the field of practice (Yetis & Kurt, 2016).
6. Planners with more years of experience will have higher levels of intercultural sensitivity (Drandic, 2013).
7. Third culture planners will have a higher level of intercultural sensitivity than monoculture planners (del Villar, 2010; Christmas & Barker, 2014)
8. Planners who speak one or more foreign language will have a higher level of intercultural sensitivity (Uzun & Sevinc, 2015; Ruiz-Bernardo, 2012; Rahimi & Soltani, 2011)

Recruitment and Data Collection Process

Planners were selected as potential interviewees through purposive and the snowball sampling technique (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The snowball sampling technique aligns with the methodology of Halvorsen and Jarvie (2003) who have used this approach to assess working women's perception of participation. I also found participants through personal and professional networks in order to have a fairly diverse group in regards to experiences and perspectives.

I contacted the directors of my selected agencies and requested their participation in the research prior to the data collection process. I gave a short overview of the study to participants in the email. After reading and signing the consent form for participation, participants completed the 24-item version of the ISS and the demographic questionnaire during working hours. I collected data using the University of Texas at Arlington (UTA) Qualtrics tool. Qualtrics is a survey development tool useful for in the creation of survey and the analysis of data (The University of Texas at Arlington, nd). Respondents took about 10-15 minutes to fill out all the data forms.

Data Analysis

The socio-demographic data and the ISS items were entered in SPSS for analysis. The study used descriptive statistics to analyze the data. The descriptive statistics measured participants' levels of intercultural sensitivity. Furthermore, a correlation matrix was used to examine the relationship between the eight independent variables. The researcher ran a series of analyses of variances (ANOVA) and T-tests to determine if the dependent variables (ISS scores) differed according to the independent variables: race, age, gender, education levels, field of practice, years of experience, third culture status, and multilingualism (Bayles, 2009).

Furthermore, the researcher performed a regression analysis to predict whether or not the variables race, age, gender, education levels, field of practice, years of experience, third culture status, and multilingualism could predict the levels of intercultural sensitivity.

Percentage distributions, means, t-tests, analysis of variance, and regression analyses were used to analyze the data. Table 2 shows the regression table of measurement. The values $< .05$ and $.10$ were considered statistically significant (Yilmaz, Toksoy, Direk, Bezirgan, & Boylu, 2017). Based on the results of the quantitative phase, the researcher interviewed participants who had scored very high or very low on the dependent variable of interaction attentiveness because studies suggest that interaction attentiveness alone maybe a strong measurement of a person's intercultural sensitivity (Taman, 2010; Coffey, Kamhawi, Fishwick, & Henderson, 2013). Interaction attentiveness represents the participant's efforts to understand what going on in intercultural interaction. People with a high score of interaction attentiveness are likely to be interculturally sensitive during conversation and they can maintain an appropriate conversation with their counterpart (Chen & Starosta, 2000).

Therefore, if planners are not attentive and sensitive during their interaction with the public, they might not be able to capture the subtle meanings expressed either verbally or non-verbally. If planners score low, it means that they do not make enough effort to understand their culturally different counterparts and learn from them during their communication. As Umemoto (2001) has suggested, when planning in multicultural settings, planners have the duty to clarify the meaning of the words so that all participants in the planning process understand the word in the same manner. She reminds us that acknowledging language discrepancy between people of different cultures is an important step toward sensitivity. In fact, "[sensitivity] helps us know what to listen for. It helps us pay attention to innuendo and connotation that can be found in

narrative, tone, or silence. And it helps us to understand the potential sources and the nature of conflicts that result from these differences” (p.24).

Table 2

Regression Level of Measurement

Variables	Level of Measurement
Age	interval / Dichotomous (0= 21-40 Years old, 1= 41 years old and more)
Gender	Nominal/ Dichotomous (0= Female, 1= Male)
Race	Nominal/Dichotomous (0= Non-Whites, 1= Whites)
Education Level	Nominal/ Dichotomous (0= Master’s degree or higher, 1= Bachelor’s degree or lower)
Years of Experience	Continuous/ Mean= 14.45, Standard Deviation=11.10, Range {0.5; 47}
Third Culture	Nominal/Dichotomous (0= No, Yes=1)
Multilingualism	Nominal/Dichotomous (0= No, Yes=1)

Summary

This chapter described the mixed-methods design used in the study. It presented the theoretical framework, the research design (both quantitative and qualitative), and the description of the research instrument. The next section reports the findings.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

This study evaluates the intercultural sensitivity of planners in the DFW area and examines the relationship between the scores and the participants' demographic factors. This chapter reports the findings. The results are the summary of data gathered through the administration of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS), a demographic questionnaire, and interviews to public servants working in the DFW area, especially within the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG).

Three research questions are defined for this study and several hypotheses are identified for each question. The first section presents the results of the inferential statistics which were used to determine the level of intercultural sensitivity of planning professionals as well as the difference (or lack of thereof) in the levels of intercultural sensitivity based on the various independent variables. First the quantitative results for research questions 1 and 2 are presented. This section includes descriptive statistics as well as the results of the statistical tests. The main question of this research is "Are planners culturally sensitive?" The subsequent questions are as follows:

1. What is the level of intercultural sensitivity of planners, as measured by the ISS of planners in the DFW area?
2. Do planners' levels of intercultural sensitivity vary in relation to the following variables: age, gender, race, levels of education, field of practice and years of experience, third culture status, and multilingualism?

The second section presents the results of the interviews and the manners in which planners discuss the outcomes of the previous quantitative results. Themes that emerged from the

interviews in answer to research question 3 are presented to provide further insights into the quantitative findings. The chapter concludes with a summary of findings. The third research question is

3. To what extent do the qualitative results align with the observations and experience of planners and how do they make sense of these results?

Descriptive Statistics of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale Items

We can make better use of the outcomes by analyzing the sample mean and the standard deviation of all the items of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale. The sample mean is the average of all the observed outcomes while the standard deviation measures the dispersion of a set of values. Considering the standard deviation is important because a high standard deviation suggests a wide array of responses pertaining to the question. It means that the questions are either confusing or written in a way that could lead to respondents providing socially acceptable answers. Therefore, it is important to reword the question to solve that issue.

The item with the highest mean is the reverse score item 9, “I get upset easily when interacting with people from different cultures.” Reverse scoring means that the numerical scoring scale runs the opposite direction. In this case, this means that the questions seeks to know if planners do not get easily upset when dealing with people from other cultures. The associated standard deviation ($SD=0.609$) means that the answers to this question are not dispersed, they are more clustered around the mean, since the minimum and maximum score values are 2 and 5 respectively. Moreover, it indicates that most respondents haven given the same answer to the question and that the question is clear and does not need to be reworded.

The item with the lowest mean is item 5, “I always know what to say when interacting with people from different cultures,” which suggests that planners could be intimidated when

interacting with people from different cultures. This item has the highest standard deviation (SD= 0.895), which means that this question has a very wide assortment of answers with relatively more respondents scoring toward one extreme or the other; the minimum score value is 1 and the maximum score is value is 5. By asking some follow up questions, the researcher can find out why information is the way it is. Table 3 outlines the different scores of the items of the scale.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale Items

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
1 I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures	102	2	5	4.44	0.623
2 I think people from other cultures are narrow-minded (Recoded)	102	1	5	4.11	0.855
3 I am pretty sure of myself when interacting with people from different cultures	102	2	5	4.04	0.702
4 I find it hard to talk in front of people from different cultures (Recoded)	102	2	5	4.16	0.741
5 I always know what to say when interacting with people from different cultures	102	1	5	2.97	0.895
6 I can be as sociable as I want to be when interacting with people from different cultures	102	2	5	3.86	0.89
7 I don't like to be with people from different cultures (Recoded)	102	0	5	4.5	0.805
8 I respect the values of people from different cultures	102	1	5	4.48	0.767
9 I get upset easily when interacting with people from different cultures (Recoded)	102	2	5	4.49	0.609
10 I feel confident when interacting with people from different cultures	102	2	5	3.89	0.819
11 I tend to wait before forming an impression when interacting with people from different cultures	102	1	5	3.96	0.795
12 I often feel discouraged when I am with people from different cultures (Recoded)	102	0	5	4.34	0.764
13 I am open -minded to people from different cultures	102	2	5	4.45	0.607
14 I am very observant when interacting with people from different cultures	102	1	5	4.12	0.812
15 I often feel useless when interacting with people from different cultures (Recoded)	102	2	5	4.19	0.714
16 I respect the ways people from different cultures behave	102	1	5	4.14	0.797
17 I try to obtain as much information as I can when interacting with people from different cultures	102	2	5	4.12	0.762
18 I would not accept the opinions of people from different cultures (Recoded)	102	1	5	4.45	0.669
19 I am sensitive to my culturally-distinct counterpart subtle meanings during our interaction	102	2	5	3.68	0.834
20 I think my culture is better than other cultures (Recoded)	102	1	5	4.22	0.991
21 I often give positive responses to my culturally different counterpart during interaction	102	1	5	3.92	0.74
22 I avoid those situations where I have to deal with culturally-distinct persons (Recoded)	102	1	5	4.31	0.744
23 I often show my cultural distinct counterpart my understanding through non-verbal cues	102	1	5	3.9	0.751
24 I have a feeling of enjoyment towards differences between my culturally-distinct counterpart and me	102	1	5	3.97	0.861
Total Score	102	72	120	98.71	9.649

Public Participation Frequency

Planners reported on their involvement in public participation activities, by answering the question, “in the last 30 days, how often have you been involved in public participation activities?”

The results indicated that public participation occupies a considerable amount of time in planners' professional lives, since more than half of planners conduct public participation activities at least one time a week. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Public Participation Frequency

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public Participation Frequency	None	2	2.0	2.0
	1 - 5 times	62	60.8	62.7
	6- 10 times	17	16.7	79.4
	11 times or more	21	20.6	100.0

Research Question 1

The first research question asks about the level of intercultural sensitivity of planners. The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale is the instrument used to assess this sensitivity (Chen & Starosta, 2000). To address the specific question, ISS scores were computed, and the results are presented in Table 2 and Table 4. Table 2 shows that planners have a high mean score of 98.71. Furthermore, 95% of the planners in the sample have an ISS score of 115.85 or less, which also indicates that most planners have high scores of intercultural sensitivity (Table 5).

Table 3 also presents the minimum and the maximum scores, the mean and the standard deviation for the total score. The scores vary from 72 to 120 (M= 98.71, SD=9.649). The average score of 98.71 indicates a high level of intercultural sensitivity. This high score reveals that planners respect people from different cultures, enjoy interacting with them and feel confident in their interaction. Moreover, these high scores show that most respondents have a strong “positive emotion towards understanding and appreciating cultural differences” and, therefore, “promote

appropriate and effective behavior in intercultural communication” (Chen & Starosta, 1997). Furthermore, it shows that planners are motivated to understand and appreciate others regardless of the differences between cultures. Such traits and comportments are more likely to foster a planning process that is inclusive and respectful of cultural minorities.

Table 5

Percentile Ranking of the Sample

	5	10	25	50	75	90	95
ISS Total Score	83.3	88	92	98	106	112	115.85

Difference of Means in Groups

Furthermore, for this particular sample, results indicate some differences of means in groups (Table 6). However, some categories do not differ in means. Females have a slightly higher mean of intercultural sensitivity (M=99.06) than men (M=98.38). Non-Whites composed of Blacks, American-Indians, Asians, and other races have a higher mean of intercultural sensitivity than Whites. Furthermore, in terms of ethnicity, Hispanics have a higher means of intercultural sensitivity than non-Hispanics. In the area of education, doctorate degree holders have the highest mean of intercultural sensitivity as compared to respondents holding another degree, a bachelor’s degree, or a master’s degree. Surprisingly, those holding another degree have the second highest mean within the education group. Also, professionals who speak more than two languages have a higher mean of intercultural sensitivity. Likewise, participants who have lived in a country other than that of their parents during their developmental years have a higher mean of intercultural sensitivity as opposed to those who have not.

Additionally, those who have lived in another country other than that of their parents showed the highest mean (M=103.47) of all groups, followed by doctorate degree holders (M=103.00). Moreover, among all groups, Whites scored the lowest mean (M= 97.77), followed by the group of respondents who have not lived in a country other than that of their parents (M= 97.89). Other variables such as age and field of practice had means that do not considerably differ among the categories.

Table 6

Difference Means in Groups

		Mean
Age	21-40 years old	98.19
	41-55 years old	99.58
	56 years old and more	98.59
Gender	Males	98.38
	Females	99.06
Race	Whites	97.77
	Non-Whites	101.60
Ethnicity	Yes	101.60
	No	98.21
Education Level	Masters' Degree	98.52
	Bachelors' Degree	98.23
	Doctorate Degree	103.00
	Other	101.67
Field of Practice	Community Development	98.29
	Land use and Other	98.95
Multilingualism	Yes	100.28
	No	98.08
Third Country	Yes	103.47
	No	97.89

Research Question 2

Research question 2 asks how planners' levels of intercultural sensitivity vary in relation to the following variables: age, gender, race, ethnicity, levels of education, field of practice, years of experience, third culture status, and multilingualism. Eight hypotheses are defined for this question:

- Hypothesis 1: The older the planner, the higher the level of intercultural sensitivity
- Hypothesis 2: Women planners will have a higher level of intercultural sensitivity than men
- Hypothesis 3: White planners will have lower levels of intercultural sensitivity than other races
- Hypothesis 4: Planners with more education will have a higher level of intercultural sensitivity
- Hypothesis 5: The intercultural sensitivity levels is to vary according to the field of practice
- Hypothesis 6: Planners with more years of experience will have higher levels of intercultural sensitivity
- Hypothesis 7: Third culture planners will have a higher level of intercultural sensitivity than those who have not lived in a country other than that of their parents
- Hypothesis 8: Planners who speak two languages or more will have a higher level of intercultural sensitivity than those who do not.

The mean score was calculated for each demographic variable and sub-variable. The researcher grouped the answers for each of the variables into two groups to perform inferential statistics. The researcher performed t-test statistics on each demographic sub-variable to

determine whether any significant difference emerged based on the independent demographic variables. No significant differences were found ($p\text{-value} > 0.05$) for any of the independent variables (Table 7) that is, age, gender, race, education level, field of practice, multilingualism, third culture status and years of experience as indicated in Table 7 in relationship to the dependent variable total score. Therefore, for each of the independent variables, I have accepted the null hypothesis that levels of intercultural sensitivity do not vary according to the variables of age, gender, race, ethnicity, education level, field of practice, multilingualism, and third culture status. Therefore, I concluded that the differences in means among demographic groups are only due to chance.

Table 7

Summary of the ISS Score T-tests

	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Age	0.024	0.876	0.546	100	0.586	1.048
Gender	0.001	0.970	-0.356	100	0.723	-0.684
Race	0.657	0.419	-1.743	100	0.084	-3.834
Ethnicity	3.656	0.059	1.262	100	0.210	3.393
Education	0.484	0.488	0.252	100	0.801	0.504
Field of Practice	0.150	0.700	-0.334	100	0.739	-0.664
Multilingualism	0.099	0.753	1.036	100	0.303	2.194
Third Country	0.053	0.818	2.104	100	0.038	5.582

Furthermore, a correlation between the independent variable years of experience and the dependent variable sensitivity score has determined that the level of intercultural sensitivity does not vary according to the years of experience, because no statistical significance has been found, as indicated in Table 8 ($p\text{-value} = 0.320 > 0.05$).

Table 8

Years of Experience

		Sensitivity Score	Years of Experience
Sensitivity Score	r	1	-0.099
	P		0.320
	N	102	102
Years of Experience	r	-0.099	1
	P	0.320	
	N	102	102

Moreover, I conducted a regression analysis to see which variables can predict the levels of intercultural sensitivity scores. The dependent variable of this model is the intercultural sensitivity score. By reading across the rows for each of the predictor variables, race, years of experience and age were variables which significantly contributed to the model ($p = 0.04$); however, all other variables did not because their p-value was greater than $p=0.05$ and $p=0.10$. The variable race was significant at $p < 0.05$ / Using White as the reference group, the model tells us that being White decreases the level of intercultural sensitivity by 5.37 units. This is interpreted as being White makes one less sensitive to other cultures as opposed to other races. The variables years of experience and age were significant at the 0.10 level. As experience increases by one year, the level of intercultural sensitivity decreases by 1.78 units. This means that the longer one stays in the profession the less culturally sensitive she becomes. However, as one gets older, the level of intercultural sensitivity increases by 1.66 units. This is means that older planners are more likely to be culturally sensitive as opposed to younger planners. The results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Predictor Variables of ISS Scores among Planners

Independent Variable	Regression Coefficient	T	P-value
Multilingualism	1.156511572	0.43228901	0.666639109
Years of Experience	-0.227169999	-1.7869143	0.077558795**
Age	4.76249845	1.66538694	0.099561133**
Gender	0.625744781	0.29430973	0.769247303
Race	-5.362022936	-2.0403921	0.044452199*
Third Country	5.552387973	1.4827629	0.14187963
Education	-0.170612184	-0.0818241	0.934981236
Field of Practice	0.446895013	0.21638953	0.829208771

*Significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. ** Significant at the $p < 0.10$

The following section deals with the second phase of the study and presents the results of planners' interviews and discussions, exploring to what extent the quantitative results align with the observations and experiences of planners and seeing how do they make sense of the results

Research Question 3

For this study I interviewed four planners, two males and two females, based on their scores on the interaction attentiveness, for the purpose of discussing and interpreting the results. The respondents interviewed were outliers, which means that they scored high or low on the construct of interaction attentiveness. I interviewed each of planners at their specific place of work.

The interviewees were presented with planners' intercultural sensitivity scores as well demographic breakdown of survey participants. Respondents were then asked whether the results aligned with their own experience and how they made sense of the results in light of public participation. Finally, participants were asked what their recommendations were for practicing planners and academia. The following sections present the findings from the interviews.

How Do the Results Align with Your Own Experience?

The demographic results aligned with the expectations of all respondents. They expected planners in the DFW area to be culturally sensitive. One of the respondents stated, “I’d say it’s [the results] are accurate, the stereotypical planner is more culturally aware.” However, one respondent was initially surprised by the almost even gender distribution of planners overall because she thought that a male predominance would be more pronounced in the profession.

All interviewees agreed with the fact that the profession of urban planning is one that is dominated by the White race, while respondents also pointed out the diversity in their personal and professional circles. One respondent shared, “I am thinking about my circle of friends, the planners I speak to the most are white males, two women from India, and one white woman.” Furthermore, another participant expressed, “I believe I am the only white man in my department.” He later added that his office circle is diverse in that they have people from several countries including Iran, India and the United States.

How Do You Make Sense of the Results, in Light of Public Participation?

More specifically, participants answered the following question: “since the results show that planners are culturally sensitive, then how do you explain that the needs of socio-economic and cultural minorities are not taken into account in plans and policies, regardless of public participation mandates?” From the semi-structured interviews, the subsequent themes emerged: public input, public participation constraints and the role of the planner, existing gaps between school training and planning practice, and recommendations for academia. The following section reports these emerging themes.

Public input. Most participants recognized the need to include public input into plans and policy making. As stated by one planner, “planners have to plan with what the people want.”

Furthermore, when questioned about whether or not public engagement was necessary? One planner agreed:

Yes, because you need to know what the public wants, you cannot enforce what you think is good for the neighborhood because their needs and wants could be totally different [from what you think].

And yet while most agreed with the idea that planners need to know what the public wants, respondents also spotted the difficulty of getting the public engaged. One participant mentioned the struggle in getting minorities involved. She shared her experience in involving cultural minorities in a predominantly White small city:

If they see who your leadership is when they come to the meetings and [when] they see what your policies are, it can be discouraging.

Another planner added that the lack of participation from socio-cultural minorities could be due to a perceived or real language barrier and advised that planners play an active role in suggesting the inclusion of minority interests in the community plans.

All respondents have acknowledged that members of the public do not always have the full picture when it comes to their requests because sometimes the community expresses concerns which escalate the planners' scope of duty. In fact, one participant explained, "it might be a financial issue, a budget issue, [but] we cannot give it if we do not have the money for it, the space for it". Another respondent similarly expressed that:

Sometimes the community says [we want something] and you don't have the resources, the budget or legal resources to do so. For some plans, the city would have to buy a land to make it a park for example... in the past people have complained about a land that has not been developed, when in fact, we did not have the money to buy the land.

Planners have recognized that planning is regulated by several constraints. Hence, the next theme that emerged was the political nature of the planning process.

Planning as a political process. Respondents also acknowledged that planning is a political process regulated by the free market more than the public's input; "it is not a democracy

when it comes to development, it is about property rights,” and, he added, “he who owns the land will develop.” The previous sentences capture the sentiments that some planners had in regards to federally mandated law, the same respondent elaborated and shared:

Are you going to ask someone how they feel about a 7/11 if they have zoning and they have the right to build? What type of public outreach [will you conduct?]. Again, we are not doing public outreach at the local planning department, we are building stuff. We are a permitting instruction office, it is market-based. The free market has way more to do than the public outreach.

When I asked him how he integrates the input of the population, the respondent candidly replied, “Well, I am not sure anyone will ask them.” Another respondent added:

If the city has worked to recruit the developer, then yes, it is going to happen because the city wants the developer there, and yes, it is going to happen no matter what happens during public hearings. It is usually a done deal!

Furthermore, to the question of how the participant conducts public meetings, he answered:

Those are state law requirements...most cities do not do that in house, they hire public consultants to conduct public outreach. We really have no public outreach outside of state-law, bare-minimum requirements.

The role of the planner. Deriving from their responses, participants have been asked to define the role of the planner. Most respondents identify planners as facilitators. Furthermore, one planner has explained that the planner’s role is to suggest a community to be more inclusive in its planning by considering the interests of minorities in its plans, without being able to enforce the inputs or interests of such groups in the overall community plans. This is corroborated by another participant’s definition of a planner as a facilitator. Another participant has highlighted the role of the planner as an arbitrator and has mentioned the fact that planners must have the skillsets to persuade others and be creative in finding ways to reach consensus.

One participant has observed: “the thing that you want is not going to work exactly in the way that you want, so maybe you need to do xyz to try to put the two together”. Another responded has provided a similar response:

The role of the planner is to arbitrate to reach consensus and to suggest different options, a, b, and c, but it does not always work... but in some communities, it is also successful.

Planners’ constraints. Planners elaborated on the restrictions of the political climate in which they operate. Planners mentioned the differences between small and big cities. They expressed that both levels have political rules of which planners needed to be aware and be able to navigate. To all respondents, these political factors are the same, regardless of the size of the city, but they differ in terms of scale. For instance one planner shared her difficulties in operating a small city:

[In] smaller cities, the leadership can be very hands on. Everything has to be cleared through them, which is the same at a bigger level of government; it just seems that at the bigger level there is so much to manage and so much to implement that the council will tend to lean on the staff, the senior staff, to implement the policies and new programs.

Another participant added, “The final decision does not always rest on planners, and it depends on the structure of the city... at the end of the day, city council makes the decision.” She explained that sometimes when the city council is not representative of the community it can lead to the marginalization of the minorities’ interests.

Recommendations for academic training and planning practice. In this section, reactions to the findings are presented first, followed by the recommendations offered. Respondents unanimously were disheartened at the enormous discrepancies between academia and practice. They especially expressed that training in planning that does not prepare students to face the veritable challenges of practice:

One of the things that I think is challenging for the industry at large is that academia is training a lot of students who are not fit for local government. I am running a permitting

and development office, and some of the people [I work with] are urban planners. What we are doing is on a daily basis is 98% not taught with school; it has nothing to do with what you are taught in school, nothing.

When asked if there was a discrepancy, the same participant answered, “massive, there is a huge discrepancy.” He has later added:

Academia, does not train for local government. Local government, state government, [and] national government are radically different...like on the AICP exam, only three questions dealt with my day-job.

The previous statement implies that other questions on the licensing exam are not related to what a regular planner does in current practice, which, in turn, exacerbates the gap between training and practice. One planner mentioned:

When you come out of the field of practicing planning, you have all these great ideas about what you are going to do, and then the real world beats you down and then you say well, never mind.

Another one said:

When I was in college I always thought that the profession of planning was to make everything walkable and connect everything. Schools are not exposing student’s planners to a lot of responsibilities that planners are exposed to right now.

She added:

[There are things] we are really taught in school such as writing a plan, but how do you address community issues, how do you bring people together, this was something that I had to learn. Also some of the regulations, I really learned that in practice, regarding different situations, different citizens, their issues and problems they did not teach us in school.

Similarly other planners expressed that they were ignorant of the political climate in which they were to navigate, once out of school. One typical reflection was:

Students are coming out and they have no comprehension of local politics... and they come in an administration that is very much influenced by the political culture.

Another one added on the topic of public participation:

Community engagement is very important to me, but I didn't take any classes or get any skills on how to reach people.

Recommendations were made for those who educate and train planners because if the principles of participation taught in school overlook or discard the political context in which planners operate, such teachings and principles need to be revised and adapted to prepare students and professionals. Planners recommended education and training courses to focus on the context of participation that involves political and cultural structures as well as appropriate techniques with which to conduct participation.

For example one planner said, "sometimes we need help with the everyday stuff: how do I find people to come to the meetings, how do I write a staff report...?" She added "even at school, we do not learn how to write a staff report, all the little practical 'ins and outs' to get through to have an idea to move forward."

Respondents also suggested the use of experiential learning to help students develop skills and knowledge outside of the traditional academic setting. Practitioners encourage students to be more engaged in their community, attend community meetings in order to know how planners conduct meetings, and understand the issues at stake and how planners address them. Furthermore, participants advised students to participate in professional meetings and internships in order to expose them to the more realistic side of planning practice.

Summary. This section presented the qualitative findings of the study. Three main themes have emerged from the semi-structured interviews which were presented as an answer to why the interests of socio-economic and cultural minorities are often disregarded in plans and policies regardless of the high levels of intercultural sensitivity of DFW planners as indicated by the quantitative findings. This section discussed the necessity of public input, the political nature

of public participation, and, finally, the role and constraints of planners. Planners also shared their inputs and recommendations on the existing gaps between theory and practice.

First, respondents have pointed out to the challenge of gathering public input due to the lack of minorities' participation pertaining to a perceived or real language barrier as well as recurring unrealistic expectations from members who participate. Besides the challenges of involvement, respondents have shared that the political nature of planning is often restricted by the free market, and planners are often obliged to conduct public participation to fulfill legal mandates. Furthermore respondents identified the planner as a facilitator and liaison tool working under a web of constraints in order to achieve consensus with political actors, developers, and other stakeholders. Participants identified the gaps existing between theory and practice such as the lack of knowledge of politics in the context of planning as well as the lack of training regarding the day-to-day tasks of an average planner. To remediate such issues, they suggested more hands-on and direct learning experience to expose students to the practicalities of the planning profession

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, SUMMARY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This mixed-method study investigated intercultural sensitivity among planners in the DFW area and has examined the relationship between the ISS and various demographic and intercultural background of planners. The overall research question was “Are planners cultural sensitive?” The sub-questions were

- What is the level of intercultural sensitivity of planners, as measured by the ISS of planners in the DFW area?
- Do planners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity vary in respect to the following variables: age, gender, race, years of experience, field of practice, education, third culture status, and multilingualism?
- To what extent do the qualitative results align with the observations and experiences of planners, and how do they make sense of the results?

This chapter presents a summary of the findings and discusses their implications. The contribution to theory, recommendation for practice, and suggestions for research are provided.

Summary of Quantitative Findings

Planners’ Intercultural Sensitivity

The main research question asked for planners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity. The results have shown that planners, in general, have a high level of intercultural sensitivity with a score of 98.71. This high level of cultural sensitivity means that planners can improve their service within the community because they have the skills which enable them to learn about and understand differences among people.

Demographic Variables and Intercultural Sensitivity

Eight variables were hypothesized to be associated with ISS, age, gender, race, field of practice, years of experience, third culture status, education, and multilingualism. Comparisons of the means revealed significant differences between the impact of the variables through a t-test analysis ($p\text{-value} > 0.05$). Furthermore, a correlational analysis did not reveal a significant relationship between years of experience and the ISS ($p\text{-value} = 0.320$).

Discussion

The data indicates that planners in the DFW area display a high level of cultural sensitivity. It shows that planners in this study are accustomed to the presence of foreign cultures and as a result, they have the desire to understand, appreciate, and accept people from different cultures by seeking interaction (Chen & Starosta, 2000). In fact, planners explained this high level of intercultural sensitivity during the interviews. According to respondents, planners are exposed to different culture because DFW is a region with a very high number of immigrants. The DFW area is made up of 46% non-Hispanic whites, 15% of Black, 29% Hispanic, 7% Asians and 3% non-Hispanic other (US Census Bureau, 2017). Therefore, the likelihood to work or live close to someone from another culture is also high. Additionally, planners' exposure to a diverse cultural make-up has *de-facto* provided planners with the skills to mutually understand other cultures. Therefore, in this study, some of the demographic variables as predictors of intercultural sensitivity are not relevant because respondents already have the qualities necessary to interact with diverse cultural groups and individuals.

Moreover, in terms of public participation frequency, legal mandates require planners to conduct public participation. Planners in this study have conducted public participation activities at least one to five times a week during the past 30 days. These recurrent meetings allow

planners to interact with members of various cultural groups. Therefore, because planners already possess the skills that were significant in other studies, it can explain why they have high scores in intercultural sensitivity.

Yet, when using the Anova and t-tests to determine the variables which influence respondents' sensitivity, all the variables failed to reach statistical significance; therefore, none of the hypotheses were confirmed with these tests. The fact that any of the variables associated with the ISS score have produced no statistical differences using the t-tests could be explained by the size of the sample. In fact, the sample size is extremely important in determining the significance of the difference between means, this particular sample size is small. An increased sample size is likely to lead to a more stable representation of group performance. However due to the time limit and financial constraints of this study, the researcher was not able to obtain a larger data set.

Furthermore, when compared among groups, as depicted in Table 5, the difference of means within each subgroup is not sufficiently large. In fact, the greater difference between the two means would have yielded a greater likelihood that a statistically significant mean difference exists. In fact, when the means of the two groups are sufficiently different, there is a greater confidence that there is a real difference between them. For instance, within the age variable, the means of the three subcategories are 98.19, 99.58, and 98.59 for the 21-40 years old category, 41-55 years old category, and 56 years and more category. Moreover, the different means are 98.38 for males versus 99.06 for females. Among races, Whites have a 97.77 average while non-Whites have a mean of 101.60. Concerning the education variable, the means vary between 103 and 98.52. For the variable field of practice, the means are 98.29 and 98.95 for the groups community development and land use and other, respectively. Among those who speak another

language and those who do not, the respective mean is 100.28 and 98.08. Finally, among those who have lived in another country as opposed to those who have not, the different means are 103.47 and 97.89, respectively.

Moreover, the lack of significance associated with the demographics variables can be explained by the fact that this study pioneers the use of the ISS in the field of planning as a tool to measure intercultural sensitivity within the profession. Therefore, variables and hypotheses used in this research have derived from studies pertaining to the field of education and nursing which have used the ISS or from studies on intercultural sensitivity using the IDI, which is another tool to measure intercultural sensitivity.

Also, because the purpose of the study is explained in the consent form, respondents could have given socially acceptable answers as well. This phenomenon is described as response bias, a widely discussed concept when self-reported data is used. (Rosenman, Tennekoon, & Hill, 2011). The reasons why respondents may provide biased answers on self-assessed questions range from a misunderstanding of what the appropriate measurement is to a social-desirability bias where the respondents still want to remain in good standing regardless of the anonymous nature of the survey (Rosenman et al., 2011). In this case, participants would usually respond with what they think the researcher is looking for and would seldom report on events they believe may reflect poorly on them. In the case of this research, since sentiments of acceptance are addressed, if respondents have perceived that they could be stigmatized for being discriminatory or prejudice against other cultural groups, they could have modified their answers.

However, the lack of significance can also be explained by the nature of the test performed. In fact, upon conducting a regression analysis, to see which variables could predict

intercultural sensitivity scores, the variables race, years of experience and age proved significant. This study compared Whites and non-Whites, with Whites being the reference group. The results show being White decreases one's level of intercultural sensitivity. In other words, the finding suggest that are more likely to have lower ISS scores as opposed to other races. These results are congruent with previous studies which have showed that Whites and non-Whites have different levels of intercultural sensitivity (Bonilla, 2009) and that intercultural sensitivity scores do vary according to race (Ekong, Kavookjian, & Hutchison, 2017).

Furthermore, previous studies have shown significant findings with variables age (del Villar, 2010) and years of experience (Drandic, 2013) associated with intercultural sensitivity. Therefore, on one hand, we accepted hypotheses 1 which posited that “the older the planner, the higher the level of intercultural sensitivity”. As explained by Del Villar (2010), maturity with life experience could explain why older respondents were more sensitive than their younger counterparts. Maturity often comes with self-acceptance, which also leads to accepting others and being more tolerant and open-minded about cultural differences.

On the second hand, we could not accept hypothesis 6 which stated that “planners with more years of experience will have higher levels of intercultural sensitivity”, because in this study, the levels of intercultural sensitivity decreases with additional years of experience. This could be explained by the fact that the longer planners remain in a field, they are accustomed to the work and therefore they tend to fulfill their tasks more mechanically. Hence they fail to activate the emotional, affective side known as intercultural sensitivity, when interacting with people from different cultures. Furthermore, in the workplace setting in general, senior employees may have difficulties adapting to changes imposed by the increasingly diverse

population or the newer generation of practitioners. Therefore this hostility to change may translate into a lack of cultural sensitivity.

It is worth noting that the variable years of experience, there was no literature found as part of this research which examined years of professional experience and its relationship to the ISS. The study by Drandic (2013) measures intercultural sensitivity by using the Intercultural Development Inventory. Future studies using the ISS could also confirm whether or not years of experiences increase or decrease one's levels of intercultural sensitivity.

The qualitative findings of this research highlight the complexity of public participation research and, in particular, how socio-political and local constraints influence policies. In fact, the idea that planners are insensitive to the needs of socio-cultural minorities is an unfounded assumption and an unsound basis for efforts to increase public participation in planning. This research, instead, has revealed that planners constantly find creative ways around political and social structures to build consensus about specific issues and to ensure that each group has a voice in the decisions directly affecting them.

One theme that has emerged from the interviews, which the original study design overlooked, is the political nature of the planning process within which planners operate daily. In fact, even planning theorists, fierce proponents of public participation, have acknowledged that the context in which planning occurs places limitations on, and in some cases inhibits, the possibilities of authentic and meaningful participation (Innes, 2004; Rosenberg, 2007). Indeed, when representative democracy is not representative enough in its deliberative forms, it often results in exclusionary urban policies and practices which mainly affect socio-cultural minorities and low-income groups. Planners are aware of the intricate system of power relations; however,

planners' professional, personal, and intellectual values enable them to explore ways to solve conflicts in an attempt to build constructive relationships (Connelly, 2010).

The conventional public participation process has four main components: the issue, the administrative structures and systems, the planners, and the citizens. Participation is framed such that these components are organized around the issue. The systems are placed closest to the issue. The administrator is placed between the structure and the citizens. The structures and the processes are the politically and socially constructed constraints within which the administrator must operate (King et al., 1998). Thus, the administrator has no real power to change the process for a greater citizen involvement (Forester, 1989).

In this study, planners have expressed that the leadership style of their cities determines the final outcomes, as well as how participation is made. Respondents have pointed out the fact that the planner is one that facilitates and liaises with political actors and developers and yet has to operate under some constraints to achieve consensus among stakeholders. Planners have expressed their own limitations in that they can only act as liaisons or facilitators instead of enforcers on issues of diversity of social equity in plan making, for example. It is mostly up to the community or their local representatives to determine the community outcomes.

However, although the planning literature presents planners as facilitators, it often downplays the importance of structural constraints (Connelly, 2010). In cases where community leaders are more conservative, the planners' recommendations to be more inclusive are more likely to be discarded when the majority does not recognize the interests of the minorities living in their community. Therefore, the different values and interests, the cultural identities, the political nature of the planning process narrow the scope of participation and present a challenge in regards to meaningful participation of cultural groups in the local government setting.

Most planners have recognized the fundamental use of public participation within a contemporary urban practice. Planners believe that the input of the community is important especially in the decisions which affect them. However, planners have capitulated before the impracticability and impossibility of including *all* the people affected by a decision to participate.

Planners have acknowledged the power imbalances as well as the difficulty to engage cultural minorities, poor, and disadvantaged groups because the programs and decisions are made through an elite culture of political and bureaucratic control. Therefore, some cultural groups refrain from participating broadly because of cultural differences and, more specifically, because of the language barrier. Such groups often feel intimidated because they perceive themselves as lacking political efficacy. In other words, they believe that they cannot influence decisions because they do not have the skills and knowledge to effectively communicate their concern.

In some other instances, cultural groups have lost the desire to participate when they perceive that their elected or appointed offices do not represent them or their interests, and this applies for minorities voters who did not choose the winner. In fact, “representative democracy is viewed as too hierarchical, bureaucratic and party bound to be able to deal effectively with questions of identity in a multi-cultural and global/local world” (Newman, Barnes, Sullivan, & Knops, 2004, p. 204). When these marginalized groups participate, it often amounts to tokenism, including just enough participation to fulfill legal mandates (Mahjabeen & Dee, 2003) while their inputs are never considered in the decision-making process. And when participation is circumvented by systems that are distant from the real dynamics of the entire community, tokenism is inevitable.

Therefore, the new planner with little to no knowledge of politics of local politics is often trapped in this widespread assumption that the practitioner alone can be an agent of change, when, in fact, these assumptions are unrealistic and unattainable in the face of existing power dynamics (Williams, 2004) and often discarded during academic raining. Participants acknowledged gaps between theory and practice, such as the lack of knowledge of politics in the context of planning as well as the lack of training regarding the day-to-day tasks of an average planner. To remediate such issues, they have suggested more hands-on and direct learning experiences that expose students to the practicalities of the planning profession.

Furthermore, some planners have mentioned another complex component of public participation, the difficulty of including the public on matters where the public has little or no knowledge. As pointed out by Yang (2006), some issues requiring technical knowledge often question the extent to which citizens should decide in the process. Planners have pointed out the fact that citizens often do know have knowledge of technical issues and may have unrealistic requests or advocate only for their own personal interests. According to Adams (2004), when groups or individuals with strong extremists views dominate in public hearings for instance, it provides planners with an excuse to discard their comments because planners believe these groups are not representative of what the public at large thinks. For example, during the interview, one participant expressed his disdain for public hearings. He mentioned that citizens often do not have any technical knowledge, such as that of zoning, for instance, and when they complain about a development when the land has already been purchased by the developer and the zoning previously approved, the likelihood of not realizing the project is very low, despite citizens' protests.

Furthermore, this participant stated that when public participation about this specific development is conducted just to fulfill federal mandates, citizens often shame public officials and developers about the issues they cannot change and increase the planner's load of work in terms of staff reports that they have to write. He mentioned that for cities with extremely low planning staff, conducting public participation is a waste of resources. Therefore, as previously mentioned by Yang (2006), when participation becomes time consuming and unproductive, it leads to fewer involvement efforts.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Study.

First, the study has provided answers to original research questions in a context that has never been researched. Regardless of the fact that the results are not generalizable, they provide a baseline for future research. Second, the use of mixed-methods design is also a strength of the study because it has allowed the quantitative results to be explored through interviews with respondents and the research design allowed participants to suggest points that have been previously overlooked.

The findings of this research are only applicable to planners in other contexts in a general sense. The findings cannot be generalized outside of the DFW area. Furthermore, only one researcher has participated in this study. Therefore, the findings bear the researcher's biases, a common complication when a single researcher encodes and interprets data.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research.

The use of the ISS, a new instrument to the planning field, may be a limitation to this study as there is no research in the planning literature to compare and contrast different studies which have used the ISS to measure demographic variables. Most of the studies have used the IDI instrument to measure the intercultural sensitivity and those studies are more pervasive in the

literature of intercultural sensitivity. However, measuring the results of our study against another instrument to confirm or give future directions is inconsistent with the direction of this research.

Another limitation of this study is the sample used. The sample is small due to time and financial resources tied to this research. However a bigger sample could provide different results. Furthermore, similar studies should be conducted with other planners in different regions to better generalize results.

Also, the self-reported process in the form of the survey has posed a limitation for this research. The results are drawn from a survey and interviews with a small data set of planners working in the DFW area. These results are therefore more suggestive than conclusive. A larger study incorporating a larger subset of planners in different regions of the United States would allow more definitive conclusions.

Additional research could apply the same research process to a larger population of planners in other metropolitan areas in order to compare the results with those of this study. Moreover, future studies could compare intercultural sensitivity scores of a set of professionals and a set of citizens. It would be interesting to see the levels of intercultural sensitivity of citizens and compare those scores to the scores of planners in this study to determine the level of intercultural sensitivity of the population with which planners work. Since communication is a two-way process, it would be useful to see if the levels of intercultural sensitivity of the public can pose a problem to public participation in a multicultural and diverse milieu.

Conclusion

Intercultural sensitivity has been widely discussed in the planning literature without truly having a measurement tool to evaluate it in practice. Intercultural sensitivity relates to the

affective realm of communication that planners should possess as a prerequisite to deal with the growing multi-cultural population of western urban regions.

The purpose of this study was to introduce the ISS as a tool for measuring the intercultural sensitivity of professionals within the planning field, to evaluate different variables that affect the intercultural sensitivity, and to know how planners discuss the topic of public participation in an increasingly diverse society. The findings indicate that planners have a high degree of intercultural sensitivity. However no statistical significance has been found between the demographic variables that could affect planners' levels of intercultural sensitivity. However, a regression analysis revealed that race is a predictor of levels of intercultural sensitivity scores.

The needs for new planners to be trained to the practicalities of the planning professions were also addressed in this study. While training can take many forms, the research suggests that even with structural constraints, meaningful participation can be achieved when planners are willing to be creative and explore the avenues in which the local power is reduced. In fact, planners' values, whether they believe in inclusion or they acknowledge the merit and validity of participation, can change participation outcomes. Therefore, this research confirms that participation depends on the people conducting participation as well as the context in which it occurs (Connelly, 2010).

APPENDIX 1

REQUEST TO FORWARD EMAIL

From: Eihua.shaw@mavs.uta.edu
Date: February 20, 2019
To: XXXXXX@cityXXX.gov
Subject: Request to Forward Email

Dear Professional,

My name is Eihua Corinne Olivia Shaw, I am a PhD candidate at the University of Texas at Arlington, in the College of Planning and Public Policy (CAPP). I am conducting a research study to investigate planners' feelings during their communication with people from a different cultural background. The research will allow the planning field to gain more insight about intercultural sensitivity and to improve public participation and relationships with the public. The data from the study will remain confidential. The data will be coded so that the agency will not be known or traceable.

Because I do not have access to your planning staff emails, I kindly ask that you please pass the following link https://uta.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_a3r4QUAK8d1QW0d down to your staff involved in public participation activities. The link will take them to a consent form where they can agree to participate or not. Furthermore, to avoid any conflict of interest or pressure to participate, I have mentioned the voluntary nature of the study and the fact that you are not related in the study.

They access the link and answer questions NO LATER THAN MARCH 25th, 2019 by going to (https://uta.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_a3r4QUAK8d1QW0d).

Best Regards,

Eihua Corinne Olivia, Shaw

APPENDIX 2

SURVEY CONSENT INFORMATION

From: Eihua.shaw@mavs.uta.edu

Date: February 20, 2019

To: XXXXXX@cityXXX.gov

Subject: Survey Request and Consent Information

Dear Professional,

You are invited to participate in a research studying the intercultural sensitivity of professionals conducting public participation activities in the DFW area. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in this study. Eihua Corinne Olivia Shaw, a PhD candidate at the University of Texas at Arlington (UTA), College of Planning and Public Policy (CAPP), conducts this study.

This research seeks to investigate the feelings of professionals conducting participations during their face-to-face interaction with people from a different cultural background. The study will allow the planning field to gain more insight about intercultural sensitivity in order to improve public participation and relationships with the public. If you consent to participate in this research, you will complete the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) and a demographic questionnaire online. Completing the ISS and the demographic questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes.

It is unlikely that you will experience any risks or discomfort from participating. However, it is possible that self-reflecting on intercultural relationships could be unpleasant. Yet, it is likely that such reflection may lead to a better understanding of your own perceptions. The main benefit to participating in this research is that your agency or city may gain some insights about intercultural sensitivity to improve public participation and relationships with the public.

The data from the ISS will remain confidential. Individual respondents cannot be identified. The data will be coded so that your identity will not be known or traceable in the event you request your data to be removed and not a part of the research, as it is your right as a voluntary participant.

Since you will be participating via the Internet, be aware that data transfer across the Internet is not secure and could be subject to third party observations. However, to ensure a maximum safety, your data will be stored in the UTA Qualtrics, a survey development tool, accessible to every UTA student. Each student has their own account to ensure that survey results can remain private. Other research records will be stored securely in the research's supervisor's lock cabinet and only the primary investigator will have access to the records. The data will be stored for a period of three years.

Please note that your supervisor is not related to the research in any ways. Participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any point.

Should you have any questions, please contact the researcher at eihua.shaw@mavs.uta.edu. Should you have any questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone else other than the researcher, please contact the research supervisor Dr. Li at jjli@uta.edu.

If you choose to complete the online Intercultural Sensitivity Scale as part Eihua Corinne Olivia Shaw's Research on planners' intercultural sensitivity levels. Please complete the online survey by NO LATER THAN MARCH 25, 2019 by going to (survey link Qualtrics).

Statement by person agreeing to participate in this study:

I have read this informed consent document. I understand each part of the document. I freely and voluntary choose to participate in the study.

Yes, I consent

No, I do no consent

Best Regards,

Eihua Corinne Olivia, Shaw

APPENDIX 3

INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY SCALE

Below is a series of statements concerning intercultural communication. There are no right or wrong answers. 5= Strongly agree; 4= Agree; 3= Uncertain; 2= Disagree; 1= Strongly disagree
Thank you for your cooperation.

- ___ 1. I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.
- ___ 2. I think people from other cultures are narrow-minded.
- ___ 3. I am pretty sure of myself in interacting with people from different cultures.
- ___ 4. I find it very hard to talk in front of people from different cultures.
- ___ 5. I always know what to say when interacting with people from different cultures.
- ___ 6. I can be as sociable as I want to be when interacting with people from different cultures.
- ___ 7. I don't like to be with people from different cultures.
- ___ 8. I respect the values of people from different cultures.
- ___ 9. I get upset easily when interacting with people from different cultures.
- ___ 10. I feel confident when interacting with people from different cultures.
- ___ 11. I tend to wait before forming an impression of culturally-distinct counterparts.
- ___ 12. I often get discouraged when I am with people from different cultures.
- ___ 13. I am open-minded to people from different cultures.
- ___ 14. I am very observant when interacting with people from different cultures.
- ___ 15. I often feel useless when interacting with people from different cultures.
- ___ 16. I respect the ways people from different cultures behave.
- ___ 17. I try to obtain as much information as I can when interacting with people from different cultures.
- ___ 18. I would not accept the opinions of people from different cultures.
- ___ 19. I am sensitive to my culturally-distinct counterpart's subtle meanings during our interaction.
- ___ 20. I think my culture is better than other cultures.
- ___ 21. I often give positive responses to my culturally different counterpart during our interaction.
- ___ 22. I avoid those situations where I will have to deal with culturally-distinct persons.
- ___ 23. I often show my culturally-distinct counterpart my understanding through verbal or nonverbal cues.
- ___ 24. I have a feeling of enjoyment towards differences between my culturally-distinct counterpart and me.

APPENDIX 4

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

The following demographic questions will help to categorize and analyze the data. Please provide the response that best describes you.

Public participation is a series of activities and actions that directly engages the public in decision-making and considers public input in making that decision. This research restrains public participation to activities that involve *face-to face interaction* between professionals and citizens, such as public meetings, workshops, and briefings.

Public Participation Frequency: In the last 30 days, how often have you been involved in public participation activities?

- None 1- 5 times 6 -10 times 11 times or more

Age: What is your age range?

- 20 years or less 21- 25 years 26-30 years 31-35 years 36-40 years 41- 45 years 46-50 years 51-55 years 56-60 years 61-65 years 66 years or more

Gender: What is your gender? (Select one)

- Male Female

Ethnicity: Are you Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

- Yes No

If YES: Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano Puerto Rican Cuban Other (Please specify): examples include Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, or Spaniard. _____

Race: What is your race? (Select all that applies)

- White Black or African-America American Indian or Alaska Native Asian Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Other

Education Level: What is your highest level of education?

- Bachelor's degree Master's degree Doctorate degree Other (please specify) _____

Field of Practice: What is your field of practice? (Select all that applies)

- Community development Comprehensive / long range planning Housing/ economic development Environment/ natural resources planning Hazard mitigation/ disaster planning Historic preservation Land use and code enforcement Parks and recreation Transportation planning Urban design Other (Please specify) _____

Years of Experience: Please enter the number of years you have worked in your current field?

Number of years : _____.

Third Culture: Have you grown up in a country other than that of your parents?

YES NO

Multilingualism: Do you speak another language other than English?

YES NO

Follow-up: Is it permissible to contact you for a follow-up interview?

YES NO

If you have selected YES, what is your email address? _____

APPENDIX 5

INTERVIEW INVITATION

Dear Professional,

Thank you for having taken the time to participate in my study by completing the Intercultural Sensitivity Questionnaire; Thank you for the contribution you have made.

As the next step in this study, I am conducting interviews. I would like to ask you to be part of the interview. I will ask a series of questions with the intent of getting you to discuss specific situations or events related to public participation. I am seeking vivid and comprehensive reflection the events. I am interested in your story, thoughts, feelings and perceptions.

I value your participation and thank you for your commitment, time and efforts so far. The results of this study and your insights are valuable; they will contribute to this research depth and thoroughness. Thank you for considering this request. Please reply to this email to let me know if you agree to participate, or not. If you do, I will contact you to schedule the interview soon.

Best Regards,

Eihua Corinne Olivia Shaw

APPENDIX 6

INTERVIEW INFORMED CONSENT

This study involves the use of audio recordings with the sole purpose to assist with the accuracy of your responses. Only the researcher and the faculty advisor will have access to this data. Neither your name nor any other identifying information will be associated with the audio recording or the transcript. This data will be kept secure by the researcher in a locked filing cabinet on campus and will be destroyed within three years.

I understand that the researcher will audio record me. You have the right to refuse the audio recording. Please select one of the following options:

- Yes, I consent to audio recording
- No, I do not consent to audio recording

APPENDIX 7

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Do these results align with your own observations?

Prompts (if needed):

- a. What is consistent? Can you give me an example?
- b. What is not consistent? Can you give me an example?

2. How do you explain or make sense of these results?

Prompts (if needed):

- a. Why do you think these differences show up? Can you give me an example?
- b. Do you think there might be any extraneous reasons that might explain the difference (i.e., limitations of the research)

3. What do you think the implications of these findings are?

Prompts (if needed):

- a. For planners?
- b. For academia?

4. What recommendations would you give based on these findings and what we have discussed?

Prompts (if needed):

- a. Recommendations to practicing planners?
- b. Recommendations to academia?

APPENDIX 8

FOLLOW-UP PHONE CALL SCRIPT

Hello, may I please speak to [First Name and Last Name]?

Hi, my name is Eihua Corinne Olivia Shaw; I am a PhD student at UTA. I sent you an email XXX days ago with a request to forward a link of my research to your staff. I am calling to follow-up on the email since I did not hear back from you.

If you cannot do it or there is another person that will be more appropriate to follow up with, please let me know.

Thanks for your help. Have a great day!

APPENDIX 9

REQUEST TO TAKE SURVEY

From: Eihua.shaw@mavs.uta.edu

Date: April 17, 2019, 2019

To: XXXXXX@cityXXX.gov

Subject: Request to take survey

Dear Professional,

My name is Eihua Corinne Olivia Shaw, I am a PhD candidate at the University of Texas at Arlington, in the College of Planning and Public Policy (CAPPA). I am conducting a research study to investigate planners' feelings during their communication with people from a different cultural background. The research will allow the planning field to gain more insight about intercultural sensitivity and to improve public participation and relationships with the public. The data from the study will remain confidential. The data will be coded so that the agency will not be known or traceable.

I kindly ask that you please take the survey

https://uta.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_a3r4QUAK8d1QW0d and if possible pass it to your colleagues also involved in public participation activities. The link will take them to a consent form where they can agree to participate or not. Furthermore, to avoid any conflict of interest or pressure to participate, I have mentioned the voluntary nature of the study.

I have read this informed consent document. I understand each part of the document. I freely and voluntarily choose to participate in the study.

Best Regards,

Eihua Corinne O

REFERENCES

- Abel, T. D., & Stephan, M. (2000). The limits of civic environmentalism. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44(4), 614-628.
- Adams, B. (2004). Public meetings and the democratic process. *Public Administration Review*, 64(1), 43-54.
- Albrechts, L., & Denayer, W. (2001). Communicative planning, emancipatory politics and Postmodernism in *Handbook of Urban Studies*, 369-384 . London: Sage.
- Albu, C. E. (2015). Intercultural communication in tourism. *Cross-Cultural Management Journal*, (1), 7-14.
- Alshenqeeti, H. (2014). Interviewing as a data collection method: a critical review. *English Linguistics Research*, 3(1), 39-45.
- Ameyaw, S. (2000). Appreciative planning: An approach to planning with diverse ethnic and cultural groups. *Urban Planning in a Multicultural Society*, 101-114.
- American Planning Association. (2019). A portrait of planners. Retrieved November 26, 2019 from <https://www.planning.org/salary/planner/>
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(3), 335-371.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216-224.
- Babbie, E. (2007). *The practice of social research*. Thompson Wadsworth, Belmont.

- Baker, W. H., Addams, H. L., & Davis, B. (2005). Critical factors for enhancing municipal public hearings. *Public Administration Review*, 65(4), 490-499.
- Balla, S. J. (2000). Legislative success and failure and participation in rule making. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(3), 633-654.
- Barreto, M. A., Segura, G. M., & Woods, N. D. (2004). The mobilizing effect of majority–minority districts on Latino turnout. *American Political Science Review*, 98(1), 65-75.
- Barnes, M., Newman, J., & Sullivan, H. (2004). Power, participation, and political renewal: Theoretical perspectives on public participation under New Labour in Britain. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 11(2), 267-279.
- Bayles, P. P. (2009). *Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of elementary teachers in bilingual schools in a Texas school district*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota). Retrieved November 26, 2019 from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.507.6271&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Banos, R. V. (2006). Intercultural sensitivity of teenagers: A study of educational necessities in Catalonia. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 15(2), 16.
- Bennett, M. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Berke, P. R. (1996). Enhancing plan quality: Evaluating the role of state planning mandates for natural hazard mitigation. *Journal of environmental planning and management*, 39(1), 79-96.
- Berke, P. R., & French, S. P. (1994). The influence of state planning mandates on local plan quality. *Journal of planning education and research*, 13(4), 237-250.

- Berman, E. M. (1997). Dealing with cynical citizens. *Public Administration Review*, 105-112.
- Berman, E. M., & West, J. P. (2008). Managing emotional intelligence in US cities: A study of social skills among public managers. *Public Administration Review*, 68(4), 742-758.
- Berry, J. M. (1981). Beyond citizen participation: Effective advocacy before administrative agencies. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17(4), 463-477.
- Berry, J. M., Portney, K. E., & Thomson, K. (1993). The rebirth of democracy. *Washington: The Brookings Institutions*.
- Bhawuk, D. P. S. and Brislin, R. (1992). The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 413-36.
- Birkland, T. A. (1996). Natural disasters as focusing events: Policy communities and political response. *International journal of mass emergencies and disasters*, 14(2), 221-243.
- Birkland, T. A. (1997). *After disaster: Agenda setting, public policy, and focusing events*. Georgetown University Press.
- Bishop, P., & Davis, G. (2002). Mapping public participation in policy choices. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 61(1), 14-29.
- Bonilla, J. (2009). *Talking about race: comfort levels of racial groups in dialogue*. communication studies undergraduate publications, presentations and projects, 57.
- Booher, D. E., & Innes, J. E. (2002). Network power in collaborative planning. *Journal of planning education and research*, 21(3), 221-236.
- Brabham, D. C. (2009). Crowdsourcing the public participation process for planning projects. *Planning Theory*, 8(3), 242-262

- Brabham, D. C., Sanchez, T. W., & Bartholomew, K. (2009). Crowdsourcing public participation in transit planning: preliminary results from the next stop design case. *Transportation Research Board*.
- Brand, R., & Gaffikin, F. (2007). Collaborative planning in an uncollaborative world. *Planning Theory*, 6(3), 282-313.
- Brislin, R., Worthley, R., & Macnab, B. (2006). Cultural intelligence: Understanding behaviors that serve people's goals. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(1), 40-55.
- Brody, S. D., Godschalk, D. R., & Burby, R. J. (2003). Mandating citizen participation in plan making: Six strategic planning choices. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(3), 245-264.
- Buchy, M., & Hoverman, S. (2000). Understanding public participation in forest planning: a review. *Forest policy and Economics*, 1(1), 15-25.
- Burayidi, M. A. (2003). The multicultural city as planners' enigma. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 4(3), 259-273.
- Burby, R. J. (2003). Making plans that matter: Citizen involvement and government action. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(1), 33-49.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2019). *U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Outlook Handbook, Urban and Regional Planners*. Retrieved November 26, 2019 from <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/life-physical-and-social-science/urban-and-regional-planners.htm>
- Carp, J. (2004). Wit, style, and substance: How planners shape public participation. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 23(3), 242-254.

- Cassell, C., Nadin, S. & Gray, M.O. (2001). The use and effectiveness of benchmarking in SME. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 8 (3), 212-222.
- Cegala, D.J. (1981). Interaction involvement: A cognitive dimension of communicative competence. *Communication Education*, (30), 109-121.
- Chadwick, A., & May, C. (2003). Interaction between states and citizens in the age of the Internet: “e-government” in the United States, Britain, and the European Union. *Governance*, 16(2), 271-300.
- Chen, G.M. (1993). Intercultural communication education: A classroom case. *The speech Communication Annual*, 7, 33-46.
- Chen, G.M., & Starosta, W. J. (1996). Intercultural communication competence: A synthesis. In Burleson B.R (Ed.), *Communication yearbook*, 19 (pp.353-383). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chen, G.M., & Starosta, W.J. (2000). The development and validation of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale. *Human Communication* 3, 1-15.
- Christmas, C. N., & Barker, G. G. (2014). The immigrant experience: Differences in acculturation, intercultural sensitivity, and cognitive flexibility between the first and second generation of Latino immigrants. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 7(3), 238-257.
- Clifford, B. P. (2013). Rendering reform: Local authority planners and perceptions of public participation in Great Britain. *Local Environment*, 18(1), 110-131.
- Coffey, A. J., Kamhawi, R., Fishwick, P., & Henderson, J. (2013). New media environments’ comparative effects upon intercultural sensitivity: A five-dimensional analysis. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 37(5), 605-627.

- Cole, R. L., & Caputo, D. A. (1984). The public hearing as an effective citizen participation mechanism: A case study of the general revenue sharing program. *American Political Science Review*, 78(2), 404-416.
- Con Peng, Z. R. (2001). Internet GIS for public participation. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 28(6), 889-905.
- Connelly, S. (2010). Participation in a hostile state: how do planners act to shape public engagement in politically difficult environments?. *Planning Practice & Research*, 25(3), 333-351.
- Conroy, M. M., & Gordon, S. I. (2004). Utility of interactive computer-based materials for enhancing public participation. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 47(1), 19-33.
- Corburn, J. (2003). Bringing local knowledge into environmental decision making: Improving urban planning for communities at risk. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 22(4), 420-433.
- Creighton, J. L. (2005). *The public participation handbook: Making better decisions through citizen involvement* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Croft, S., & Beresford, P. (1992). The politics of participation. *Critical Social Policy*, 12(35), 20-44.
- Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2005). *Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared-power world* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crosby, N., Kelly, J. M., & Schaefer, P. (1986). Citizens panels: A new approach to citizen

- participation. *Public Administration Review*, 170-178.
- Dallas City Hall. (2016). *Reducing the epidemic of poverty and ending the opportunity gap: Mayor task force to the Dallas city council*. Retrieved December 15, 2016 from http://dallascityhall.com/government/Council%20Meeting%20Documents/b_reducing-the-epidemic-of-poverty-and-ending-the-opportunity-gap_combined_090716.pdf
- Dallas City Hall. (2015). *Neighborhood Plus: Draft neighborhood revitalization plan for Dallas*. Retrieved December 15, 2016 from <http://dallascityhall.com/departments/pnv/DCH%20Documents/Neighborhood-Plus-June17-small.pdf>
- Dallas Independent School District. (2014). *Facts about: Dallas independent school district*. Retrieved December 15, 2017 from <https://www.dallasisd.org/cms/lib/TX01001475/Centricity/Domain/110/NEO%20-%20Facts%20About%20DISD%202014.pdf>
- Dallas Observer. (2017). *5 Surprising facts about immigrants in DFW*. Retrieved October 22, 2018 from <http://www.dallasobserver.com/news/5-surprising-facts-about-immigrants-in-dfw-9206650>
- Dallas News. (2013). *At 30, DART still faces growing pains*. Retrieved December 14, 2017 from <https://www.dallasnews.com/news/transportation/2013/08/10/at-30-dart-still-faces-growing-pains>
- Dalton, L. C., & Burby, R. J. (1994). Mandates, plans, and planners: Building local commitment to development management. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 60(4), 444-461.

- Damurski, Ł. (2015). From formal to semi-formal and informal communication in urban planning. Insights from Polish municipalities. *European Planning Studies*, 23(8), 1568-1587.
- Day, D. (1997). Citizen participation in the planning process: An essentially contested concept? *Journal of Planning Literature*, 11(3), 421-434.
- de Groot, M., Winnubst, M. H., van Schie, N., & van Ast, J. A. (2014). Visioning with the public: Incorporating public values in landscape planning. *European Planning Studies*, 22(6), 1165-1181.
- DFW International. (2014). *239 Languages are spoken in the DFW metroplex –February 2010*. Retrieved December 05, 2019 from <http://www.dfwinternational.org/demographics/languages>
- de Souza Briggs, X. (1998). Doing democracy up-close: culture, power, and communication in community building. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 18(1), 1-13.
- Dodd, C.H. (1995). *Dynamics of intercultural communication* (4th ed.). Madison, WY: Brown & Benchmark.
- Dong, Q., Day, K.D, & Collaco, C.M. (2008). Overcoming ethnocentrism through developing intercultural communication sensitivity and multiculturalism. *Human Communication 11* (1), 27-38.
- Drandić, D. (2013). Intercultural sensitivity of teachers as precondition for the development of intercultural sensitivity of pupils. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Zagreb).
- Ebdon, C., & Franklin, A. L. (2006). Citizen participation in budgeting theory. *Public Administration Review*, 66(3), 437-447.

- Edwards, J.B. (2016). Cultural intelligence for clinical social work practice. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 44 (3), 211-220.
- Ekong, G., Kavookjian, J., & Hutchison, A. (2017). Predisposition for Empathy, Intercultural Sensitivity, and Intentions for Using Motivational Interviewing in First Year Pharmacy Students. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 81(8), 5989
- Environmental Protection Agency. (2018). *Public participation guide: process planning*. Retrieved February 05, 2017 from <https://www.epa.gov/international-cooperation/public-participation-guide-process-planning>
- Environmental Protection Agency. (2018). *Public participation guide: introduction to public participation*. Retrieved February 05, 2017 from <https://www.epa.gov/international-cooperation/public-participation-guide-introduction-public-participation>
- Environmental Protection Agency. (2017). *Public participation guide: citizen juries*. Retrieved February 05, 2017 from <https://www.epa.gov/international-cooperation/public-participation-guide-citizen-juries>
- Environmental Protection Agency. (2018). *Public participation guide: focus groups*. Retrieved from <https://www.epa.gov/international-cooperation/public-participation-guide-focus-groups>
- Evans-Cowley, J., & Hollander, J. (2010). The new generation of public participation: Internet-based participation tools. *Planning Practice & Research*, 25(3), 397-408.
- Fabregas Janeiro, M. G., Kelsey, K. D., & Robinson, S. J. (2012). Predicting intercultural sensitivity using demographic variables among college of agriculture undergraduate students. *US-China Education review*, 8, 710-719.

- Fiorino, D. J. (1996). Environmental policy and the participation gap. In W.M. Lafferty & J. Meadow-Croft (Eds.), *Democracy and the environment: Problems and prospects*, 194-212. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Fiskaa, H. (2005). Past and future for public participation in Norwegian physical planning. *European Planning Studies*, 13(1), 157-174.
- Fung, A. (2015). Putting the public back into governance: The challenges of citizen participation and its future. *Public Administration Review*, 75(4), 513-522.
- Friedman, J. (1973). *Retracking America*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday
- Friedman, K. (1996). *The informed city: Urban planning at the border of culture and technology*. Sandvika, Norway: Norwegian School of Management.
- Forester, J. (1989). *Planning in the face of power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Forester, J. (1999). *The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes* (1st ed.). Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Forester, J. (2000). Multicultural planning in deed: Lessons from the mediation practice of Shirley Solomon and Larry Sherman. In M. Burayidi (Ed.), *Urban planning in a multicultural society* (pp.147-168). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Forester, J. (2006). Making participation work when interests conflict: Moving from facilitating dialogue and moderating debate to mediating negotiations. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 72(4), 447-456.
- Fritz, W., Mollenberg, A., & Chen, G.M. (2001). Measuring intercultural sensitivity in different cultural context. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 11, 165-176.
- Gaffikin, F., & Sterrett, K. (2006). New visions for old cities: The role of visioning in planning. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 7(2), 159-178.

- Gilens, M. (2012). *Affluence and Influence: Economic Inequality and Political Power in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gittell, M. (1972). Decentralization and citizen participation in education. *Public Administration Review*, 32, 670-686.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Gormley, W. T. (1981). Nonelectoral participation as a response to issue-specific conditions: The case of public utility regulation. *Social Science Quarterly*, 62(3), 527-539.
- Grisez Kweit, M., & Kweit, R. W. (2007). Participation, perception of participation, and citizen support. *American Politics Research*, 35(3), 407-425.
- Gruber, J. E. (1987). *Controlling bureaucracies: Dilemmas in democratic governance*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Halvorsen, K. E. (2003). Assessing the effects of public participation. *Public Administration Review*, 63(5), 535-543.
- Halvorsen, K. E., & Jarvie, M. E. (2002). Working and lower middle class women and obstacles to environmentally related public meeting participation. *Environmental Practice*, 4(1), 36-44.
- Hammersley, M. & Gomm, R. (2008). Assessing the radical critiques of interviews. In: M. Hammersley, (Ed.), *Questioning Qualitative Inquiry: Critical Essays* (pp. 89-100) London: Sage.
- Hammer, M.R. (2008). The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI): An Approach for assessing and building intercultural competence. In M.A. Moodian (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Understanding and utilizing cultural diversity to build successful organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Hammer, M.R., Bennett, M.J. & Wiseman, R. (2003). The Intercultural Development Inventory: A measure of intercultural sensitivity. In M. Paige (Ed), *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 421-443.
- Hammer, M.R., Gudykunst, W.B., & Wiseman, R.L. (1978). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 2, 382-392.
- Hanna, K. S. (2000). The paradox of participation and the hidden role of information: A case study. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 66(4), 398-410.
- Hanzl, M. (2007). Information technology as a tool for public participation in urban planning: a review of experiments and potentials. *Design Studies*, 28(3), 289-307.
- Healey, P. (1996). The communicative turn in planning theory and its implications for spatial strategy formation. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and design*, 23(2), pp. 217-234.
- Healey, P. (2003). Collaborative planning in perspective. *Planning Theory*, 2(2), 101-123.
- Healey, P. (2006). *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hendriks, C. M. (2009). Deliberative governance in the context of power. *Policy and Society*, 28(3), 173-184.
- Hibbard, M. and Lurie, S. (2000). Saving land but losing ground: Challenges to community planning in the era of participation. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 20(2): 187-95

- Hoggart, K., & Nichols Clark, T. (Eds.). (2000). *Citizen responsive government*. New York: JAI Press.
- Hollander, J. A. (2004). The social contexts of focus groups. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 33(5), 602-637.
- Horst W. J. Rittel, & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2), 155-169.
- Hou, J., & Kinoshita, I. (2007). Bridging community differences through informal processes: Reexamining participatory planning in Seattle and Matsudo. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 26(3), 301-314.
- Innes, J. E. (1998). Information in communicative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 64(1), 52-63.
- Innes, J. E. (2004). Consensus building: Clarifications for the critics. *Planning Theory*, 3(1), 5-20.
- Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (2004). Reframing public participation: Strategies for the 21st century. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 5(4), 419-436.
- Innes, J. E., Connick, S., & Booher, D. (2007). Informality as a planning strategy: Collaborative water management in the CALFED bay-delta program. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 73(2), 195-210.
- Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (2010). *Planning with complexity: An introduction to collaborative rationality for public policy*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Irvin, R. A., & Stansbury, J. (2004). Citizen participation in decision making: Is it worth the effort? *Public Administration Review*, 64(1), 55-65.

- Jain, R., Yadov, O. & Rathore, A. (2008). The propagation of benchmarking concepts in Indian manufacturing industry. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 15 (1), 101-117.
- Jaques, M., & Povey, B. (2007). Assessing the changing role, attitudes and knowledge of UK business advisors to the benefits of benchmarking and benchmarking tools. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 14(5), 639-661.
- Johnson, P. (1993). *Frames of deceit: A study of the loss and recovery of public and private trust*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L.B. (2007). Educational research: *Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johnson, R., & Onwuegbuzie, A. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33 (7), 14.
- Kathlene, L., & Martin, J. A. (1991). Enhancing citizen participation: Panel designs, perspectives, and policy formation. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 10(1), 46-63.
- Kakabadse, N. K., Kakabadse, A., & Kouzmin, A. (2003). Reviewing the knowledge management literature: towards a taxonomy. *Journal of knowledge management*, 7(4), 75-91.
- Kenyon, W. (2005). A critical review of citizens' juries: how useful are they in facilitating public participation in the EU Water Framework Directive?. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 48(3), 431-443.
- King, C. S., Stivers, C., & Box, R. C. (1998). *Government is us: Strategies for an anti-government era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- King, C.S., Feltey, K.M., & Susel, B. (1998). The question of participation: Toward authentic public participation in public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 58(4): 317-26.
- Kresova, N. S., Rayuskaya, T. O., & Derkun, C. A. (2010). Cross-cultural communication. *Evropejskij Issledovatel'*, 1(1), 74-77.
- Kweit, M. G., & Kweit, R. W. (1981). *Implementing citizen participation in a bureaucratic society: A contingency approach*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Kymlicka, W. (2007). *Multicultural Odysseys: Navigating the New International Politics of Diversity*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Landis, D., & Bhagat, R.S. (1996). *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Langton, S. (1978). What is citizen participation? In S. Langton (Ed.), *Citizen participation in America* (pp.13-24). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Laurian, L. (2003). A prerequisite for participation: Environmental knowledge and what residents know about local toxic sites. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 22(3), 257-269.
- Laurian, L., & Shaw, M. M. (2008). Evaluation of public participation: the practices of certified planners. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 28(3), 293-309.
- Lavrakas, P.J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Leighninger, M. (2013). Three Minutes at the Microphone: How Outdated Citizen Participation Laws Are Corroding American Democracy. In Working Group on Legal Frameworks for Public Participation (Ed.), *Making Public Participation Legal*, 3-6. Denver CO: National Civil League

- Leighninger, M. (2014). Want to increase trust in government? update our public participation laws. *Public Administration Review*, 74(3), 305-306.
- Lennox, R.D., & Wolfe, R.N. (1984). Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46 (6), 1349-1364.
- Listerborn, C. (2008). Who speaks? And who listens? The relationship between planners and women's participation in local planning in a multi-cultural urban environment, *GeoJournal*, 70 (1), 61–74.
- Lincoln, Y & Guba, E.G. (2000). Paradigm controversies. In Denzin, N & Lincoln Y (Eds), *handbook of qualitative research* (pp.163-168). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Lowndes, V., Pratchett, L., & Stoker, G. (2006). Local participation: the impact of rules-in-use. *Public Administration*, 84 (3), 539-561.
- Lyttle, A. D., Barker, G.G., & Cornwell, T.L. (2011). Adept through adaptation: Third culture individuals' interpersonal sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(5), 686-694.
- Mahjabeen, Z., Shrestha, K. K., & Dee, J. A. (2003). Rethinking community participation in urban planning: The role of disadvantaged groups in Sydney metropolitan strategy. *Australasian Journal of Regional Studies*, 9(1), 45.
- Martin, G. P. (2009). Public and user participation in public service delivery: tensions in policy and practice. *Sociology Compass*, 3(2), 310-326.
- McCann, E. J. (2001) Collaborative visioning or urban planning as therapy? The politics of public-private policy making, *Professional Geographer*, 53(2), pp. 207–218.
- McLaverty, P. (2002). Civil society and democracy. *Contemporary Politics*, 8(4), 303-318.
- McClurg, S. D. (2003). Social networks and political participation: The role of social interaction

- in explaining political participation. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(4), 449-464.
- McCool, S. F., & Guthrie, K. (2001). Mapping the dimensions of successful public participation in messy natural resources management situations. *Society & Natural Resources*, 14(4), 309-323.
- McKay, I. R. (2013). Assessing orientations to cultural difference of the faculty of a university foundation programme in the gulf cooperation council: a mixed-methods approach informed by the intercultural development continuum and using the intercultural development inventory. (Doctoral Thesis, United Kingdom).
- Mehler, D. M., Edelsbrunner, P. A., & Matic, K. (2019). Appreciating the significance of non-significant findings in psychology. *Journal of European Psychology Students*, 10(4).
- Meier, K. J. (2000). *Politics and the bureaucracy: Policymaking in the fourth branch of government*, 4th ed. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Michaels, S., Mason, R. J., & Solecki, W. D. (2001). Participatory research on collaborative environmental management: Results from the Adirondack Park. *Society & Natural Resources*, 14(3), 251-255.
- Midden, C. J. H. (1995). Direct participation in macro-issues: A multiple group approach; an analysis and critique of the Dutch national debate on energy policy, fairness, competence, and beyond. In O. Renn, T. Webler, & P. Wiedemann (Eds.) *Fairness and competence in citizen participation* (pp. 305-320). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., Huberman, M. A., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Milroy, B. M., & Wallace, M. L. (2002). *Ethnoracial diversity and planning practices in the greater Toronto area*. Joint Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Settlement. Ryerson University, Toronto.
- Miraftab, F. (2003). The perils of participatory discourse: Housing policy in postapartheid South Africa. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 22(3), 226-239
- Modiga, G. (2014). Intercultural communication. *EIRP Proceedings*, 9(1), 284-290.
- Moore, C. M., Longo, G. & Palmer, P. (1999) Visioning. In T. Susskind, S. McKernan & J. Thomas-Larmer (Eds). *The consensus building handbook: A comprehensive guide to reaching agreement* (pp. 557–591). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moralle, M. R., Preston, J. S., Chen, L., & Berberian, W. S. (2016). An exploratory study of empathy in resident physicians at an urban medical center. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 9(2), 526.
- Morrison, K. (2003) Stakeholder involvement in water management: Necessity or luxury? *Water Science and Technology*, 47(6), pp. 43–51
- Myren, R. A. (1972). Decentralization and citizen participation in criminal justice systems. *Public Administration Review*, 32, 718-738.
- Nasca, T. F., Changfoot, N., & Hill, S. D. (2019). Participatory planning in a low-income neighbourhood in ontario, canada: Building capacity and collaborative interactions for influence. *Community Development Journal*, 54(4), 622-642.
- Nelson, N., & Wright, S. (1995). *Power and participatory development: Theory and practice*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Neshkova, M. I. (2014). Does agency autonomy foster public participation? *Public Administration Review*, 74(1), 64-74.

- Neshkova, M. I., & Guo, H. (2012). Public participation and organizational performance: Evidence from state agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22(2), 267-288.
- Newig, J., Haberl, H., Pahl-Wostl, C., & Rothman, D. S. (2008). Formalised and non-formalised methods in resource management—knowledge and social learning in participatory processes: an introduction. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 21(6), 381-387.
- Newman, J., Barnes, M., Sullivan, H., & Knops, A. (2004). Public participation and collaborative governance. *Journal of Social Policy*, 33(2), 203-223.
- North Central Texas Council of Governments. (2017). *2017 Population Estimates Highlights*. Retrieved from June 22, 2018 from <http://www.nctcog.org/trans/committees/sttc/documents/hndt.2017ppltn.estmts.sttc042817.pdf>
- North Central Texas Council of Governments. (2017). *The Metropolitan transportation plan for North Central Texas*. Retrieved June 24, 2018 from <https://www.nctcog.org/trans/mtp/2040/documents/Mobility2040Chapters.pdf>
- North Central Texas Council of Governments. (2019). *Mobility 2040: Social Considerations*. Retrieved December 05, 2019 from https://www.nctcog.org/nctcg/media/Transportation/DocsMaps/Quality/Environ/M2040_SocialChapter.pdf
- Peattie, L. R. (1994). Communities and interests in advocacy planning. American Planning Association. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 60(2), 151-153.
- Peng, Z. R. (2001). Internet GIS for public participation. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 28(6), 889-905.

- Pennington, M., & Pestieau, K., & Wallace, M. (2003). Challenges and opportunities for planning in the ethno-culturally diverse city: A collection of papers-- introduction. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 4(3), 253-258.
- Petrovic, D., Starcevic, J., Chen, G., & Komnenic, D. (2015). Intercultural sensitivity scale: Proposal for a modified serbian version. *Psihologija*, 48(3), 199-212.
- Pew Research Center. (2015). *In greater Dallas area, segregation by income and race*. Retrieved March 05, 2018 from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/06/29/in-greater-dallas-area-segregation-by-income-and-race/#>
- Pew Research Center. (2019). *Key findings about U.S. immigrants*. Retrieved November 10, 2019 from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/06/17/key-findings-about-u-s-immigrants/>
- Pickering, T., & Minnery, J. (2012). Scale and public participation: Issues in metropolitan regional planning. *Planning Practice & Research*, 27(2), 249-262.
- Pollock, D. C., & Van Reken, R. E. (2001). *Third culture kids: The experience of growing up among the worlds*. Boston: Nicholas Brealey
- Portalla, T., & Chen, G. M. (2010). The development and validation of the intercultural effectiveness scale. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 19(3), 21-37.
- Potapchuk, W. R. (1996). Building sustainable community politics: Synergizing participatory, institutional, and representative democracy. *National Civic Review*, 85(3), 54-59.
- Potapchuk, W. R., & Crocker Jr, J. P. (1999a). Exploring the elements of civic capital. *National Civic Review*, 88(3), 175-202.

- Potapchuk, W. R., & Crocker, J. (1999b). Implementing consensus-based agreements. In Sussking, L., McKernan, S. & Thomas-Larner, J. (Eds), *The Consensus Building Handbook. A Comprehensive Guide to Reaching Agreement* (pp. 527-556). London: Sage Publications.
- Prater, C. S., & Lindell, M. K. (2000). Politics of hazard mitigation. *Natural Hazards Review*, 1(2), 73-82.
- Qadeer, M. (2009). What is This Thing Called Multicultural Planning? *Plan Canada: Special Edition*, 10-13.
- Qadeer, M. A., & Agrawal, S. K. (2011). The practice of multicultural planning in American and Canadian cities. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 20(1), 132-156.
- Rahder, B., & Milgrom, R. (2004). The uncertain city: Making space for difference. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 13(2), S27.
- Rahimi, A., & Soltani, A. (2011). Teachability of intercultural sensitivity from the perspective of ethnocentrism vs. ethnorelativism: An Iranian experience. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 113-139.
- Regional Transportation Authority Chicago. (2015). 2015 *Sub-regional peer review*. Retrieved August 29, 2016 from <https://www.rtachicago.org/files/documents/2015%20Sub-regional%20Peer%20Report.pdf>
- Roberts, N. (2004). Public Deliberation in an age of direct citizen participation. *American Review of Public Administration* 34:315–53.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Rosenberg, S. W. (2007). Rethinking democratic deliberation: The limits and potential of citizen participation. *Polity*, 39(3), 335-360.
- Rosenman, R., Tennekoon, V., & Hill, L. G. (2011). Measuring bias in self-reported data. *International Journal of Behavioural & Healthcare Research*, 2(4), 320.
- Rowe, G., & Frewer, L. J. (2000). Public participation methods: A framework for evaluation. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 25(1), 3-29.
- Rowe, G., & Frewer, L. J. (2005). A typology of public engagement mechanisms. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 30(2), 251-290.
- Roy, M. M., & Gordon, S. I. (2004). Utility of interactive computer-based materials for enhancing public participation. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 47(1), 19-33.
- Russell, S., & Vidler, E. (2000). The rise and fall of government-community partnerships for urban development: grassroots testimony from Colombo. *Environment and Urbanization*, 12(1), 73-86.
- Ruiz-Bernardo, P. (2012) Validación de un instrumento para el estudio de la sensibilidad intercultural en la provincia de Castellón. (Doctoral dissertation, Spain).
- Ruiz-Bernardo, P., Sanchiz-Ruiz, M. L., & Gil-Gómez, J. (2014). Study of intercultural sensitivity among young people in the province of Castellón, Spain. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 132, 318-323.
- Rydin, Y. (2000). Researching social capital in local environmental policy contexts. *Policy & Politics*, 28(2), 233-249.

- Rydin, Y., & Pennington, M. (2000). Public participation and local environmental planning: the collective action problem and the potential of social capital. *Local Environment*, 5(2), 153-169.
- Sager, T. (2009). Responsibilities of theorists: The case of communicative planning theory. *Progress in Planning*, 72(1), 1-51.
- Sanchez, T. W., Stolz, R., & Ma, J. S. (2003). Moving to equity: Addressing inequitable effects of transportation policies on minorities. The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University, Cambridge: MA.
- Sanoff, H. (2000). *Community participation methods in design and planning*. New York: Wiley.
- Sandercock, Leonie. (1998). *Towards cosmopolis. Planning for multicultural cities*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Sandercock, L. (2000). Negotiating fear and desire: The future of planning in multicultural societies. *Urban Forum*, 11(2), 201-210.
- Sandercock, L. (2003a). Planning in the ethno-culturally diverse city: A comment. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 4(3), 319-323.
- Sandercock, L. (2003b). Out of the closet: The importance of stories and storytelling in planning practice. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 4(1), 11-28.
- Sandercock, L. (2004). Towards a planning imagination for the 21st century. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70(2): 133–141.
- Schaller, S., & Modan, G. (2005). Contesting public space and citizenship: Implications for neighborhood business improvement districts. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24(4), 394-407.
- Seltzer, E., & Mahmoudi, D. (2012). Citizen participation, open innovation, and crowdsourcing:

- Challenges and opportunities for planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 28(1), 3-18.
- Senge, P. M. (1994). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organisation*.
New York: Doubleday.
- Shiple, R. (2002). Visioning in planning: Is the practice based on sound theory? *Environment and Planning A*, 34(1), 7-22.
- Shiple, R., & Utz, S. (2012). Making it count: A review of the value and techniques for public consultation. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 27(1), 22-42.
- Shepherd, A., & Bowler, C. (1997). Beyond the requirements: Improving public participation in EIA. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 40(6), 725-738.
- Sieber, R. (2006). Public participation geographic information systems: A literature review and framework. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 96(3), 491-507.
- Simon, J. S. (1999). How to conduct focus groups. *Nonprofit World*, 17, 40-43.
- Smith, L. G. (1983). *Impact assessment and sustainable resource management*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Soltani, A. (2014). Impact of ethnic background on Iranian EFL university students' intercultural sensitivity level. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 222-227.
- Talen, E. (1999). Perceptual GIS: a new tool for individual and group expression in participatory planning. *Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning*. Paper presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning annual meeting, Chicago, IL.
- Tamam, E. (2010). Examining Chen and Starosta's model of intercultural sensitivity in a multiracial collectivistic country. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 39(3), 173-183.

- Tamam, E., & Krauss, S. E. (2017). Ethnic-related diversity engagement differences in intercultural sensitivity among Malaysian undergraduate students. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 22*(2), 137-150.
- Terenzini, P. T., & Upcraft, M. L. (1996). Using quantitative methods. In M. L. Upcraft & J. H. Schuh (Eds.), *Assessment in student affairs: A guide for practitioners* (pp. 84–109). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Thomas, J. C., & Streib, G. (2003). The new face of government: citizen-initiated contacts in the era of E-Government. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 13*(1), 83-102.
- Thomas, J. C. (2013). Citizen, customer, partner: Rethinking the place of the public in public management. *Public Administration Review, 73*(6), 786-796.
- Timney, M. M. (1998). Overcoming administrative barriers to citizen participation: Citizens as partners, not adversaries. In King & Stivers (Eds.), *Government is us: Public administration in an anti-government era*, 88-101. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Timney, M. M. (1996). Overcoming NIMBY: Using citizen participation effectively. *American Society for Public Administration*. Paper presented at the 57th national conference of the American Society for Public Administration, Atlanta, GA.
- Tolchin, S. J. (1996). *The angry American: How voter rage is changing the nation* (2nd ed.). Boulder Colorado: Westview Press.
- Tompkins, A., Cook, T., Miller, E., & LePeau, L. A. (2017). Gender influences on students' study abroad participation and intercultural competence. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 54*(2), 204-216.

- Trawalter, S., & Richeson, J. A. (2008). Let's talk about race, baby! When Whites' and Blacks' interracial contact experiences diverge. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(4), 1214-1217.
- Umemoto, K. (2001). Walking in another's shoes: Epistemological challenges in participatory planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 21(1), 17-31.
- United States Census Bureau. (2017). *QuickFacts Dallas, Texas*. Retrieved September 05, 2018 from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/dallascitytexas/PST045216>
- United States Department of Transportation. (2018). *Transportation planning capacity building*. Retrieved June 22, 2019 from https://www.planning.dot.gov/PublicInvolvement/pi_documents/3b-a.asp
- Uzun, Ö., & Sevinç, S. (2015). The relationship between cultural sensitivity and perceived stress among nurses working with foreign patients. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 24(23-24), 3400-3408.
- Van Herzele, A. (2004). Local knowledge in action: Valuing nonprofessional reasoning in the planning process. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24(2), 197-212.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Villar, D. C. (2010). How Savvy are we?: Towards predicting intercultural sensitivity. *Human Communication*, 13 (3), 197-215.
- Vogt, D. S., King, D. W., & King, L. A. (2004). Focus groups in psychological assessment: enhancing content validity by consulting members of the target population. *Psychological Assessment*, 16(3), 231.

- Wabash College.(nd). *Review of the intercultural development inventory for assessing outcomes of a liberal art education*. Retrieved December 04, 2019 from https://www.wabash.edu/news/displaystory.cfm?news_ID=2614
- Wallace, M. (2000). Where planning meets multiculturalism: A view of planning practice in the Greater Toronto Area. *Plan Canada*, 40(4), 19-20.
- Wallace, M. & Milroy, B. (1999) Intersecting claims: planning in Canada's cities, In T. Fenster (Ed.) *Gender planning and human rights* (pp. 55-73). London: Routledge.
- Walters, L. C., Aydelotte, J., & Miller, J. (2000). Putting more public in policy analysis. *Public Administration Review*, 60(4), 349-359.
- Wang, X. (2001). Assessing public participation U.S. cities. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 24(4), 322-336.
- Wang, X., & Van Mart, M. (2007). When public participation in administration leads to trust: An empirical assessment of managers' perceptions. *Public Administration Review*, 67(2), 265-278.
- Waterton, C., & Wynne, B. (1998). Can focus groups access community views?. In R.S., Barbour & J, Kitzinger, J. (Eds), *Developing focus group research* (pp. 127-143). London: SAGE Publications.
- Weber, L. M., Loumakis, A., & Bergman, J. (2003). Who participates and why? An analysis of citizens on the Internet and the mass public. *Social Science Computer Review*, 21(1), 26-42.
- Weber, E. P., & Khademian, A. M. (1997). From agitation to collaboration: Clearing the air through negotiation. *Public Administration Review*, 57(5), 396-410.

- Wheeless, V. E., & Duran, R. L. (1982). Gender orientation as a correlate of communicative competence. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 48, 51-61
- Wiedemann, P. M., & Femers, S. (1993). Public participation in waste management decision making: Analysis and management of conflicts. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 33(3), 355-368.
- Williams, B. L., Suen, H. K., Brown, S., Bruhn, R., De Blaquiere, R., & Rzasa, S. E. (2001). Hierarchical linear models of factors associated with public participation among residents living near the US Army's chemical weapons stockpile sites. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 44(1), 41-65.
- Wulz, F. (1986). The concept of participation. *Design Studies*, 7(3), 153-162.
- Yang, K. (2006). Trust and citizen involvement decisions: Trust in citizens, trust in institutions, and propensity to trust. *Administration & Society*, 38(5), 573-595.
- Yang, K., & Callahan, K. (2005). Assessing citizen involvement efforts by local governments. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 29(2), 191-216.
- Yang, K., & Pandey, S. (2011). Further dissecting the black box of citizen participation: When does citizen involvement lead to good outcomes?. *Public Administration Review*, 71(6), 880-892.
- Yetiş, V. A., & Kurt, Ç. (2016). Intercultural sensitivity levels of Turkish pre-service foreign language teachers: Examples from education faculties of two universities in Turkey. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(17), 1719-1730.
- Yilmaz, M., Toksoy, S., Direk, Z. D., Bezirgan, S., & Boylu, M. (2017). Cultural sensitivity

- among clinical nurses: A descriptive study. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 49(2), 153-161.
- Young, I. M. (2001). Activist challenges to deliberative democracy. *Political Theory*, 29(5), 670-690.
- Zanetti, L. A. (1998). At the nexus of state and civil society. In C.S. King & C. Stivers (Eds.), *Government is us: Public administration in an anti-government era* (pp.102-121). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zhuang, Z. C. (2013). Rethinking multicultural planning: An empirical study of ethnic retailing. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 22(2), 90-116.
- Zlomislic, J., Gverijeri, L. R., & Bugaric, E. (2016). The significance of intercultural competence in cross-cultural communication. *Ekonomski Vjesnik*, 29(2), 433.