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ABSTRACT

Immigrants’ Engagement in Tourism Planning: 
The Case of the Rouge National Urban Park
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University of Guelph, 2015

Advisors:
Dr. Statia Elliot
Dr. Marion Joppe

The overarching goal of this research is to provide a deeper understanding of the current approach to immigrants’ engagement in tourism related public decision-making activities and to suggest underlying principles for designing more inclusive community engagement processes. The research was conducted in the context of Canada’s first National Urban Park located in one of the most diverse neighbourhoods in the Greater Toronto Area. An inductive and interpretivist approach was adopted for this study and data were collected from three groups of participants: planners, partner/community organizations, and first generation immigrant community leaders. Semi-structured interviews were conducted as the primary data gathering method, while document analysis served as a secondary method for gaining familiarity with the research context as well as identifying consistencies, inconsistencies, and potential gaps in the data. The research process was informed by the constructivist grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2006).

The first research objective is addressed by exploring participants’ perceptions of the community participation concept as well as identifying building blocks of the current approach to immigrants’ engagement. Insights gained from studying the current situation, as well as additional data on research participants’ suggestions for enhancing immigrants’ engagement, supports the development of underlying principles for more inclusive participation processes.
This study contributes to the literature on stakeholder participation in tourism planning in two main ways: first, by conducting empirical research with members of a host community as a heterogeneous stakeholder group; and second, by focusing on immigrants as important yet under-represented and under-studied tourism stakeholders, who contribute considerably to ongoing changes in host communities. It provides a foundation for future studies aiming to improve the scope and quality of community engagement by addressing the challenges of dynamic and diverse future communities. In practice, research findings will help planners to facilitate and enhance immigrants’ participation in tourism planning.
Dedication

This work is dedicated to my parents Soussan and Fereidoon, my sister Mitra, and my brother Babak. Words can never express how thankful I am for your love and support.
Acknowledgements

I am grateful to my supervisors, Dr. Statia Elliot and Dr. Marion Joppe for their tremendous support, patience, and mentorship. Thank you for guiding me through my PhD journey with such genuine care and kindness. You are my role models.

Very special thanks go to my advisory committee members Dr. Heather Mair, Dr. Elizabeth Kurucz, and Dr. Chris Choi for their encouragement, guidance, and contributions. It was truly an honor to work with and learn from you.

I would also like to thank Dr. Paul Eagles, Dr. Al Lauzon, and Dr. Miana Plesca, for participating in my examining committee and for their valuable comments.

I am thankful to Mr. Scott Meis and Ms. Denisa Georgescu for their advice and insights at the early stages of this research, which was instrumental in choosing Rouge National Urban Park as the research context and in connecting with research participants. I would also like to thank Parks Canada for supporting my research through information and time. This study would not have been possible without the contribution of participants, who generously took the time to share their opinions and stories with me.

Finally, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the faculty and staff of the College of Business and Economics and School of Hospitality, food and Tourism Management as well as my colleagues and friends for making my five years in the PhD program a wonderful experience, filled with beautiful memories.
Table of Contents

1 Introduction .................................................................................................................. 1
  1.1 Research Objectives and Approach ....................................................................... 4
  1.2 Organization of Thesis .......................................................................................... 5
2 Literature Review ........................................................................................................ 6
  2.1 Application of Stakeholder Theory to Advance Community Participation .......... 7
    2.1.1 Community participation in tourism planning ................................................. 7
    2.1.2 The evolution of stakeholder theory .............................................................. 11
    2.1.3 Implications of progressive approaches to stakeholder theory for enhancing
          community engagement in tourism planning ................................................. 14
  2.2 The Case for Engaging First Generation Immigrants in Tourism Planning .......... 18
  2.3 Immigrants’ Engagement in Planning for Urban Nature Parks ............................ 21
    2.3.1 Immigrants as visitors ................................................................................... 22
    2.3.2 Immigrants as members of host communities ............................................... 26
  2.4 Summary of the Literature Review ...................................................................... 30
3 Research Approach and Methodology ........................................................................ 32
  3.1 Philosophical Assumptions: Ontology and Epistemology of the Research .......... 32
    3.1.1 Ontological assumptions ............................................................................. 33
    3.1.2 Epistemological assumption ....................................................................... 34
  3.2 Research Approach ............................................................................................... 34
  3.3 Research Context .................................................................................................. 36
  3.4 Data Gathering ..................................................................................................... 40
  3.5 Data Analysis ........................................................................................................ 43
    3.5.1 Initial coding .................................................................................................. 44
    3.5.2 Focused coding using NVivo ........................................................................ 44
    3.5.3 Axial coding through mind mapping ............................................................ 45
    3.5.4 Between-group analysis ............................................................................... 46
    3.5.5 Memo writing ............................................................................................... 46
    3.5.6 Connecting findings to theory ................................................................. 47
    3.5.7 Composing the first complete draft ............................................................. 48
3.6 Establishing Research Rigour: Criteria for Quality and Trustworthiness .......... 48

4 Findings and Interpretations ................................................................. 54

4.1 Understanding the Current Situation .................................................. 55

4.1.1 Meaning of community participation ............................................. 55

4.1.2 Planners’ approach to engaging first generation immigrants ................. 58

4.2 Principles of More Inclusive Consultation Processes ................................ 74

4.2.1 Adopting an ongoing, long-term, and communicative approach ............... 75

4.2.2 Being open to new perspectives and willing to revisit assumptions .......... 77

4.2.3 Engaging in short-term and long-term learning .................................. 80

4.2.4 Collaborating with community leaders ............................................. 83

4.2.5 Designing parallel strategies and customized tactics ............................. 86

5 Conclusion ......................................................................................... 91

5.1 Research Positioning and Theoretical Contributions .................................. 91

5.1.1 Contributions to the tourism planning literature .................................. 92

5.1.2 Contributions to stakeholder theory literature ................................... 98

5.2 Practical Contributions ....................................................................... 99

5.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research .................................... 100

References ......................................................................................... 103

Appendix A: Map of Rouge National Urban Park ....................................... 116

Appendix B: Rouge National Urban Park Establishment Process .................. 117

Appendix C: Guiding Principles for Establishment and Management of the Park .... 118

Appendix D: Interview Questions - Planners and Partner Organizations .......... 119

Appendix E: Interview Questions - Community Leaders .............................. 120

Appendix F: List of Reviewed Documents .................................................. 121

Appendix G: Memo Mind Maps .................................................................. 122

Appendix H: Coding Tables ...................................................................... 128
List of Tables

Table 3-1. Diversity in neighbourhoods around the Rouge National Urban Park ....................... 38
Table 3-2. Criteria for grounded theory studies and strategies adopted to address them .......... 53
List of Figures

Figure 2-1. Conceptual framework ................................................................. 6
Figure 2-2. Advancing fringe stakeholder engagement in tourism planning .......... 14
Figure 3-1. Research participants .................................................................. 40
Figure 3-2. Data analysis process ................................................................... 44
Figure 4-1. Meaning of community participation ............................................ 57
Figure 4-2. Planners’ approach in engaging first generation immigrant .......... 73
Figure 4-3. Berkes’ (2009) roles of bridge organizations in co-management .... 85
Figure 5-1. Research findings ........................................................................ 95
1 Introduction

The participatory approaches to tourism planning are highly complex (Wilson, Fesenmaier, Fesenmaier & Van Es, 2001). They require a deep understanding of community members’ as well as other stakeholders’ perspectives, experiences, and views toward participation in tourism related decision-making activities. To better understand residents’ attitudes toward tourism and to find effective ways for engaging them in tourism planning, a wide range of theories from different disciplines have been brought to the tourism field (Nunkoo, Smith & Ramkissoon, 2013). Two limitations can be identified in empirical studies on community engagement: (1) host community is typically considered as a homogenous stakeholder group; and (2) studies have largely been focused on the current needs, expectations and perceptions of community members, with little attention paid to the dynamic nature of communities. This is partly because most of the studies on residents’ attitudes toward tourism have been conducted in “economically strapped rural communities” (McGehee & Andereck, 2004, p.132) with relatively homogenous ethnic populations. Yet these characteristics do not reflect the reality of urban communities that are becoming increasingly diverse and dynamic as a result of immigration. The heterogeneous nature of host communities and the importance of engaging smaller community segments in tourism planning have been highlighted in the literature (e.g. Jamal & Stronza, 2009; Okazaki, 2008). In addition, accommodating both current and future needs and expectations of host communities has been emphasized as a key component of sustainable tourism development (Byrd, 2007). However, empirical studies on elements of successful community engagement in diverse and changing communities are lacking. In particular, first generation immigrants’ engagement in tourism planning has rarely been studied, despite the growing number of immigrants in developed countries like Canada, Australia, the U.S., the U.K. and many others.

In a broader context of civic participation, Baer (2008) mentioned immigrants’ engagement in voluntary activities as an “under-investigated area” (p.4). Immigrants remain largely on the fringe of community planning endeavours, their voices unheard and their value underutilized. Yet immigrants’ input to policy has been recognized as one of the key criteria for ranking countries in terms of their success in integrating immigrants (Huddleston, Niessen, Chaoimh & White, 2011).
Stakeholder theory lends a useful lens and an appropriate theoretical foundation for approaching this issue. Despite considerable influence of stakeholder theory on the tourism literature (e.g. Sheehan & Ritchie, 2005; Byrd, 2007; Bornhorst, Ritchie & Sheehan, 2010; d'Angella & Go, 2009; Timur & Getz, 2008; 2009), its application has been limited to early studies focused on powerful and salient stakeholders (e.g. Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997; Agle, Mitchell & Sonnenfeld, 1999). However, the evolution of the literature on stakeholder theory shows increasingly more attention paid to the heterogeneity within stakeholder groups, with specific emphasis on marginalized and fringe segments (Burton & Dunn, 1996; Hart & Sharma, 2004; Roloff, 2007; Crane & Ruebottom, 2011). Researchers are also moving toward suggesting more customized strategic alternatives for addressing diverse stakeholder claims and needs (e.g. Dunham, Freeman & Liedtka, 2006). These advancements, which have received very limited attention in the tourism field, can be valuable in gaining a better understanding of the state of theory and practice of community engagement in tourism planning as well as moving toward more inclusive community engagement approaches.

Community engagement has been paramount for national park agencies due to the critical role that community support plays in “successful long-term protection” of these sites (Mannigel, 2008, p. 499) as well as the future of national park agencies as relevant institutions. Designing more inclusive planning processes that account for “emerging social and environmental issues” has been identified as one of the main needs that should be addressed:

“Planning systems must be increasingly developed to be more inclusive of these [local and experiential] forms of knowledge and of the people affected by or interested in a park or protected area” (Eagles & McCool, 2002, pp. 312-313).

Immigration has added another dimension to the already complex and messy context, as described by McCool (2009), of planning for parks and protected areas. The trend toward establishing wilderness and nature parks closer to urban areas, with large immigrant populations, has created significant pressure but also a great opportunity for planners to connect with immigrant communities as important and less-engaged stakeholder groups. Yet, so far the focus in both scholarly and practitioner efforts has been on the engagement of immigrants and minority groups as visitors and not partners in planning and decision making activities.
This study addresses these gaps in two main ways: first, by conducting empirical research with members of the host community as a heterogeneous stakeholder group; and second, by focusing on immigrants as important yet under-represented and under-studied tourism stakeholders, who contribute considerably to ongoing changes in host communities.

Engaging immigrants in tourism planning is important from both normative and instrumental perspectives. From the instrumental point of view, today’s new immigrants will form a major proportion of future hosts. They will influence and be influenced by tourism planning in various ways, therefore, their long-term support is crucial for sustainable tourism development. Active and meaningful engagement is the only way that would allow planners to incorporate immigrants’ needs and expectations in tourism plans, accurately and without being influenced by steryotypical assumptions. In addition, community members’ diverse perspectives, experiences, and world views can provide a valuable source of innovation, which is essential for addressing the complex issues faced by planners in the context of parks and protected areas.

From the normative point of view, public participation in tourism planning should serve a broader purpose, namely “fulfilling stakeholders’ needs and aspirations for the benefit of society and the tourism industry” (Marzuki, Hay & James, 2012, p. 590). In a democratic society, all attempts should be made to engage stakeholders in decision making processes and to ensure that less powerful groups have not been “marginalised” (Reed, Graves, Dandy, Posthumus, Hubacek, Morris et al., 2009, p.2420). In the context of parks and protected areas, “growing demands for democratic forms of government” is identified as one of the major trends influencing management practices (Eagles & McCool, 2002, p.296). Jamal & Stronza (2009) emphasize the importance of providing equal opportunities for engaging and empowering “those most disadvantaged and least capable of receiving fair treatment” in the planning process (p.174). Because education and empowerment are main elements of community engagement, it could facilitate immigrants’ transition to their new life and help them to become active members of society by becoming more knowledgeable about different aspects of their new country. Research shows how immigrants’ participation in outdoor leisure activities can enhance their sense of belonging to the new country.
“Leisure practices may play an important role in home-making, insofar they are situated in time and physical as well as social space. Through embodied leisure practice, migrants are not only \textit{in} the place where they happen to live, they also become \textit{of} that place” (Mata-Codesal, Peperkamp & Tiesler, 2015, pp. 1-2).

In the same vein, it has been argued that gaining knowledge about attractions in the new country and being able to share that knowledge with others can contribute to immigrants’ empowerment (Horolets, 2015).

This research can provide a foundation for future studies aiming at improving the scope as well as quality of community engagement by addressing the challenges of dynamic and diverse future communities. In addition, research findings would help planners to facilitate and enhance immigrants’ participation in tourism planning in practice. More general insights into immigrants’ participation, applicable to other fields, can also be gained from the study. It is hoped that this dissertation can meet the “social usefulness” criterion for evaluating academic research. According to which, scholarly works should contribute to “a greater good” by addressing real world, practical issues and “hearing alternative views” (Oliver, 2009, p. 30).\(^1\)

1.1 Research Objectives and Approach

The overarching goal of this research is to provide a deeper understanding of the current approach to immigrants’ engagement in tourism related public decision-making activities and to suggest underlying principles for designing more inclusive community engagement processes. The interdisciplinary nature of the topic connects the study to a broad range of disciplines with different levels of relevance. In order to maintain focus ideas and concepts are mostly drawn from studies on stakeholder theory, public planning, sustainable tourism development, immigrants’ participation in leisure activities, and learning theories.

The research was conducted in the context of Canada’s first National Urban Park located in one of the most diverse neighbourhoods in the Greater Toronto Area. In line with the inductive and interpretivist approach adopted for this study, the phenomenon needed to be explored from

\(^1\) This section is derived in part from an article published in Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 05August 2015, available online: http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09669582.2015.1042481.
different perspectives. Therefore, data were gathered from three groups of participants: planners, partner/community organizations, and first generation immigrant community leaders. Semi-structured interviews were conducted as the primary data gathering method, while document analysis served as a secondary method for gaining familiarity with the research context as well as identifying consistencies, inconsistencies, and potential gaps in the data. The research process is informed by the constructivist grounded theory approach introduced by Charmaz (2006).

1.2 Organization of Thesis

The dissertation is organized in five chapters. The first chapter establishes the research significance, outlines the research objectives, and provides an overview of the dissertation. The second chapter presents the conceptual framework that has informed the research. The discussion in chapter 2 is organized in three sections: application of progressive approaches to stakeholder theory for enhancing community engagement in tourism planning; the case for engaging first generation immigrants in tourism related planning and decision making activities; and, immigrants’ engagement in planning for urban nature parks. Chapter 3 explains the philosophical assumptions as well as the methodological approach adopted for this research. This chapter also includes an overview of the research context and the criteria used for ensuring research quality and trustworthiness. In the fourth chapter, research findings are discussed using insights gained from exploring additional areas of literature. The literature review at this stage was guided by research findings as suggested by the constructivist grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2006). Selected interview excerpts are presented throughout the chapter as “power quotes”, while additional “proof quotes” and coding details are included as an appendix (Pratt, 2009, p.860). Chapter 5 summarizes theoretical and practical contributions of the dissertation, provides a reflection on study limitations, and offers suggestions for future research.
This chapter discusses the underlying conceptual framework of the study. Figure 2-1 illustrates three main domains that inform this research. The confluence of push factors (i.e. progressive approaches to the stakeholder theory), and the heterogeneous nature of the host community as a pull factor, along with immigration (as a phenomenon that is contributing to the dynamic nature of host communities) has simultaneously brought forward the need to enhance the engagement of first generation immigrants, and the need to research different aspects of this topic.

This chapter comprises three sections. In the first section, I discuss how progressive approaches to stakeholder theory can help to identify under-studied areas in the literature on community participation in tourism planning, with specific focus on less engaged community segments. The second section discusses the case for engaging first generation immigrants, as one of the less-engaged community subgroups in tourism related planning and decision making activities. Lastly, I will focus on immigrants’ engagement with national parks and protected areas, as the context selected for this study.

Figure 2-1. Conceptual framework

---

2 This section is derived in part from an article published in Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 05August 2015, available online: http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09669582.2015.1042481.
2.1 Application of Stakeholder Theory to Advance Community Participation

In the following pages, I first review the literature on community participation in tourism planning. Next, the evolution of stakeholder theory in the mainstream management field and how it can enhance community engagement in tourism planning is discussed. The section concludes with a discussion of potential directions for future research in the field.

2.1.1 Community participation in tourism planning

Community is defined as “a geographical area, or a group of people with shared origins or interests” (Aas, Ladkin & Fletcher, 2005, p.30). In the same vein, Joppe (1996) provides the following definition for community:

“Community is self-defining in that it is based on a sense of shared purpose and common goals. It may be geographical in nature, or a community of interest built on heritage and cultural values shared among community members” (Joppe, p. 475).

For decades, community members have been considered as one of the most important tourism stakeholder groups. Murphy (1983) argued that tourism is a “community industry”, using the analogy of a corporation that “represents the interests of the whole community” (p.181). Further, community members are considered key components of the very “hospitality atmosphere” in destinations (Simmons, 1994, p. 98). Jamal and Getz (1995) introduced a “collaborative community-based planning process” as a way to increase destination competitiveness and to move towards sustainable tourism development (p. 200). Drawing on Jamal and Getz’s study, Sheehan and Ritchie (2005) indicated that Destination Management Organization (DMO) managers perceive residents as stakeholder groups that can be highly influential in both positive and negative ways (through collaboration or by acting as threats). More recently, Bornhorst, Ritchie and Sheehan (2010) advocated “community support” as one of the three determinants of tourism success for both destinations and DMOs.

According to Tosun (2000), the emergence of community participation as “an umbrella term” and a “new genre of development intervention” can be traced back to the 1970s (p. 615). The community participation approach in development is explained as follows:
“to design development in such a way that intended beneficiaries are encouraged to take matters into their own hands, to participate in their own development through mobilizing their own resources, defining their own needs and making their own decisions about how to meet them” (Stone, 1989, p. 207).

Changes in the broader political and economic environment in the United States and Canada contributed to the increasing emphasis on stakeholder participation in decision-making and economic development at local and regional levels (Mair, 2006). Private-sector partners became increasingly involved in economic development as the government’s role gradually changed from managerialism to entrepreneurialism during the 1980s (Harvey, 1989). According to MacLeod (1999) during the 1990s, as the result of the shift from “centrally administered and bureaucratic government” to “governance”, a broader range of local stakeholders including business elites became engaged in public policy (p. 346). Consequently, more attention was paid to “diverse forms of collaborative management, public and private sector partnerships, delegated authority and community management”. Another factor that contributed to the growing trend toward public participation in local decision-making processes was the “increasing disconnection between people and traditional representative democracy” (Bramwell, 2010, pp. 242-243). Local participation could provide residents an opportunity to directly influence decisions that would affect their lives.

Seminal works of Arnstein (1969) and Aggens (1998) in the general planning field, frequently referenced in tourism studies, discuss different levels of participation. Arnstein’s (1969) typology, named the ladder of citizen participation, distinguishes between eight levels of participation, categorized in three groups: non-participation; degree of tokenism; and degree of citizen power. Levels grouped as non-participation focus on “educating” or “curing” citizens without any attempt to engage them in the decision-making process, or even to ask for their opinion. When engaging in the second “tokenism” group, citizens receive information and have the opportunity to express their opinions. However, they still have no power to influence either the resulting decisions or their implementation. At the highest levels of the ladder, citizens “engage in trade-offs with traditional power holders” and have the power to fully control decisions (p. 217). Aggens (1998) categorized the general public into six groups by level of participation in public projects: unsurprised apathetics; observers; reviewers; advisors; creators (plan makers); and decision makers. The level of interest and energy devoted to the project increases gradually from the first to the last group while the size of the participating group
decreases. Drawing on typologies of community participation in the development studies literature, Tosun (1999) introduces a framework specifically designed for the tourism industry that discusses community participation in three groups, namely spontaneous; induced; and coercive participation. He emphasizes the importance of flexibility in approaching community participation in different contexts and the need to adjust participation models based on the unique characteristics of each destination (Tosun, 2006). Ross, Buchy & Proctor (2002), suggest a more comprehensive framework in an attempt to better address the complexity of community participation, especially in the field of natural resources management. In addition to power sharing, which forms the basis of previous typologies, this model takes the following factors into account:

“agency (which parties carry the initiative), tenure (the nature of the parties' control over the resources), the nature of the participants, the nature of the task, and its duration” (205).

*Participation* and *engagement* have typically been used to describe similar concepts in the tourism literature, although more precise definitions can be found in other fields such as organizational behaviour (e.g. Macey & Schneider, 2008; Maslach, Schaufelli, & Leiter, 2001). For the purpose of this research, the term *engagement* is used because it implies the higher end of the public participation continuum, meaning a deeper connection beyond simple involvement, reflecting a shared well-being. Community engagement is described by the International Association for Public Participation (2007) as: a “two-way communication process between planners and community” which is a continuum with no involvement at the lowest level, and empowerment, defined as “the ability to make and control the outcome”, at the highest level.

In the tourism field, the degree of community participation in planning activities has been influenced by the dominant approaches to stakeholder participation and their underlying assumptions. Byrd (2007) explained that there are two approaches to stakeholder involvement in tourism. The first approach, drawing on studies in the management field (and more specifically earlier interpretations of stakeholder theory) is based on the idea that managers should be aware of, and take into account, interests and expectations of different stakeholder groups in their strategic decisions. But, since various stakeholders have different levels of power over the organization, managers do not consider all stakeholders as equally important and put more emphasis on the more salient ones. The second approach to stakeholder involvement is based on
the “collaborative thinking” concept, which considers all stakeholder groups as equally important (p. 9). Other scholars, such as Lew (2007) argue that the functional rationality approach has been dominant in tourism planning. This view is based on the assumption that tourism goals are defined mainly by stakeholders that do not necessarily represent “poor and disenfranchised” community members (p. 389). The “transactive planning approach” is suggested as an alternative way of planning. Based on this approach, the planner is considered as the “agent of social change” and all stakeholders engage in a “mutual learning process” (Lew, 2007, p. 389). Mair and Reid (2007) also argued that the “social guidance” approach has been dominant in tourism planning. This approach emphasizes the “technical, scientific knowledge” and hence considers planning as the job of professionals and not community members (p.406). In line with Lew (2007), they suggest adopting an alternative approach, named “social transformation” (p. 407), whereby a broader range of stakeholders should be empowered and supported by the planner, not only to participate in, but also to control the planning process.

The impact of the sustainable development paradigm on the tourism field, and the interest in “sustainable tourism” during the late 1980s and 1990s (Joppe, 1996), refocused attention on community participation as a key factor in tourism planning success. The importance of citizens’ participation in achieving sustainable development goals is clearly stated in the seminal report, Our Common Future, prepared by the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development (1987):

“Humanity has the ability to make development sustainable - to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. . . . Meeting essential needs requires not only a new era of economic growth for nations in which the majority are poor but an assurance that those poor get their fair share of the resources required to sustain that growth, such equity would be aided by political systems that secure effective citizen participation in decision making and by greater democracy in international decision making” (p. 8).

This established the community, along with government and industry, as one of the three key partners for sustainable tourism development (Hung, Sirakaya, & Ingram, 2011).

The emphasis on concepts like “justice” and “inclusiveness” (Sharma & Ruud, 2003, p. 2006) in the sustainability paradigm provides a strong rationale for considering fringe communities as important players. According to Braswell and Lane (2014), “sources and
consequences of inequity” and “values, fears and hopes of the marginalised” are among issues that have received more attention as a result of the critical turn in sustainable tourism research (p.3). Jamal and Camargo (2014) stress the importance of “procedural justice” in ensuring “active involvement of a destination’s resident stakeholders (including indigenous, low income, diverse and minority groups)” in development activities (p.17).

It can be inferred from the literature that there is a consensus among researchers on the importance of engaging a wide range of stakeholders, especially community members, in tourism planning. However, moving toward community participation in practice is a “complex and difficult process” (Wilson et al., 2001, p. 133). In the following pages, I highlight the increasing diversity of communities, especially in urban areas, as a key and under-studied dimension of community participation that is contributing to the already complex phenomenon.

2.1.2 The evolution of stakeholder theory

The shift from the purely shareholder orientation in the business world to the broader stakeholder perspective can be traced back to the Great Depression (Sundaram & Inkpen, 2004), as the emphasis moved from the rights of ownership to the rights of community. However, not until the publication of Freeman’s (1984) seminal book Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach did the stakeholder view receive notable attention in the management field (Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997). According to Freeman, Wicks and Parmar, (2004), the essence of the stakeholder theory can be summarized in two questions: “what is the purpose of the firm?” And “what responsibility does management have to stakeholders?” (p. 364). Based on the stakeholder view, managers are not only responsible toward shareholders. Hence, value maximization is not the only focus of the firm. The role of managers is described by Freeman et al. (2004) as follows:

“Managers must develop relationships, inspire their stakeholders, and create communities where everyone strives to give their best to deliver the value the firm promises” (p.364).

According to the broadest definition, “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objective” is considered as a firm’s stakeholder (Freeman 1984, p. 46). However, as firms have limited resources, more specific criteria have been provided in order to help managers prioritize stakeholders (Mitchell et
Agle et al. (1999) use power, legitimacy and urgency as three indicators of stakeholders’ salience, which is defined as “the degree to which managers give priority to competing stakeholder claims” (p. 508). Despite attempts to provide managers with clearer guidelines for identifying legitimate stakeholders, it remains a challenging decision (Sundaram & Inkpen, 2004). In an ideal world all stakeholders and their needs should be equally important. In reality, managers are forced to prioritize due to limited resources. In order to address this issue, new ways of stakeholder classification and prioritization have been introduced, which emphasize the heterogeneity within each stakeholder group and call for more attention to marginalized and vulnerable stakeholders. Burton and Dunn (1996) adopted the ethics of care theory to address the stakeholder prioritization issue. They suggested that managers’ first priority should be to make sure that their decisions will not have any negative impact on the “least advantaged groups” (p.143). Their main concern should be to find out which stakeholder group is more “vulnerable to action” instead of which group has more power and greater influence on the decision (p.144). The idea of shifting the focus from salient stakeholders to disadvantaged and less powerful ones also forms the basis of Hart and Sharma’s (2004) approach to stakeholder theory. They encouraged reaching out to fringe stakeholders, who are defined as:

“Adversarial, divergent, poor, weak, illiterate, disinterested, non-legitimate or even non-human” (p. 10).

These stakeholders are usually not considered as salient for a firm’s success according to the traditional stakeholder management view and therefore are “disconnected from or invisible to” the firm (p.10). Hart and Sharma (2004) argue further that in order to increase innovative capabilities and gain sustained competitive advantage, firms should shift their focus from powerful to fringe stakeholders, and try to engage in a “two-way and on-going dialogue” with them (p.17). Incorporating “heterogeneous views” of fringe stakeholders into the planning process is critical for predicting the needs of future customers and adopting proactive strategies (p. 9). Crane and Ruebottom (2011) added social identity as a new dimension to the traditional way of categorizing stakeholders. They cross-mapped traditional stakeholder roles (i.e. investors, customers, employees, competitors, suppliers, government, media, and NGOs) with social identity roles (e.g. based on age, race, nationality, ethnicity, gender, ability, political orientation, and location). This approach reflects the heterogeneity and diversity within each segment and
highlights “minority or vulnerable social groups [that] often do not carry power...[but] may, however, have legitimate interests” (p.83).

Dunham, Freeman and Liedtka (2006) looked specifically at the heterogeneity within community as a stakeholder group in order to address “the problem of community”, resulting from lack of a clear understanding of, and definition for, the concept. They identified four community subgroups namely: communities of place, communities of interest, virtual advocacy groups, and communities of practice. Three strategic alternatives: collaboration, cooperation, and containment are introduced for establishing community relationships.

Roloff (2007) argues that the traditional “organization focused” approach to stakeholder management leads to “overlooking stakeholders who are affected by the organization in favour of those who can affect it” (p. 236). She draws on the literature on multi-stakeholder networks to suggest “issue-focused” stakeholder management as an alternative perspective. This approach stresses a collaborative attempt by a group of equally important stakeholders to address a specific issue instead of focusing on one organization and its objectives as the focal point.

In sum, advancements of stakeholder theory focus on the following themes:

- Diversity and heterogeneity within traditionally defined stakeholder groups;
- Engaging marginal and less powerful stakeholders;
- Flexible strategies to account for changing stakeholder motivations; and,
- More collaborative relationships between stakeholders.

Investigating community engagement in tourism planning from the perspective of these four themes can lead to a better understanding of constantly changing host communities and contribute to the design and implementation of more inclusive decision-making and consultation processes. The following section will focus on these themes and their application for enhancing the engagement of less-involved community subgroups, with specific focus on first generation immigrants, in tourism planning.
2.1.3 Implications of progressive approaches to stakeholder theory for enhancing community engagement in tourism planning

Figure 2-2 illustrates how research on stakeholder theory in the management field can contribute to sustainable tourism development by enhancing fringe stakeholders’ engagement in tourism planning. Advancements in stakeholder theory provide the philosophical foundation and a strong rationale for engaging fringe community segments, including first generation immigrants. It also offers valuable insight into how to approach different community segments at the strategy level. On the other hand, tourism planning provides a very suitable context for studying fringe community subgroups and developing practical tools and techniques for engaging them, due to the inherent interconnectedness and mutual impacts of sustainable tourism development and community well-being.

The four areas discussed in the following section are broad examples of priority areas that need to be addressed in this new line of research in order to help planners enhance community participation in tourism planning by engaging a broader range of community members as well as targeting higher levels of community participation.

**Diversity and heterogeneity within host communities**

As community cannot be considered a homogenous unit (Jamal & Stronza, 2009; Okazaki, 2008), it has been subdivided and categorized in many different ways. Molotch (1976) explained that the residents’ community is made up of smaller sub-communities. Madrigal (1995) grouped...
residents into three segments: the largest group is named “realists”, followed by “haters”, and “lovers” (p. 94). Lovers and haters are motivated enough to strongly agree or disagree with tourism development plans while the majority of residents who have a more balanced and realistic understanding of the positive and negative effects of tourism usually do not express their opinions. Moreover, in many cases only those community groups that support development plans are involved in the process, and other groups that are more critical are ignored (Joppe, 1996).

Harrill (2004) highlighted the need to engage “attached and unattached” and “long-term” as well as “short-term” residents in tourism planning (p. 264). Research has also shown that community members’ attitudes toward tourism development differ based on their “spatial location and economic dependency”. This means that those that are more influenced by negative impacts of tourism development and less dependent on economic benefits gained from tourism tend to have more negative attitudes toward development plans (Harill & Potts, 2003, p.240).

Moving toward “full community participation” as one of the main components of sustainable tourism (Choi & Murray, 2010, p. 575) requires finding ways to involve all community segments. However, although the heterogeneous nature of host communities has been acknowledged in the literature, it has rarely been addressed in empirical works. Progressive approaches to stakeholder theory, which have received relatively less attention in the tourism field, can bring new insights into the design and implementation of tourism planning and decision making processes that better reflect the heterogeneous nature of the host communities.

**Marginal and less powerful community subgroups**

Acknowledging that host communities are comprised of many segments, each with a unique and complex set of characteristics and expectations, and the fact that often this level of diversity is not reflected in community engagement projects, leads to the conclusion that some community segments remain disengaged. The importance of engaging “socially and economically marginalized people” in decision-making (Bramwell, 2001, p. 542) and finding ways to “make officially sponsored public involvement work better” for them is emphasized in the literature (Connelly, 2006, p. 14). According to Jamal and Stronza (2009), specific attention should be paid to “ensuring just and equitable participation of those most disadvantaged or least capable of receiving fair treatment in the collaboration and its outcomes” (p.174).
Some segments may be absent from the planning process from the outset while others may be present but lack the power to influence outcomes. The impact of power relations on community engagement is extensively discussed in the literature on consensus-based decision-making. This approach can be considered as one of the core elements of “community and collaborative-based tourism planning” (Bramwell, 2010, p.241) and is specifically appropriate when planning deals with “complex environmental and social issues” as well as in situations that involve “many divergent interests” (Connelly & Richardson, 2004, p. 3).

It has been argued that full community participation may not always be “the most appropriate” approach to planning (Bramwell, 2004, p. 545) or feasible in all contexts and stages of the decision-making process due to structural barriers (Tuson, 2000) and limited resources (Connelly & Richardson (2004). Moreover, efforts to engage fringe community subgroups may not result in tangible and short-term outcomes, which are commonly used as performance evaluation criteria for planners. Connelly and Richardson (2004) distinguish between ideal and practical consensus building processes and argue that sometimes planners have to exclude some stakeholder groups due to resource limitation and in order to maintain the “focus and cohesion” of the process (p.10). Elsewhere Connelly (2006) indicates that power relations in a consensus-based decision-making process can lead to exclusion at three levels. At the first level, all participants can express their opinions and are “listened to”, however some groups, especially those with a bigger share of resources, have more influence on the outcome. The second form of exclusion happens when some of the players have the power to determine the “issues with which the public can engage” (p.18). The third type of exclusion is exercised at a higher level and beyond the specific decision-making process. It is rooted in “dominant ideas and values of society” that form the public involvement processes.

However, in line with normative and instrumental assumptions of sustainable tourism development, empowerment of fringe community members to engage in planning processes and move toward higher levels of participation should be an integral component of any long-term strategy and vision of planning and decision making.
**Flexible and customized strategies and methods**

Progressive approaches to stakeholder theory emphasize the need to adopt customized strategies for different stakeholder groups based on their motivations, roles, and relationships with the organization (e.g. Dunham et al., 2006; Buchholz & Rosenthal, 2005; Verbeke & Tung, 2013; Bridoux & Stoelhorst, 2014). The increasing complexity of communities, especially in larger urban areas, underscores the need for flexible and customized community engagement strategies. Therefore, although knowledge transfer can still happen in the form of learning from and drawing on successful strategies and techniques in similar contexts, developing and adopting tried-and-true community engagement strategies has been largely ineffective.

Appropriate tools and techniques need to be designed and implemented depending on the strategy and targeted levels of participation. Several techniques have been used or recommended for engaging stakeholders in tourism planning: “Surveys, scenarios, gaming techniques, nominal group technique” (Simmons, 1994, p. 100), “stakeholder-wide visioning sessions” (Mair & Reid, 2007, p. 419) “advisory boards” (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006, p.1281) “public hearings, focus groups, public deliberation, citizen review panels, civic review boards, work groups, implementation studies and written comments” (Byrd, 2007, p.8). Only a few of these methods, such as joint policy boards, parallel groups of citizens and power holders, and independent neighbourhood corporations are appropriate for encouraging higher levels of participation. Others are mostly designed for providing community members with information about the project and/or limited consultations (Arnstein, 1969). Finding appropriate methods for reaching out to community groups and keeping them engaged at different stages of the planning process is a challenge for planners, and is even more complicated when working with diverse immigrant populations. Each immigrant community has its unique decision-making structure and communication channels, which may not be known to planners. Method effectiveness may also vary based on the context and specific nature of each project.

**Re-defined stakeholders’ roles and relationships**

In a more inclusive approach to planning, traditionally powerful stakeholders may need to modify their traditional roles in order to facilitate the engagement of marginal community members and empower them to become active partners. The need for a “convener” that
facilitates community engagement (Jamal & Getz, 1995, p. 198) is highlighted in the literature. Governmental (Choi & Murray, 2010) and non-governmental organizations (Tosun, 2000) can play key roles in enhancing community collaboration through empowerment and education. On the government side, empowering immigrants to become engaged in decision-making activities requires higher commitment in terms of time and resource allocation, as well as developing a genuine belief in the value and importance of having immigrants on board. Non-governmental organizations that work closely with immigrant communities can also play a key role by connecting these communities with planning bodies and by sharing their first-hand knowledge and experience in working with immigrants. Facilitators need to engage in dynamic relationships with immigrant community members as well as other stakeholders, and continuously adjust their strategies to better fit the unique characteristics of each planning stage and the changing nature of stakeholders’ claims.

The next section of this chapter presents the case for the engagement of first generation immigrants, as one of the less engaged community sub-groups, in tourism planning and decision-making activities.

### 2.2 The Case for Engaging First Generation Immigrants in Tourism Planning

Migration is rapidly changing the face of countries around the world. In 2010, nearly 214 million people were estimated to live outside their home countries (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2009). This phenomenon has resulted in increasing interest among scholars in various fields to study impacts of migration on host countries.

Studies in the tourism field are mostly focused on immigrants’ role in the industry as visitors and workforce. Research has been conducted on the relationship between visiting a country as a tourist and deciding to immigrate to that country (Williams & Hall, 2000). A study conducted by Tadesse and White (2011), looks at the immigration-visitation phenomenon from the other side and is focused on the relationship between the number of immigrants from a specific country to the U.S., and the number of tourists that visit the U.S. from that country. Focused on Moroccan immigrants living in the Netherlands, Moufakkir (2014) studied the impact of negative perceptions about immigrants on the likelihood of Dutch people to visit
Morocco and also how the experience of Arab and Moroccan tourists in the Netherlands is influenced by residents’ perceptions and stigmas about immigrants from these countries (Moufakkir, 2015). Adopting a different perspective, Griffin (2014) looked at immigrants as hosts and studied their role in VFR (visiting friends and relatives) tourism. Another line of research has been concerned with the immigrant workforce in the tourism industry (e.g. Janta, Brown, Lugosi & Ladkin, 2011; Joppe, 2012). However, no study has been conducted on the role of immigrants as members of host communities in tourism planning initiatives.

Previous research in the broader civic participation field indicates that in general many immigrant groups, especially those that do not speak a country’s official language at home, have lower levels of civic engagement compared to non-immigrant citizens (i.e. Canadian-born individuals in this specific study) (Baer, 2008). In the same context, social participation is even lower among immigrant women compared to men due to factors such as lack of previous experiences in social participation and decreased social interactions after immigration (Couton & Gaudet, 2008). A study conducted by Uzar (2007) on Turkish and Arab immigrants in Germany identified factors that hinder their participation in decision-making activities as: lack of language proficiency (both language of the host country and technical terms used in the planning process), different cultural backgrounds and perceptions of participation, lack of awareness about participation opportunities, not feeling accepted by native Germans, considering the content of discussions as not relevant to their lives, expecting tangible results from the participation, and inappropriate meeting times (which particularly affects women due to safety concerns). In the context of recreational activities, Aizlewood, Bevelander, and Pendakur (2006) indicated that “ethnic minority and immigrant status, belonging to a minority religion and speaking a non-official language” have negative impacts on participation level (p. 22).

First generation immigrants represent one of the less engaged and under-studied subgroups of tourism host communities. They may be educated but still lack sufficient levels of knowledge and information about the new country, especially in terms of tourism; not be familiar with the culture and geography; lack language skills; not yet be part of active social groups or, simply not be interested in tourism related issues. They may not have a strong sense of belonging to the new society or perceive themselves as guests instead of hosts. However, stakeholders’ level of interest or power is not static (Reed, et al., 2009, Crane & Ruebottom, 2011) and effective
stakeholder management should account for changes in “content and saliency of stakeholders’ claims” (Verbeke & Tung, 2013). Today’s newcomers will form the future host community. They will be part of the place identity and engaged in the co-creation of experiences with tourists (Saraniemi & Kylänen, 2011).

Byrd (2007) indicates that, based on a sustainable tourism development approach, four stakeholder groups should be engaged in the tourism planning process: present tourists, the present host community, future tourists and the future host community. As there is not “a definable, single, generic interest for the future host community”, incorporating their interests in tourism planning is very challenging for planners (p. 11). This issue is even more important and challenging for countries and cities that are open to new residents from different cultures, who may have different attitudes and perceptions about the place, and also about tourism. According to Meppem and Gill (1998), issues such as “changes in urban/environment relationships and community structures, heterogeneous and changing values and non-linear relationships” (p. 129) make sustainable development a highly complex issue. Thus, there is always “a gap between current understanding and that necessary” for the appropriate planning and management (p.131). The authors argue that establishing a participatory learning process can help to address this problem (p. 130). By establishing effective processes for engaging immigrants in an ongoing dialogue, planners can take the change factor into account. This will lead to more success in formulating and implementing strategies for sustainable tourism development.

Definitions provided for community (e.g. Aas et al., 2005; Joppe, 1996) are broad enough to accommodate a more inclusive approach to community participation. Although in today’s diverse society people may not share the same heritage, origin, and cultural backgrounds, many of them believe in the same values, such as: justice; fairness; preserving nature for future generations; and the right and responsibility to become engaged in decision-making through expression of opinion. These values, which lie at the heart of the sustainability paradigm, can play a key role in motivating first generation immigrants to participate in public decision-making activities. Often people’s decisions with regard to immigration and choosing where they want to live are influenced by such values.

It is important to distinguish between immigration and migration, as two terms that have been used interchangeably in the literature. Migration is a broader concept that includes moving
both within and between countries for any reason and regardless of the length of stay in the destination, whereas immigration refers to moving to another country with the purpose of living there for a longer period of time (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2009). This study is focused on immigrants and the distinction is important because when people decide to live permanently in a place their participation becomes more important for them and for the society. The transition from being a temporary resident to a long-term member of the community may also happen gradually as migrant workers and students to countries like Canada usually have the opportunity to apply for permanent residency after a few years.

The following section is specifically focused on nature parks that are located near urban areas, as the context selected for this study. It provides an overview of the literature on immigrants’ relationship to urban wilderness and nature parks and discusses the need and potential for their engagement in planning and decision making activities.

2.3 Immigrants’ Engagement in Planning for Urban Nature Parks

The existing literature on the engagement of immigrants and minorities with parks and protected areas is mostly focused on their role as visitors. This is in response to the fact that visitation is lower among immigrants and ethnic minorities (Lovelock, Lovelock, Jellum, & Thompson, 2012) and based on the assumption that visitation is the first step toward ensuring future support from increasingly diverse communities. As discussed in the following pages, research has been conducted on differences between immigrant and non-immigrant park users, various ethnic communities, as well as first and second-generation immigrants with regard to leisure activities and preferences. However, studies on immigrants’ role as members of host communities and their engagement in planning and decision-making activities are almost non-existent in the literature. This section focuses on similarities and values shared between first generation immigrants and long-term citizens with regard to nature. It also suggests that the recent trend toward establishing national parks closer to urban areas provides new challenges but also unique opportunities for encouraging visitation and ensuring future support from a broader range of community members through engaging them in planning and decision-making activities.
2.3.1 Immigrants as visitors

The first national parks were established in the U.S., Canada and New Zealand during the 1870s and 1880s (e.g. Yellowstone in 1872, Banff in 1885, and Tongariro in 1887). The early national parks shared three main characteristics. They were established on *worthless lands* or in remote areas not appropriate to use for other more economically profitable purposes; to preserve the wilderness; and, to “represent remnants of the frontier that was quickly disappearing” (p.476). Wilderness and nature formed the core of the first national parks in the New World countries. These sites were created for “elite” visitors and preferably away from local communities (478). However, more recent, mostly European, national parks are established in “working landscapes as opposed to protected landscapes”, where other uses need to be balanced with protection and preservation. Local culture has become a key component of many of the more recent national parks as a way to attract more visitors and to provide additional sources of income for local and indigenous communities (Boyd, 2004, pp. 476-477). Weber and Sultana (2013a) suggest that park systems in the future will include fewer of “the large nature parks, with their association to elitism (p. 463)”.

“Visitation” is considered a key criterion for park agencies’ success, to a point where sometimes concerns about declining visitation have received more attention than concerns about negative impacts that increased visitation may have on conservation of national parks (Shultis & More, 2011). According to Jamal and Stronza (2009), planning for parks and protected areas should address the “marketing-planning” gap, which is the result of promoting these areas as tourist attractions without paying enough attention to sustainability and conservation issues (p. 171). The emphasis on visitation is based on the assumption that visitation leads to appreciation of and support for national parks and therefore declining visitation means “decreased public and political support” (Shultis & More, 2011, p. 121). Parks receive required resources only if “visited and valued by sufficiently large numbers of people in a society” (Eagles & McCool, 2002, p.24). The visitor-focused perspective and attempts to enhance visitor satisfaction by offering various programs are rooted in the shift from the progressive philosophy to neoliberalism, as the underlying philosophy of national park agencies.
“Under neo-liberalism, national parks were viewed as services and "marketized"; that is, moved from full public funding to a market-based operating system that involved greater reliance on user fees, marketing, outsourcing, and public-private partnerships” (Shultis & More, 2011, p. 111).

A comparative study of Canadian and American national park agencies indicates that both countries have experienced significant decline in visitation since the late 1980s. An analysis of the agencies’ strategic documents reveals that Parks Canada and the National Park Service have discussed the issue in the context of four broad environmental challenges namely, less visitation by children due to the increasing use of technology, limited visitation by minorities and immigrants, an aging population, and increasing urbanization. In order to address the problem, national park agencies have tried to reach out to “children, minorities, and recent immigrants, especially in urban areas” by offering educational programs (Shultis & More, 2011, pp.118-119). Parks Canada’s recent documents indicate that the agency is still following the same strategy. New Canadians, youth and urban Canadians are highlighted as Parks Canada’s primary audience. The emphasis on youth engagement in both program and planning activities as well as educational programs for new Canadians (e.g. Learn to Camp) reflect efforts to connect with the three groups mentioned as the primary audience (Parks Canada, n.d.). In a Canadian study of “perceived health and well-being motives and benefits among park visitors”, Lemieux et al. (2015) recommend park agencies to adopt specific outreach methods for “youth and new Canadians” as a way to enhance the well-being of these groups and to gain public support for parks and protected areas and (p.1).

Ensuring visitation and support by an increasingly diverse clientele is a major challenge for national park agencies. According to Eagles (2014), building public support with specific emphasis on “new immigrants whose cultural background may not involve a focus on outdoor recreation” (p.529) is one of the 10 research priorities identified in the parks tourism field. Many studies (mostly focused on North America, New Zealand, and Australia) have been dedicated to understanding behaviours and preferences of immigrants and ethnic groups with regards to leisure activities in general and visiting national parks in particular (e.g. Lovelock, Lovelock, Jellum, & Thompson, 2011; Stodolska, Shinew & Li, 2010; Carter, 2008; Shinew et al., 2006; Deng, Walker & Swinnerton, 2005; Stodolska, 2000; Floyd, 2001; Floyd, Shinew, McGuire, & Noe, 1994).
In the broader area of immigrants’ engagement in leisure activities, “adaptation, assimilation, and integration” of immigrants have been the dominant theme (Mata-Codesal, Peperkamp & Tiesler, 2015). “Ethno-cultural diversity” is considered as a barrier to immigrants’ participation (Golob & Giles, 2015). According to Horolets (2015) this view puts the host society in a privileged position with dominant and preferred types of activities that immigrants should pursue. Instead, she suggests looking at leisure activities as a form of “identity work” as explained below:

“Arguably, migrants need a venue where they can re-establish or negotiate their identities. The time outside of work and family obligations seems to offer such venue due to its ‘playful’ qualities” (p.6).

Comparison is made between two types of leisure activities: visiting commercial attractions and wandering around. Visiting attractions contributes to immigrants’ empowerment by helping them to gain knowledge about the place and be able to share it with others as experts (Horolets, 2015, p.6). According the Horolets (2015) unplanned exploration of unfamiliar places is very similar to the immigration experience as in both cases the person is dealing with uncertainty and the perception of limited control over the environment. By voluntarily engaging in these activities immigrants “claim their right to place by discovering uncontrived embodied meanings of place” (p.14). Glob and Giles (2015) look at immigrants and minorities’ engagement in leisure activities from a different perspective. They adopt Foucault’s notion of entrepreneurial self and argue that although power relations act as barriers to immigrants’ participation in leisure activities, they can also “enable leisure pursuits and the experiences therein” (p.110).

Focused on national parks, Floyd (2001) summarizes the literature on different reasons for lower visitation by minorities under five hypotheses: marginality hypothesis (the impact of socio-economic factors on visitation among minorities, specifically African Americans); sub-cultural hypothesis (cultural preferences with regard to recreational activities); assimilation hypothesis (the degree to which the minority group acquires cultural characteristics of the majority group and the level of interaction between the two), interpersonal discrimination (minority groups feeling discriminated against by members of the majority group), and institutional discrimination (systematic barriers and discrimination against minority groups at organizational level). Research also shows that visitation by non-white minorities (specifically
African, Asian, and Hispanic Americans) is influenced by geographical distance to national parks and that creating urban recreation areas could be an effective strategy to increase visitation among these groups (Weber & Sultana, 2013a). A study by Buijs, Elands and Langers (2009), conducted in the Netherlands and focused on Turkish and Moroccan immigrants, indicates that immigrants have a different image of nature compared to native Dutch people. Among the three different images of nature (namely wilderness; functional; and inclusive) immigrants are more supportive of the functional image whereas non-immigrants hold the wilderness image. It means that immigrants have “a more anthropocentric view of the human–nature relationship” (p.121) and prefer managed natural environments while native Dutch people put high emphasis on the “eco-centric value and independence of nature” (p.113). The study also shows that second generation immigrants (i.e. people born in the Netherlands and raised by first generation immigrant families) construct an image of nature that has components of both functional and wilderness images.

Lovelock et al. (2011) look at how recent immigrants’ sense of belonging to natural spaces can influence their integration into the new country (i.e. New Zealand in this study). The research shows that white and non-white immigrants have different perceptions of and experiences with nature-based settings. Non-whites, specifically Chinese immigrants, tend not to visit parks because they associate nature-based activities with lower social classes. Non-immigrant residents may also think that immigrants do not belong to nature-based spaces because they are from countries that do not embrace the value of nature as they do (Lovelock et al., 2011). However, Hester et al. (1999) address this myth and indicate that ethnic minorities do appreciate and increasingly support development of urban parks (p.139). They distinguish between traditional and non-traditional park users and define traditional users as “generally affluent Anglo-Saxons who hold a strong environmental conservation ethic”. People of color are among users that are considered as new to wilderness settings by traditional users (p. 139). The former group of visitors mostly enjoy outdoor activities such as hiking, whereas the latter usually visit parks in larger groups and expect more facilities. Considering the fact that traditional users have a longer history of involvement with parks and different environmental groups, they are in a position that can define acceptable and preferred ways of using wilderness parks (Hester et al., 1999). Lovelock et al. (2011) also show that Asian immigrants feel uncomfortable and alienated in park settings because these spaces are designed for “the settled majority who are
predominantly white” and therefore the facilities do not reflect their expectations and needs. These experiences resonate with recent immigrants’ general feelings and experiences in a new country where “there is no place for them to sit, to view or to see themselves” (Lovelock et al., 2011, p. 252).

These studies show that visitation is the outcome of a much more complex and deeper connection between people and parks and that gaining immigrants’ support for national parks and protected areas should go beyond attempts to engage them in visitation programs. It requires an approach that helps them to develop a sense of ownership and belonging to these places. The dominant “use → appreciation →support mantra” (Shultis & More, 2011, p.112) needs to be coupled with the new engagement →ownership → visitation approach. This would give first generation immigrants the opportunity to become engaged in planning and management activities and allow for their needs, expectations, and ideas to be incorporated in the design of parks and protected areas from the outset. As a result, they would be able to “situate themselves in the nature” (Lovelock et al., 2011, p.252) and re-establish their relationship with nature in the context of their new country. Visitation could be the natural outcome. Research already shows that local residents’ participation in designing urban parks leads to increased visitation (Peters, Elands & Buijs, 2010). It is noteworthy, however, that engaging immigrants and minorities in planning activities is not considered as an alternative but rather a complementary and long-term strategy to be adopted in addition to the current short-term initiatives focused on increasing visitation.

2.3.2 Immigrants as members of host communities

Planning for national parks and protected areas has followed the same pattern as the broader tourism field. The “rational-comprehensive model” has been dominant in the field (Plummer & Fennell, 2009; McCool, 2009). This approach is based on the positivist view and the assumption that the world is “understandable, predictable and controllable” (Plummer & Fennell, 2009, p. 150). Hence, traditionally the role of planners was to set goals and select the most appropriate strategy for achieving them among a number of strategic alternatives. Local communities were considered as “beneficiaries of tourism development rather than essential partners” (Garrod, 2003, p.36). However, as a result of two major trends, namely “the shift from
government to governance” and the emergence of the “complex systems theory”, the need for new approaches in management and planning for protected areas has emerged (Plummer & Fennell, 2009, p. 153).

Governance is defined as:

“The system of formal and informal rules that establish the interaction and cooperation guidelines among the different stakeholders that intervene in the decision-making process” (Roca, 2006, cited in Eagles et al. 2013, p. 1).

In traditional models of governance, government was the dominant power in charge of managing parks and protected areas. In the more recent models, government’s role has changed from the “controller” of the process to the “facilitator” (Eagles et al. 2013, p. 2).

The complex systems view emphasizes the unpredictable nature of systems and non-linear relationships within each system as well as between different interrelated social and ecological systems. This view is in line with the underlying assumptions of the sustainability concept (Plummer & Fennell, 2009). According to McCool (2009), planning for parks and protected areas happens in a messy context “characterized by change, complexity, and uncertainty” (p. 136).

Eagles (2009) compares eight commonly used models for managing parks and protected areas based on criteria developed by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) (1997) and Graham, Aamos and Plunptre (2003)³. According to Eagles’s (2009) study, management models that are based on “non-profit public involvement” are more compatible with criteria of good management. In the national park model, government is the owner of resources and also in charge of managing the park or protected area. As the main source of funding is tax money, this model is dominant in countries where taxpayers are willing to contribute higher amounts to achieve “equity in public services” (p.245). The model emphasizes shared vision and consensus building. It engages the broadest range of stakeholders in the planning and management processes compared to other models (Eagles, 2009). A high level of collaboration between

---

³ The criteria are: public participation, consensus orientation, strategic vision, responsiveness, efficiency, accountability, transparency, equity and role of law
government, private organizations, and local communities is required for balancing conservation and visitation aspects of national parks (Jamal & Stronza, 2009).

Studies on community engagement in planning for and managing national parks are mostly focused on rural and indigenous communities due to the fact that most of the studied sites are located in remote rural areas and/or near indigenous communities. Jamal and Stronza (2009) distinguish between three types of knowledge that should be incorporated in planning for protected areas: “scientific knowledge, indigenous (traditional) knowledge, and local knowledge, that is developed by newer residents of the area” (p. 175). Graham et al. (2003) focus on the principle of fairness, adopted from principles of good governance introduced by UNDP, to highlight the importance of engaging indigenous communities in planning and managing protected areas. The principle of fairness is focused on “groups that face discriminatory practices” for example “women, children, ethnic and religious minorities” and calls for engaging local and endogenous communities in the process of establishing and managing protected areas (p.5). Aboriginal traditional ecological knowledge (Thomlinson & Crouch, 2012) is considered a valuable asset that can be used for enhancing management decisions. Therefore, attempts have been made to establish co-management processes between aboriginals and governmental institutions that allow both sides to “share responsibility for managing a protected area” (Thomlinson & Crouch, 2012, p.72). From the tourism perspective, local and indigenous culture has become an integral part of the visitor experience in many national parks and protected areas (Boyd, 2004; Goodwin & Roe, 2001).

Strategies for enhancing community support and engagement in managing national parks and protected areas have been focused on creating job opportunities and contributing to local economies by offering additional or alternative income sources (see Archabald & Naughton-Treves, 2001; Goodwin & Roe, 2001; Goodwin, 2002; Bandyopadhyay & Tembo, 2010). These strategies are designed according to characteristics of traditional national parks, located in rural areas. Yet, it has been mentioned in the literature that even in these relatively homogenous contexts establishing a national park may influence various groups and individuals in different ways. Impacts of establishing a national park on neighbouring communities vary depending on factors including:
“the dynamics and stage of development of the host community as well as ... the community’s physical location with respect to the development of the Park and its centres of attraction” (Fortin & Gagnon, 1999, p.209).

Bandyopadhyay & Tembo (2010) distinguish between poor and elite community members and argue that the level and nature of participation, as well as financial gains received by them are different.

The trend toward establishing national parks near urban areas, as part of park agencies’ strategies to enhance visitation, has contributed to the increasing attention to diversity in host communities (e.g. Rouge National Urban Park in Canada and urban National Recreation Areas in the U.S.). Romagosa, Eagles and Lemieux (2015) consider the “ever increasing separation of urban populations from nature” (p. 75) as an opportunity for establishing more parks and protected areas close to urban settings. According to the authors, facilitating and encouraging public health activities at these sites can result in increased public support as well as enhanced community well-being. These parks are different from traditional national parks in that they face different challenges with regard to conservation (Fortin & Gagnon, 1999) and incorporating “diverse demands” of an urban clientele (Gobster, 2002, p.143). At the same time, urban national parks can benefit from unique opportunities for tapping into different cultures and taking advantage of local potentials. In general, urban residents are not dependent on parks as sources of additional income and can contribute to parks in different ways compared to rural communities. The heterogeneity of host communities and its impact on planning for national parks and protected areas has remained an under-studied area. In practice, minorities and first generation immigrants are under-represented in public consultation meetings and information sessions, held by national park agencies as part of establishment processes of new parks.

National park agencies will face serious challenges and miss valuable opportunities without collaborating with and securing support from these groups. Studies focused on visitation offer helpful insights that can contribute to engaging immigrants in planning and decision-making activities. Despite lower visitation among immigrants and minorities, it cannot be argued that they “perceive of or construct wilderness in culturally different terms” with regard to values they ascribe to it (Johnson et al., 2004, p. 624). Research also shows that “people from various ethnic backgrounds value being together in parks” (Peters, 2010). A study conducted by Peters
et al. (2010) on Dutch urban parks indicates that urban parks are “more inclusive than non-urban green areas”. Urban parks can “promote social cohesion” as immigrants and ethnic minorities are more likely to visit these sites. It is noteworthy that the difference in visitation to urban parks and out-of-city green spaces has not been due to lack of immigrants’ access to transportation (p.93).

Agreement on the intrinsic value of nature and shared commitment to preserving it for future generations (Hester et al., 1999) as well as the fact that immigrants and members of ethnic communities are more likely to visit urban parks (compared to other national parks and protected areas) can provide a foundation for connecting with these fringe, yet important stakeholders through engaging them in planning activities.

2.4 Summary of the Literature Review

The fact that, despite a large body of research on community participation, community members and residents are among the least engaged tourism stakeholder groups (Choi & Murray, 2010) indicates that we need to have a deeper and better understanding of communities, and to identify more effective strategies for their engagement. Traditional assumptions do not always reflect the reality and characteristics of modern communities, such as constant change; diversity; and, heterogeneity. A review of progressive approaches to stakeholder theory reveals that successful stakeholder engagement is not possible without identifying sub-segments within each stakeholder group, understanding their changing claims and motivations, and developing customized strategies for addressing them. Studying the current state of theory and practice of community engagement in tourism planning through this lens highlights four areas that call for more attention: (i) diversity and heterogeneity within host communities, (ii) marginal and less powerful community subgroups, (iii) the need for flexible and customized participation strategies and methods, and (iv) re-defining stakeholders’ roles and relationships.

The literature on planning for parks and protected areas reveals that gaining community support, especially from immigrants and minorities as emerging and growing segments, is critical for the future of these sites. However, immigrants have lower involvement as visitors and very limited participation in decision-making and planning activities compared to non-immigrant residents. The trend toward establishing wilderness and nature parks around urban areas and in closer proximity to immigrant and multicultural communities offers a great opportunity for
connecting with these less-engaged segments. It is suggested that immigrants’ engagement in planning and governance can be a starting point for building trust and establishing relationships, and as an alternative to the traditional approach that considers visitation as the first step toward higher levels of participation.
3 Research Approach and Methodology

In this chapter, I will first discuss the philosophical assumptions that form the foundation of the approach and methodology adopted for this study. Then, I will provide an overview of the research context followed by a discussion of the selection of research participants and the data gathering methods. Next, the data analysis process is explained. The chapter concludes with a section on establishing research rigour and the criteria used for ensuring the quality and trustworthiness of the study.

3.1 Philosophical Assumptions: Ontology and Epistemology of the Research

The goal of this research is to provide a deeper understanding of the current approach to immigrants’ engagement in tourism related public decision-making activities and to suggest underlying principles for designing more inclusive community engagement processes. This research purpose is aligned with a naturalistic approach to inquiry and the underlying philosophical assumptions that support it. A description of these assumptions and justification for why these are appropriate to explore the research question at hand follows.

Guba & Lincoln (1982) distinguish between two major paradigms or modes of inquiry – rationalistic and naturalistic – by using five axioms about the nature of reality, inquirer/respondent relationship, nature of truth statements, attribution/explanation of action, and relation to values of inquiry. My philosophical positioning with regard to these axioms for the purpose of this research is as follows:

- There is no one truth to be discovered. Multiple and equally valid realities are created by participants and exist simultaneously based on their experiences and perceptions.
- As the researcher, I cannot separate myself from the research and prevent my value system, personal story as a new immigrant, and world-view from influencing the research in different ways, from forming research questions to making methodological decisions. Therefore, instead of rejecting the possibility of the

4 Axioms are defined as: “the set of demonstrated (and undemonstrated) propositions accepted by convention or established by practice as the basic building blocks of some conceptual or theoretical structure or system” (Guba & Lincoln, 1982, p.236).
research being influenced by these values, I accept the value-bound nature of this study and try to acknowledge and reflect on my assumptions and world-view.

- The research process is affected by participants and the dynamics inherent in the research context.
- Research findings need to be interpreted in close relationship with the context. Participants’ experiences are shaped by the context, power relations, and interactions among different stakeholders. Hence, it is not possible to provide context free and generalizable findings as the result of this study.

Within the broad spectrum between rationalistic and naturalist enquiry other philosophies of science have emerged over time, categorized by Tribe (2008) into three groups: positivism and post positivism, critical theory, and interpretivism. The above mentioned philosophical assumptions resonate with the principles of interpretivist paradigm as explained by Guba & Lincoln (1982), which is considered more suitable for conducting “social/behavioural inquiry”. In the tourism field, positivism was the dominant paradigm for years (Gale & Botterill, 2005; Walle, 1997, Riley & Love, 2000). However, its limitations for “fully addressing questions of understanding and meaning” (Riley & Love, 2000, p. 166) led to the emergence of alternative approaches including interpretivism. Clarifying the underlying ontological and epistemological assumptions of the research helps to further position it with regard to these approaches.

3.1.1 Ontological assumptions

Ontology is focused on the researcher’s assumptions with regard to the “the nature of the phenomenon examined” (Van de Ven, 2007, p.14) and how the researcher perceives the notion of reality. As discussed above and in line with the interpretivist approach, this study is based on a subjective view of reality and the belief that there is no one single “truth or true reality” to be “uncovered” by the researcher” (Gephart, 2004, p. 456). Multiple realities are being created and shaped by participants and researcher(s).

I believe that realities are socially constructed and emerge as the result of participants’ experiences and the meanings they build around these experiences. Crotty (1998) describes the socially constructed nature of knowledge as follows:
“All knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context” (p. 42).

Goodson & Phillimore (2004) emphasize the “socially constructed” nature of the tourism phenomenon and the need to study “individuals’ subjective experiences and perceptions and the role these play in constructing the tourist, or indeed host, experience (p.40).”

3.1.2 Epistemological assumption

Epistemological assumptions are concerned with how researchers “gain knowledge about” reality (Van de Ven, 2007, p.38). This study is based on a subjective epistemology, as suggested by the interpretivist philosophy, which allows for examining the research question from different viewpoints. Interpretivism is rooted in the thoughts of Max Weber, who argued that social sciences are focused on Verstehen (understanding) whereas hard or natural sciences are focused on Erklären (explaining) (Crotty, 1998, p. 67). Therefore, my role as the researcher is to try to “understand and describe meaning” through the eyes of “social actors’” (Gephart, 2004, p. 457) as opposed to formulating and falsifying hypotheses (Tribe, 2008, p. 246). There is no predetermined or standard method for gaining this understanding. Hence, this study is designed according to research objectives and further developed throughout the research process to account for necessary changes. The emergent research process is influenced and shaped by the researcher, participants, context, and interactions among them.

3.2 Research Approach

The research is conducted in the form of an inductive single case study, informed by a constructivist grounded theory approach. Grounded theory was first introduced by Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss in the 1960s. It has been recommended for the “examination of subjectivity of experience” and for understanding the phenomenon from “research participants’ point of view” (Tweed & Charmaz, 2011, p. 134). The purpose of conducting grounded theory research is described as follows:

“The procedures of grounded theory are designed to develop a well-integrated set of concepts that provide a thorough theoretical explanation of social phenomena under study” (Corbin & Strauss, 1990, p.5).
Glaser and Strauss’s different backgrounds and philosophical positions resulted in various approaches to grounded theory research that can be considered as a “continuum” ranging from positivist to constructivist epistemologies, with the former inspired by Glaser’s and the latter by Strauss’s philosophical assumptions (Tweed & Charmaz, 2011, p.132). A constructivist grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2006), based on the following assumptions is adopted for this research:

“Reality is multiple, processual and constructed, but constructed under particular conditions; the research process emerges from interactions; it takes into account the researcher’s and research participants’ personalities; The researcher and researched construct the data, data are the product of the research process, not simply observed objects of it” (p.402).

According to Charmaz’s (2006) approach, grounded theory is considered as a set of “flexible guidelines instead of methodological rules, recipes and requirements (p.9)”. This flexible approach allowed the analysis process (as shown in Figure 3-2) to evolve and form according to the unique characteristics and requirements of the study.

This study is focused on participants’ perceptions about immigrants’ engagement in tourism related planning activities. These perceptions are deeply rooted in their personal experiences and therefore can be best studied in the context of a real project. Potential participants would be more likely to become interested and take part in a study that is related to a specific and familiar project that has tangible impacts on their lives.

The case was selected based on an information-oriented approach and according to the following two criteria:

- Providing an appropriate context for studying fringe stakeholders’ engagement, which requires planners to be aware of the importance of an inclusive community participation approach and committed to move toward this goal.
- Offering access to immigrant community members, who have a stake in a specific tourism related project, strong enough to motivate them to participate in the project’s planning process and also in this research.

Information-oriented case selection, compared to random selection, provides the researcher with richer data and is more suitable for theory building as opposed to theory testing.
A case study approach ensures the required focus and enhances rigour and depth by studying the phenomenon in a specific context. It is commonly used for conducting research in the tourism planning and development field (Xiao & Smith, 2006) and is specifically suggested as an appropriate method for addressing issues in community based tourism (Jamal & Getz, 1995).

For the purpose of this study, the case provided a platform that connected participants to each other through shared experiences, interests, or concerns. It also made it easier for me to take part in a conversation around an actual and ongoing project. It is noteworthy that although findings offer insights into the public consultation process of the Rouge National Urban Park, it has not been the primary focus of the research. The public consultation process was used as a bridge, which enabled me to gain access to participants’ broader experiences with regard to first generation immigrants’ engagement beyond the Rouge Park project.

An inductive approach was particularly appropriate for this research and aligned with its philosophical assumptions. As an interpretivist researcher I needed to stay as open and flexible as possible to capture participants’ authentic and diverse perceptions and not to limit findings by collecting and analysing data through the lens of existing theories and concepts (Yin, 2011; Warren & Karner, 2010). The inductive approach is reflected in the literature review process and data gathering methods. The first round of literature review (presented in sections 2.1 and 2-2) was conducted before data gathering in order to ensure theoretical and practical significance of the research, to gain initial familiarity with related literatures, and also to establish a general conceptual framework. The conceptual framework was neither directly used in designing the semi-structured interview questions, nor in the coding process. Complementary literature review was conducted after themes and categories were formed in order to have a deeper understanding and interpretation of the findings by connecting them to the existing theories (presented in section 2-3 and also throughout chapters 4 and 5).

### 3.3 Research Context

Rouge National Urban Park is selected as the case for this study. National parks are defined as “representative examples of Canadian landscape”, established; managed; and protected according to the National Park System and under the Canada National Park Act.
National parks comprise 39 “National Parks Natural Regions”, identified across Canada (National Parks System Plan, n.d, p.4). For each national park a management plan must be prepared and approved by the Minister in charge of Parks Canada (Environment Minister) within five years of its proclamation. Plans are reviewed and re-tabled with any changes every five years. The process of preparing the management plan starts after the land is put under Parks Canada control, which may be long before its formal establishment under the National Parks Act. National parks can provide very good contexts for studying community engagement in planning because according to the Act, public participation should be encouraged and facilitated during the process of establishing a national park:

“The Minister shall, where applicable, provide opportunities for public participation at the national, regional and local levels, including participation by aboriginal organizations, bodies established under land claims agreements and representatives of park communities, in the development of parks policy and regulations, the establishment of parks, the formulation of management plans, land use planning and development in relation to park communities and any other matters that the Minister considers relevant” (Canada National Parks Act, 2000, p.6).

Considering that the proposed Rouge Park is located in the largest urban area in Canada and is accessible by 20% of the Canadian population, there has been a high emphasis on public involvement and the Park is referred to as People’s Park (Parks Canada, June 2012). The proposed study area for the Park extends from Lake Ontario in the south to the Oak Ridges Moraine in the north, crossing three municipalities: Scarborough, Markham, and Pickering (Appendix A). Neighbourhoods adjacent to the Park in each of the three municipalities are:

- **Scarborough**: ward 42: Scarborough-Rouge River, wards 43 and 44: Scarborough East;
- **Markham**: ward 7; and
- **Pickering**: wards 1 and 3.

Rouge National Urban Park is particularly appropriate for studying immigrants’ engagement as the communities living around the Park are among the most diverse in Canada with a high percentage of first generation immigrants. Table 3-1 shows the percentage of the immigrant population and the top five places of birth in each neighbourhood based on the 2011
National Household Survey\(^5\). Three of the areas, namely Scarborough-Rouge River, Scarborough East and Markham, have even higher percentages of first generation immigrants than the average in the city of Toronto (51.4\%)\(^6\). The National Household Survey defines first generation immigrants as follows:

“First generation includes persons who were born outside Canada. For the most part, these are people who are now, or have ever been, immigrants to Canada”\(^7\).

Table 3-1.
Diversity in neighbourhoods around the Rouge National Urban Park

| Ward 42: Scarborough-Rouge River | 64.4% | Sri Lanka; Philippines; India; Guyana; Jamaica |
| Ward 43: Scarborough East | 52.3% | India; Philippines; Sri Lanka; Jamaica; Guyana |
| Ward 44: Scarborough East | 47.5% | Philippines; India; Guyana; Sri Lanka; Jamaica |
| Markham | 59.0% | China; Hong Kong; Sri Lanka; India; Philippines |
| Pickering | 31.8% | UK; Jamaica; Guyana; Philippines; India |

In 2009, the Rouge Park Alliance and the Rouge Park board of directors hired Strategy Corp-Hemson Consulting to conduct a study on alternative governance models and funding options for the Park. In 2010, the study concluded by suggesting the national park model and turning the Rouge Park into Canada’s first national urban park, as a solution for Rouge Park governance and funding issues (Strategy Corp-Hemson Consulting, 2010). The federal Government’s plan for creating a national urban park in the Rouge Valley was formally announced in the 2011 Speech from the Throne and on May 25, 2012 $143.7 million was allocated to be spent over a 10 year period for its creation, and $7.6 million annually thereafter for its further development (Parks Canada, n.d.). The Rouge National Urban Park Act was enforced and the Park was formally established on May 15, 2015.

The public engagement process (Appendix B), implemented from November 2011 to October 2012, included the following main steps and resulted in six reports:

\(^5\) Data for Markham and Pickering represent the entire municipalities.
\(^6\) http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=2394fe17e5648410VgnVCM1000071d60f89RCRD
\(^7\) http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CSD&Code1=3518001&Data=Count&SearchText=Pickering&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&A1=Immigration%20and%20citizenship&B1=All&Custom=&amp;TABID=1
- **Visioning workshop-November 9, 2011:**
  Representatives of 43 stakeholder groups, mostly people who had been involved with
  the Park during the past 30 years, were invited to participate in drafting a set of
  guiding principles and key elements of the vision for the Rouge National Urban Park.

- **Youth workshop-February 2, 2012 (two sessions):**
  Youth, recruited from local institutions (including University of Toronto
  Scarborough, 4-H Ontario, Malvern Family Resource Centre, Centennial College,
  YMCA GTA, East Scarborough Storefront, and Dunbarton High School) were invited
  to provide input on four themes, namely *Experience, Discovery, Getting Involved,* and
  *Other.*

- **Feedback session-May 25, 2012:**
  The Park concept was developed based on the input received in the visioning and
  youth workshops. It was presented in a follow up session to representatives of 49
  stakeholder groups, including First Nations, in order to receive feedback and further
  input. The list of stakeholders invited to the follow-up session was similar to the one
  used for the first visioning workshop in addition to new participants from local
  farming associations, environmental groups, MPs, and representatives of First Nation
  communities.

- **Public engagement events and online survey-Jun 25 to October 8, 2012:**
  The Park concept was then presented to the public for feedback and input through
  different channels including:
  - Three public information sessions in Scarborough, Markham, and
    Pickering;
  - Three stakeholder meetings; and,
  - Fifteen events attended by Parks Canada staff.

  The outcome of the public engagement process was summarized under nine guiding
  principles for development and management of the Park (Appendix C).

- **Feedback on the management plan-June 2014:**
  The draft of the management plan for the Rouge National Urban Park, the strategic
  plan that will guide all aspects of its management over the next 10 years, was
published. Feedback from the public on the draft plan was collected from June to October 2014 through an online survey, four open houses, and community events.

It is noteworthy that consultation with members of First Nations communities, living in the existing Rouge Park, was conducted as a parallel process.

3.4 Data Gathering

To develop an understanding of immigrants’ engagement in tourism planning, individual semi-structured interviews were used as the primary data gathering method. 36 interviews were conducted with three groups of participants as shown in figure 3-1. The initial data gathering plan, presented in the research proposal, did not include partner organizations. However, the need for and importance of incorporating perspectives of partner organizations became evident after the first few interviews with planners.

- Planners: 17 interviews were conducted in this group with participants from: Parks Canada National Office (9), Rouge National Urban Park Initiative (2), Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (1), Rouge Park Alliance (1), Rouge Park Team (1), and politicians that have been involved in the establishment process (3). This group covers a range of different participants, including experts who have been directly involved in designing and implementing the public consultation process for the Rouge National Urban Park, Parks Canada senior managers whose philosophies and visions set the strategic direction of the agency at the national level, and politicians who have been heavily involved with the former Rouge Park and the new National Urban Park. A data sharing agreement was signed between Parks Canada and University of Guelph in order to facilitate the data gathering process.
Partner organizations: intermediaries, mainly non-profit and community organizations that connect planners with immigrant communities including University of Toronto Scarborough, David Suzuki Foundation, YMCA Scarborough, City of Toronto, East Scarborough Storefront, and Malvern Family Resource Center. 8 participants were interviewed in this group.

Community leaders: eleven community leaders, living in the neighbourhoods around the Park with South Asian (3), Caribbean (4), Chinese (2), European (1), and African (1) backgrounds participated in the research. All participants were first generation immigrants, who came to Canada between 1965 and 1996. Six of the 11 community leaders have worked and retired in Canada. They are very active in local projects and three of them are founders and executive directors of community organizations. Four of the eleven participants are still of working age and face challenges in finding jobs. One of the participants is a very accomplished politician, who came to Canada at the age of five and is highly involved with first generation immigrants and newcomers’ communities.

Research participants were recruited through purposeful and snowball sampling. The data gathering process started with interviewing research participants in the first group (planners), who were identified from documents released by Parks Canada and also through attending the three information sessions held as part of the Rouge National Urban Park’s public consultation process. Then participants in the planners’ group were asked to suggest other potential participants. Snowball sampling at this stage resulted in more interviews with planners and members of partner organizations. Participants in the third group (community leaders) were also recruited through snowball sampling and recommended by partner organizations or other community leaders. Three of the community leaders participated in this research were involved in community organizations at the management level and the other seven were active volunteers.

The approach taken with regard to collecting data from community leaders and identifying and contacting them through partner organizations resonates with research findings that suggest collaborating with community leaders as an effective strategy for overcoming barriers for understanding and reaching out to disengaged community members as well as connecting with community leaders through community organizations. Eight of the potential
participants (2 planners; 1 community/partner organization; and 5 community leaders) did not respond to interview invitations in spite of several attempts.

Participants were contacted primarily via email with phone follow-ups, if necessary. They were provided with the interview questions and consent form after accepting the invitation. Interviews took 45 minutes to one hour and were voice recorded, except one case in which the participant was not comfortable with being recorded. All interviews were conducted face-to-face in Toronto locations convenient to the interviewees, except for two Skype interviews.

Two sets of questions were designed for the interviews: one for planners and partner/community organizations, the other for community leaders (appendices D and E). Small adjustments were made before and during interviews based on participants’ backgrounds, relations to the Rouge Park as well as specific areas that required cross checking and confirmation. All participants were asked a general question about their background (e.g. professional and educational background, immigration to Canada, any potential collaboration with Parks Canada). As encouraged by the semi-structured approach, additional “unscheduled probes” were used during interviews in order to achieve a better understanding of participants’ points of view. This flexible structure allowed for comparing data across interviews and also for approaching each interview as a specific case with unique aspects (Berg, 2012, p. 113).

Interviews were conducted between July 2012 and April 2014, as the public consultation process of the Rouge National Urban Park was being implemented. Given this timeframe, I could gather accurate data by asking participants about a project that they were recently involved in, or at least had heard of, and could easily remember.

Documents, including reports and newsletters made publicly available on the Rouge National Park Initiative page of Parks Canada’s website, were used as secondary sources of data. Documents were reviewed after the completion of interview data analysis in accordance with the grounded and naturalistic approach and to reduce the impact of preconceived ideas on the analysis process. Document analysis was considered as a high level auditing process with two specific purposes:

- To better understand the context; and
- To identify consistencies, inconsistencies, and potential gaps.
Documents were specifically reviewed through the lens of the findings. The list of the analyzed documents is provided in Appendix F.

Additionally, attending the three information sessions, held by Parks Canada as part of the public consultation process, helped me to gain familiarity with the research context and make primary contacts with potential research participants before entering into the data gathering phase.

The qualitative nature of the data is aligned with the naturalistic and interpretivist approach adopted for the study and appropriate for addressing research objectives. Qualitative data allows researchers to study the complexity of social systems (Patton & Appelbaum, 2003), which is essential for this study. The nature of qualitative research is explained by Gephart (2004) as follows:

“Qualitative research employs meanings in use by societal members to explain how they directly experience everyday life realities” (p.455).

Qualitative methodologies have been increasingly used in tourism research in recent years (Pernecky & Jamal, 2010) and are recommended for future studies in the field (Ballantyne & Axelsen, 2009).

3.5 Data Analysis

With recordings of 36 interviews of 45 minutes to 1 hour in length, the volume of data collected required an extensive analysis process to code, compare, integrate, aggregate, and interpret. The multi-stages of the data analysis process customized for this research are discussed below and also shown visually in figure 3-2. First, coding was done within each of the three respondent groups. Next, the data was analyzed between the groups, followed by document and literature review leading to the study themes and principles of immigrant engagement.
3.5.1 Initial coding

Initial coding was conducted manually and without adopting any predefined labels or codes following Charmaz (2006) advice to “remain open to exploring whatever possibilities we can discern in the data” (p.47). In order to take the learning process into account, the first 15 interviews were coded twice with a 20 day break in between. The first round was more focused on developing and practicing a consistent method of coding. It included deciding on units of coding (i.e. coding transcripts phrase by phrase) and adopting labels that “demonstrate action” (e.g. working with partner organizations instead of partnership strategy) (Tweed & Charmaz, 2011, p.139). Consistent wording was used for similar codes and tentative themes started to emerge. I tried to use in vivo codes where possible (i.e. borrowing terms used by participants as labels) as a method to stay close to the data (Charmaz, 2006, p. 55). Interviews were also colour-coded based on four broad categories: Definitions and Assumptions; Context and Background Information; Barriers; and Suggestions for the Future in an attempt to make sense of the data and facilitate data management.

3.5.2 Focused coding using NVivo

Focused coding, the process of forming categories based on initial codes, was undertaken using NVivo 10 software in order to facilitate comparison of codes across interviews. Codes and themes were selected for entering into NVivo based on three criteria: frequency (number of times
repeated), importance (offering a unique or deep insight into the phenomenon although not frequently mentioned by different participants), and relevance to research questions. NVivo was used as a data management tool and not an analysis tool because the nature of this research calls for an in-depth analysis of the constructed meanings and perceptions, which cannot be performed by a software.

3.5.3 Axial coding through mind mapping

The focus of axial coding is on “linking categories with subcategories” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 60). Mind mapping was used as a manual method for connecting and integrating categories and sub-categories under main themes. The following themes were formed within each of the three data sets:

- Planners: Definitions and Assumptions (including Meaning of Community Participation, Purpose of Immigrants’ Engagement, Assumptions about Immigrants); Current Approach to Immigrants’ Engagement (including Partnership Strategy, Youth Engagement, Targeting Established Immigrants; Relying on Traditional Models; No Separate Strategy for Engaging Immigrants); and Suggested Strategies;
- Partner organizations: Definitions and Assumptions (Meaning of Community Participation; Purpose of Immigrants' Engagement; Assumptions about Immigrants); Barriers; Youth Engagement; and Suggested Strategies;
- Community leaders: Meaning of Community Participation; Community Leaders (including Characteristics of Community Leaders and Reasons for Becoming Engaged with the Community); First Generation Immigrants’ Engagement-Current Situation; Community Organizations; and Suggestions.

The iterative process of manually drawing, comparing, and revising mind maps gradually resulted in eliminating some of the findings from the final presentation of the data in order to enhance focus. Fourteen within-group mind maps were aggregated into nine between group maps, which were eventually condensed to six maps, each with a corresponding interpretation in memo format.
3.5.4 Between-group analysis

Data gathered from each group of participants were first analyzed as an independent set, and separate NVivo files or projects were created for each set in order to:

- Gain a better understanding of the different stories heard from planners, partner organizations, and community leaders;
- Identify potential consistencies, inconsistencies, and gaps;
- Reduce the risk of imposing categories that had emerged from the coded data in one group on the new data gathered from the next group of participants; and,
- Facilitate data management by splitting the data into smaller NVivo projects.

Themes were then compared across the three groups and data were aggregated into similar “higher level” or between-group themes. This step resulted in forming more comprehensive and richer themes. In addition, using different colours for data pulled from each group allowed for further between-group comparisons and identifying gaps and overlaps. The aggregated themes were as follows:

- Meaning of community participation
- Current approach to engaging first generation immigrants
- Barriers
- Suggestions for enhancing first generation immigrants’ engagements
- Appropriate time for reaching out to first generation immigrants & youth engagement
- Working with partner/community organizations
- Working with community leaders
- Context
- Rouge Park

3.5.5 Memo writing

Although writing memos was an ongoing process throughout the research as part of keeping a research journal, it was conducted in a more structured and focused way at this stage. Memo writing is considered as “an intermediate stage between data collection and write-up”
(Tweed & Charmaz, 2011, p.132). All previous memos, mind maps, categories and even codes were reviewed and revised, as necessary. This process of drafting a story for each theme by connecting, explaining and elaborating on categories and subcategories resulted in more focus on key findings and eliminating superfluous data. Maintaining focus was especially important for this research due to its broad and interdisciplinary nature.

Each memo had three components: a mind map that showed categories and subcategories forming the theme, coding details in table format, and a description of the data in text format. At the end of the memo writing process the nine themes, listed above, were revised, reorganized and condensed into the following six memos:

- Meaning of community participation;
- Parks Canada’s current approach to engaging immigrants;
- Contributing factors to low community participation among first generation immigrants;
- Suggestions for enhancing first generation immigrants’ participation;
- Appropriate time for reaching out to immigrant communities; and,
- Working with community leaders and community organizations.

The mind maps listed above are presented in Appendix G. Different colours show how data from the three participant groups are integrated to form richer themes. The colour blue represents data gathered from planners, green indicates partner organizations’ data, and purple shows community leaders’ responses.

3.5.6 Connecting findings to theory

The six memos listed above offered insights into different aspects of the current approach to immigrants’ engagement in tourism related public decision-making activities. The next stage of the analysis process was focused on identifying key elements of a more inclusive community engagement process based on research findings. The memo on “Suggestions for enhancing first generation immigrants’ participation” was used as a starting point. Main findings captured in memos were then highlighted, connected, and interpreted through the lens of the existing literature, specifically communicative planning, stakeholder theory, and learning theories.
Through this process findings were elevated to a higher level of abstraction, resulting in the following five principles:

- Adopting an ongoing, long-term, and communicative approach;
- Being open to new perspectives and willing to revisit assumptions;
- Engaging in short-term and long-term learning;
- Collaborating with community leaders; and,
- Designing parallel strategies and customized tactics.

**3.5.7 Composing the first complete draft**

The analysis process continued into the writing phase. At this stage, I already had drafts of dissertation chapters. However, integrating these documents and composing the first complete draft involved revisiting, reordering, and relabeling themes as well as additional literature review to ensure that arguments and contributions are clearly communicated and adequately supported. Earlier drafts were written in a more distant tone with a heavy emphasis on justifying methodology decisions by providing support from the literature. Several revisions helped me to move closer to the interpretivist and qualitative writing style by trying to highlight the unique story of my research while maintaining an appropriate balance between the actual research process and relevant literature. A comparison between the list of themes and principles before this stage (presented in sections 3.5.5 and 3.5.6) with final results as presented in Chapter 4, shows how the wording and grouping of the themes and principles have changed during the writing process. The six memos were aggregated into two main themes, namely meaning of community participation and planners’ approach to engaging first generation immigrants, in order to provide a more coherent and comprehensive narrative of the current situation.

**3.6 Establishing Research Rigour: Criteria for Quality and Trustworthiness**

The following strategies were incorporated into the research design to ensure quality and trustworthiness.

- *Triangulation:* Data were gathered from three different groups of participants with a wide range of experiences and backgrounds. Moreover, observation and document
analysis were used as complementary data sources in order to find consistencies, inconsistencies, and gaps.

- **Self-reflection:** I reflected on and documented my philosophical assumptions, perceptions, and expectations during the research process in a reflective journal. Guba & Lincoln (1982) emphasize the importance of explicating the researcher’s own philosophical assumptions and worldview in enhancing the quality of naturalistic enquiries. The need for higher levels of *self-awareness* in tourism studies is specifically discussed by Goodson and Phillimore (2004) who encourage researchers to:

  “acknowledge and question their own culture and identity in order to provide some insight into their understanding of themselves in the context of their interactions with others (p.41).”

- **Detailed documentation of the research process:** Important methodological decisions, adjustments made in the initial research design, and details of the data analysis method as it evolved throughout the process, were also recorded in the reflective journal.

- **Constant comparison:** Constant comparison refers to the ongoing comparison between data, codes, and categories along the entire research process. With three exceptions (a group interview with three participants and four interviews conducted within two days in Ottawa), only one interview per day was conducted. Each interview was transcribed and reviewed before the next one. This approach allowed for reflection, constant comparison of the data throughout the data gathering process, and implementation of required adjustments. In addition, it gave me the opportunity to enhance my interviewing skills based on the reflections, which resulted in collecting higher quality data. Data gathered from each of the three groups of participants was analyzed multiple times and comparisons were made both within and between groups.

- **Dependability and confirmability audit:** Members of the PhD advisory committee reviewed all steps of the research process as external auditors. Detailed reports including reflections were shared with the committee before regular meetings.

- **Theoretical sampling:** Theoretical sampling was used as a strategy for ensuring saturated categories as suggested by the constructivist grounded theory approach. It
refers to gathering additional data after initial categories are formed and developing new categories or enriching the existing ones in order to ensure “all voices are represented” (Tweed & Charmaz, 2011, pp.132-133). Theoretical sampling can be conducted through “studying documents; observation; interviewing or re-interviewing with a focus on theoretical categories” (Charmaz, 2006, p.107). Conducting interviews in small clusters and coding each cluster before starting the next round of interviews made it possible to identify areas that required further investigation. Clarifying inconsistencies and ambiguities as well as addressing information gaps were considered in selecting research participants and in modifying questions for each interview. Additional insights were also gained through reviewing documents.

- **Theoretical saturation:** Parallel data gathering and analysis as well as conducting interviews in small clusters with reflective intervals in between allowed for examining the richness of categories throughout the process. According to Charmaz (2006), categories can be considered as saturated when:

  “gathering fresh data no longer sparks new theoretical insights, nor reveals new properties of your core theoretical categories” (p.113).

All potential research participants in the planners group, identified during the purposeful and snowball sampling process, were interviewed. With regard to partner organizations, potential participants could be categorized in two groups. (1) primary informants: organizations and individuals with current or previous connections to the Rouge Park project or Parks Canada as well as those working with immigrant communities in neighbourhoods adjacent to the park, and (2) secondary informants: organizations and individuals that work with immigrant communities and newcomers in the Greater Toronto Area with no particular connection to the Rouge Park or Parks Canada. All potential participants identified in the primary group as well as all community leaders recommended through the snowball sampling process were contacted and everyone who responded to and accepted the invitation was interviewed.

It is noteworthy that due to the inherent complexity and multidisciplinary nature of the topic, diversity and wide range of potential research participants, and the fact that Rouge National Urban Park is a unique and unprecedented case in Canada, it is
extremely difficult to indicate that gathering more data would not provide additional insights. However, data gathering was continued to the point where rich categories were formed and enough data was collected to fully address the research questions.

- **Receiving participants’ feedback:** Preliminary findings were presented in a meeting at Parks Canada’s national office in Ottawa. A summary report including detailed mind maps of data gathered from planners and partner organizations was provided before the meeting. Parks Canada was represented by seven senior managers and experts, five of whom had participated in interviews before. Attendants were directly involved in implementing the agency’s *Civic and New Canadians Outreach* strategy as well as the Rouge National Urban Park initiative. The discussion was specifically focused on the six dimensions of Parks Canada’s current approach to engaging first generation immigrants (e.g. partnership strategy; youth engagement; targeting established immigrants; focusing on visitation vs. participation in governance; relying on traditional models; and not having a specific strategy for engaging first generation immigrants). The dimensions were presented and discussed one by one and were all confirmed by Parks Canada representatives. In addition, three emerging topics (namely raising awareness at the point of entry, reaching out to seniors, and building champions at the community level) were mentioned at the meeting, which resonated with the data collected from partner organizations and community leaders. Receiving participants’ feedback at this stage was particularly important because the data gathered from this group is mostly focused on understanding Parks Canada’s current approach in reaching out to immigrant communities. Therefore, it was necessary to ensure that the agency’s implicit strategies were accurately presented. These findings were then cross-checked and compared with data gathered from the other two groups of participants as well as the reviewed documents.

Qualitative studies require evaluation criteria that ensure and communicate research quality and trustworthiness and at the same time are flexible enough to allow for and highlight the creative and unique nature of each study. The above strategies are designed based on the criteria introduced by Guba & Lincoln (1982) and Charmaz (2006) as well as specific characteristics of this research. Guba and Lincoln (1982) suggest *credibility; transferability; dependability and*
confirmability as trustworthiness criteria for naturalistic inquiry and as counterparts for internal validity; generalizability/external validity; reliability and objectivity under the rationalistic paradigm. Strategies for enhancing research trustworthiness in each of these areas are summarized below:

- Confirmability: triangulation, practicing reflexivity, confirmability audit\(^8\);
- Credibility: prolonged engagement in the site, persistent observation, peers debriefing, triangulation, referential adequacy materials\(^9\), member checks;
- Transferability: theoretical sampling, thick descriptions, use of overlap methods, stepwise replication\(^10\); and,

Charmaz (2006) also offers four criteria, namely credibility, originality, resonance, and usefulness, for evaluating grounded theory studies and provides a list of questions that can be asked to assess research quality in each of the four areas. Table 3-2 shows the list of questions offered by Charmaz (2006) as well as how each question is addressed by adopting the above mentioned strategies.

Questions related to credibility and resonance are focused on the rigour and quality of data gathering and analysis. Therefore, these criteria are addressed by listing specific strategies used to ensure credibility and resonance throughout the research process. However, originality and usefulness criteria are more concerned with the findings (i.e. theoretical and practical contributions of the study) and so are discussed in chapter 5.

---

\(^8\) Working backward from the results to data through the analysis process to make sure that the research findings are the result of a meaningful interpretation of the data (Guba & Lincoln, 1982).
\(^9\) Keeping a portion of raw data to be analysed in the future as a way to see if it will result in similar findings (Guba & Lincoln, 1982).
\(^10\) Dividing the data into two parts and analysing each part separately (Guba & Lincoln, 1982).
Table 3.2.
Criteria for grounded theory studies and strategies adopted to address them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for grounded theory studies (Charmaz, 2006, p 182-183)</th>
<th>Adopted strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Has your research achieved intimate familiarity with the setting or topic?</td>
<td>Yes (triangulation, theoretical sampling &amp; receiving feedback)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Are the data sufficient to merit your claims? Consider the range, number and depth of observations contained in the data?</td>
<td>Yes (triangulation, saturated &amp; rich categories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Have you made systematic comparison between observations and between categories?</td>
<td>Yes (constant comparison)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Do the categories cover a wide range of empirical observations?</td>
<td>Yes (saturated &amp; rich categories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Are there strong logical links between the gathered data and your argument and analysis?</td>
<td>Yes (detailed documentation of the process, dependability &amp; confirmability audit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Has your research provided enough evidence for your claims to allow the reader to form an independent assessment - and agree with your claims?</td>
<td>Yes (triangulation &amp; receiving participants’ feedback)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Originality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Are your categories fresh? Do they offer new insights?</td>
<td>Yes (discussed under theoretical contributions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Does your analysis provide a new conceptual rendering of the data?</td>
<td>Yes (discussed under theoretical contributions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-What is the social and theoretical significance of this work?</td>
<td>Discussed under theoretical &amp; practical contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-How does your grounded theory challenge, extend, or refine current ideas, concepts, and practices?</td>
<td>Uncovered underlying perceptions, mapped &amp; analyzed current approaches, suggested alternative approaches &amp; practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resonance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Do the categories portray the fullness of the studied experience?</td>
<td>Yes (saturated &amp; rich categories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Have you revealed both luminal and unstable taken-for-granted meanings?</td>
<td>Yes (uncovered underlying perceptions, documented implicit strategies &amp; approaches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Have you drawn links between larger collectivities or institutions and individual lives, when the data so indicate?</td>
<td>Yes (addressed the impact of implicit &amp; explicit planning approaches on community members’ engagement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Does your grounded theory make sense to your participants or people who share their circumstances? Does your analysis offer them deeper insights about their lives and worlds?</td>
<td>Yes (received participants’ feedback) Discussed under practical contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usefulness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Does your analysis offer interpretations that people can use in their everyday worlds?</td>
<td>Yes (discussed under practical contributions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Do your analytic categories suggest any generic processes?</td>
<td>Yes (Suggested principles for more inclusive engagement processes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-If so, have you examined these generic processes for tacit implications?</td>
<td>Discussed under practical contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Can the analysis spark further research in other substantive areas?</td>
<td>Yes (discussed under areas for future research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-How does your work contribute to knowledge? How does it contribute to making a better world?</td>
<td>Discussed under theoretical and practical contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Findings and Interpretations

In this chapter I will present research findings in two sections, each addressing one of the research objectives. The first part is focused on understanding the current situation, discussed under the following themes:

- Meaning of community participation from planners’ and community leaders’ perspective; and,
- Planners’ approach to engaging first generation immigrants.

Insights gained from studying the current situation, as well as additional data on research participants’ suggestions for enhancing immigrants’ engagement are then further developed and interpreted using relevant theories, namely stakeholder theory, communicative planning, and learning theories. The result is presented in the second part of the chapter as five underlying principles for the design and implementation of more inclusive engagement processes.

As described in chapter 3, findings presented here resulted from three rounds of coding on three separate data sets (gathered from planners, partner organizations, and community leaders), between-group analysis through mind mapping, and data aggregation through memo writing. Categories and subcategories forming each of the two main themes (meaning of community participation and planners’ approach to engaging immigrants) are summarized in a mind map (Figures 4-1 and 4-2). The colour blue represents data gathered from planners, green indicates partner organizations’ data, and purple shows community leaders’ responses. Power quotes, meaning “the most compelling bits of data”, are included in text with proof quotes, meaning more data for providing additional support for arguments, along with coding details presented in Appendix H (Pratt, 2009, p.860). A tracking system is developed for linking quotations to interview transcripts, which uses a combination of letters (P for planners, PO for partner organization, and CL for community leaders) and numbers.
4.1 Understanding the Current Situation

4.1.1 Meaning of community participation

Planners’ assumptions about the notion of community participation and to what extent they are in line with community leaders’ perceptions inform the design and implementation of the process and influence its effectiveness in engaging community members. Aligned with my philosophical assumptions and in order to have a better understanding of the current approach, before discussing the specific case of the Rouge National Urban Park, I asked research participants what community participation means to them. Their responses to this question can be categorized under five themes:

- Receiving input from the community (P1; P6; P9; P10; P11)
- Raising awareness, informing, and educating community members (P3; PO7)
- Connecting with others (PO1; PO3; CL2; CL3; CL4)
- Sharing and learning (CL2; CL4; CL7)
- Helping others and developing the community/society (PO3; PO5; CL9; CL11)

The first two categories are mostly formed by the data gathered from planners, whereas the other three are formed by data gathered from community leaders and community organizations. Figure 4-1 shows categories in the form of a mind map.

Planners’ perception of community participation (i.e. receiving input and informing and educating community members) falls into the second level of Arnstein’s (1969) Ladder of Citizen Participation. It is called Degrees of Tokenism and is described as follows:

“… citizens may indeed hear and be heard. But under these conditions they lack the power to insure that their views will be heeded by the powerful. When participation is restricted to these levels there is no follow through, no “muscle,” hence no assurance of changing the status quo” (p. 217).

Tosun (2006) refers to this level of participation as induced participation and describes it as “Top-down; passive; formal; participation in implementation and sharing benefits; choice between proposed alternatives and feedback” (p. 494). Common elements can be found between these definitions and Rouge Park’s public consultation process, where the public’s input was mostly gathered later in the process and on already drafted documents. Overall there is much
more data on *talking* to community members vs. *hearing* from them. With the exception of one comment on the need to provide first generation immigrants with multiple methods for providing input (PO3), most of the responses deal with different ways of delivering information to community members, which indicates a one-way communication philosophy. In addition, data on distributing information is more specific and detailed, whereas when it comes to hearing from community members, comments are more general, possibly due to planners’ limited experience in this area.

Community leaders look at community participation more as an opportunity to connect and build relationships with their peers. They define community participation as sharing their “knowledge, time, energy, and talent”; and “mutual and transformative learning”. Another aspect of community participation as perceived by community leaders is contributing to the “development”, and “betterment” of their community, neighbourhood, and society. They emphasize the process and experience of engagement, whereas planners are more focused on achieving specific outcomes.

Planners’ comments on the purpose of community participation and their emphasis on “increased visitation” and “ensuring future generation’s support of national parks” indicate their goal-oriented approach (P7) as explained by the following research participant:

“The level of involvement, the actual way they get involved to me doesn’t really matter. What matters to me is if they can relate to this place and appreciate it and understand it and share this with their kids” (P2).
Figure 4.1. Meaning of community participation\(^{11}\)

\(^{11}\) The colour blue represents data gathered from planners, green indicates partner organizations’ data, and purple shows community leaders’ responses.
4.1.2 Planners’ approach to engaging first generation immigrants

Data collected on planners’ current approach to immigrants’ engagement is discussed under six themes (as shown in Figure 4-2). The first two themes are focused on planners’ implicit and explicit assumptions and subsequent actions with regard to targeting specific community segments. These findings advance our understanding of who is being encouraged to participate in the planning process. The other four themes are concerned with the participation process itself. This section discusses how planners reach out to communicate with and engage immigrant community members in planning and decision-making processes.

It is noteworthy that there has been no clear distinction between recent and established immigrants, first and second generation immigrants, first generation immigrants and ethnic communities; and first generation immigrants with and without Canadian citizenship. New Canadians is the term used by Parks Canada for referring to immigrants. However, different terminologies were used by research participants in the partner organizations’ group, including: cultural communities (PO4); first generation settlers (PO3); newer Canadians (P15); newcomers (RO5); and people of colour (PO8). As discussed in the following pages, although the need to connect with multicultural local communities and new Canadians has been acknowledged by planners, it is not reflected in the current community participation approach. In practice, planners’ efforts to engage community members indicate a more general strategy that does not account for the diversity and heterogeneity of communities living in the neighbourhoods adjacent to the Park or the individual differences among immigrants.

4.1.2.1 How the approach influences who participates

Targeting youth and “established” immigrants

“New Canadians, youth and urban Canadians” are specified as Parks Canada’s primary audience (P3). However, in practice the emphasis is on engaging the last two groups, especially youth.

The idea of reaching out to youth as part of the public consultation process of the Rouge National Urban Park was suggested by two of the participants in the first visioning workshop as explained below:
“When we had the very first visioning workshop there was almost no diversity in the room whatsoever. There was myself [and another lady\(^{12}\)] and that was about all the diversity we had in the room. And I think the two of us were probably the youngest in the room, and one of the things that came up was that you need to hear the voice of young people because many of the people who have been involved in the park for 20-25 years, those weren’t the people that Parks Canada needed to get involved in the park. So I guess coming out of that was that we need to do some work in terms of mobilizing young people and getting the young people’s [input] (PO1).”

A youth workshop was then held by Parks Canada to receive input from youth on the Park Concept. The focus on engaging youth can be attributed to two assumptions:

- In Toronto the youth population is very diverse and includes a large number of new Canadians. As explained in the following interview excerpt, reaching out to youth is believed to be an efficient way of using the agency’s limited resources, as it is believed that many of the youth in the neighbourhoods around the Rouge Park are also new immigrants.

  “New Canadians, urban Canadians and youth are priority audience for Parks Canada and I do have a small team, but they work with my youth team, for example, because if you are going to Toronto to talk to youth in all likelihood you are going to have an overlap of new Canadians, new immigrants in that mix” (P3).

- Planners can connect with parents through youth as described in the following quotation:

  “So if you look at new Canadian[s] ...most families have young kids. So how do we use the kids, from a positive perspective, of getting the kids out in the Park then bringing their parents in the Park?” (P7).

The best time for engaging newcomer youth is “in their first year or two in Canada” and in “grades 10 and 11 before they go to university” (PO2). The current approach does not distinguish between newcomer youth and youth that are either born in Canada or came to Canada at a very young age. However, the interview with an experienced youth engagement expert revealed that newcomer youth are more likely to bring their friends to events compared to Canadian born youth (PO2) and are more open to new experiences:

\(^{12}\) Identifying information is removed.
“Newcomer youth are a little bit more open to trying something new because everything is already a little bit new so it’s not scary ... So if I say let’s go up to the Milner Park and plant some trees, a newcomer youth, who hasn’t done it before would say OK, I’ll try it out. This is another thing I haven’t done before. Whereas, some of the other youth I had would be much more afraid to step out of their comfort zone. But the newcomer youth are already outside of their comfort zone. So with some encouragement and, you know, make [sic] sure that it’s safe and they know what they are getting into, I feel they are much more willing to go try on new things” (PO2).

Results of a workshop, during which youth where shown pictures of the Rouge Park and asked to describe their thoughts and emotions about it, reveal that some of the newcomer youth are afraid of going to the Park (PO2) because it is different from their perception of a park and other urban parks they know (which are smaller and offer different types of activities). Therefore, they would like to receive more information about the activities that they can participate in when visiting the Park.

With regard to engaging adults, Parks Canada’s efforts and programs for connecting with immigrants have been mostly focused on people who have been living in Canada for more than three to five years and are already Canadian citizens. Examples of these initiatives are holding citizenship ceremonies in national parks and national historic sites as well as the Cultural Access Pass, provided to new Canadians when they take their Oath of Citizenship (P1). The fact that Parks Canada is communicating only in official languages (English and French) also reflects its approach in reaching out to more established immigrants that are comfortable with communicating in English or French.

It is perceived that during the first three to five, or even 10 years (P10), newcomers are completely focused on their basic needs such as learning the language, finding a job, and taking care of their children’s education. Hence, Parks Canada assumes that being engaged with national parks is not among their priorities. Therefore, the first three to five years is considered as an “awareness” phase and a time for newcomers to learn about Canada in general and national parks and historic sites in particular (p7). However, data gathered from community organizations and leaders show that despite all challenges that immigrants face during the early years of settlement, they can and need to be engaged with their communities.
“They are very interested. Just the information has to be given ... so even if people are busy, you know, you can always find one hour or two a week to be engaged” (CL8).

“That’s a cop out. You know when people say that, that’s a total cop out. That tells me that they don’t have the tools or the knowledge or the experience to do the engagement. So they just say as a rationalization it’s hard and they don’t try. ... [sic] It’s all about people making judgements. So I think inherent in that ... is a value judgement. And I think that’s quite problematic” (PO5).

Newcomers visit community organizations and attend public meetings even within the first weeks and months (PO6; CL5) because they want to learn more about their new community. This would give community organizations a great opportunity to connect with newcomers and start building relationships, which is essential community engagement (CL9; PO4; PO6; PO7).

Parks are specifically appropriate contexts for this purpose as spending time in nature can help newcomers to deal with the stress that they experience in earlier stages of settlement in the new country (PO3). Five to 10 years is considered “a long time to be disengaged” (PO6). The following interview excerpt captures a research participant’s opinion on this issue:

“I think it’s a huge disservice. Because ... it assumes that people don’t like nature, that they have no inherent experience of nature and only “Canadians” understand nature. It’s an assumption of power ... It’s a huge disservice because the first five years of settlement is the most stressful and that is when you do need to have a space to go into and reflect ... And humans feel safe in nature and it is an opportunity that is being missed because those memories of the first five years stay with that first generation settler. And if those memories are formed in the Rouge National Urban Park, guess who they are going to support? Rouge National Urban Park. Guess who they will want to volunteer with? Rouge National Urban Park. Guess who they will want to work diligently to grow and nurture and maybe even interact with on a multi-generational level? ... How do we access them? From the point of entry. It means that the Rouge National Urban Park should be broadcast at the Pearson Airport” (PO3).

Such assumptions do not consider the diversity among immigrants and the fact that they have very different levels of education, language skills, and job experiences. Many of them may only need a few months to become settled, while for others it may take years or even a generation. In fact developing a sense of belonging to parks and natural spaces can enhance new immigrants’ integration with the mainstream society (Lovelock et al. 2011) and facilitate their settlement (Horolets, 2015).
In addition, due to the lack of a coherent engagement strategy (which will be discussed in more detail in the following pages), the “awareness” phase is not followed as required for empowering recent immigrants and enhancing their engagement in the long-term.

The study suggests that first generation seniors and retirees can form another segment with a high potential for community engagement that has received less attention. Seniors can be established immigrants who have worked and retired in Canada or parents of first generation immigrants, who join their children in Canada. They have more time to participate in community events and volunteer in local projects (CL2; CL6; CL7; CL11). They would appreciate opportunities to spend time outside the home during the daytime when younger members of the family are busy with work or study. Community engagement can be specifically beneficial for newcomer seniors as it would help them to be more independent, which would reduce the burden on younger family members (CL10).

It is important to note that findings do not suggest an ideal stage or time for reaching out to immigrants. The amount of time needed for getting settled and feeling prepared for community engagement is different for each individual (PO2). As expressed in the quotation below “duration is not necessarily a good measure of one’s integration”:

“You know there are a lot of immigrants who have been, people who immigrated to Canada, they wouldn’t necessarily consider themselves as immigrants but they have been living in Canada for quite some time and they are still very disconnected from the larger society. You know linguistically, culturally, employment wise, so I don’t think duration is necessarily a good measure of one’s integration let’s say” (PO7).

There is a difference between getting settled and becoming integrated into the mainstream society (CL9). Newcomers tend to stay within their cultural and ethnic communities if they do not receive adequate support and integration services (CL5) and this is where local projects and volunteer opportunities at community organizations can play a key role. Sometimes even second generation immigrants, who are born in Canada, may face the same challenges as newcomers because they live in cultural “pockets” (PO2).

**Alienating immigrant community members and reinforcing traditional models**

Research participants have expressed concerns that despite using new outreach methods (e.g. online survey, information sessions, attending events, youth workshop) for engaging the
diverse urban population in Toronto and around the Park (P2), Parks Canada is still relying on “traditional” and “passive” approaches for community engagement. This is partly because first generation immigrants are not engaged in designing outreach and engagement processes. Without engaging first generation immigrants in the planning team, processes and mechanisms will be designed mostly based on values and perceptions of the dominant group(s) and their assumptions about first generation immigrants, as reflected in the following quotations:

“I guess there is [sic] two voices that probably don’t get heard because often decision makers are like me: older people, who have been part of that establishment. One is the immigration communities themselves who aren’t fully franchised and the other is youth, which of course includes immigrant youth too” (P6).

“Boards can [become], sort of, completely so used to each other. I would say this is like what the Rouge Park Alliance was. You see [the] same people were talking to each other for 30 years. Basically there were no new ideas. And that’s why they were into preserving the butterflies and the snakes and they forgot about people” (P12).

“I think one of the biggest barriers is lack of understanding of who they are reaching out to and how to reach out to them. So this speaks volumes to the disparity in cultures of communities. There is this assumption of the norm and norm is a sliding scale ... So whoever is on the forming end of the equation in defining how they do the outreach gets to define this norm. If those individuals inherently don’t have, for example anti-racism analysis; or don’t have an awareness of cultural and social diversity; or [don’t] have an intrinsic understanding of economic diversity; mobility, for example, they will not be able to effectively manage the outreach” (PO3).

Limited diversity in the planning team and designing public participation processes based on traditional norms and assumptions contributes to low participation of first generation immigrants in decision-making activities. The majority of participants in the three public information sessions were already involved with the Park in different ways, mostly senior, long-term residents of the area and members of naturalist groups. This issue is reflected in the following interview excerpts and is supported by my observations at the information sessions.

“[We] usually reach the older people, who have known parks for a long time” (P2).

“I think we tend to go to our traditional audience through our traditional channels, tried and true type of thing. You know if we got email and contact lists we keep going back to the same people and so those are the people that, [sic] either they already know about the places; they already know about the processes; they already know what the strategies are. They know what it is that we do and I think, you know, moving
forward we have to engage a lot more people and a much more diverse audience of people. I don’t mean just necessarily culturally but ... try to engage people who don’t know about us” (P10).

As a result, people who are not represented in the group of active and regular participants feel they do not fit in and are alienated. The fact that the environmental movement in general has been predominantly white and middle class (P15; PO4; PO8) also contributes to this image. There has been a long history of community engagement by environmentalist groups in the Rouge Valley area, mostly formed around conservation issues. A good example is the Friends of the Rouge Watershed, a not-for-profit organization that has been actively involved in the Rouge National Urban Park consultation process.

“All of those people have been fighting this fight for 30 years and they love to talk about it. Without any disrespect but they just honour this old lady ... who is 106 and did 40 years of fighting for the Rouge. I looked at that and went, like, this is your image that you put out there, right? It’s very clear that, like, if somebody looks at this they are like, I don’t fit with this group” (PO8).

Attending these meetings can be an overwhelming experience for people with limited or no public participation experience, particularly first generation immigrants. When topics are related to history; heritage; and culture, adults who are raised in other countries may not feel confident to join the conversation, especially if they have different opinions or perspectives. Immigrants may have different images of nature (Buijs, et al., 2009), perceptions of wilderness (P3; P13), and expectations about how a national urban park should look and what experiences should be offered. Considering the fact that national parks are integral components of the Canadian culture and identity, many of the immigrant community members may be hesitant to share their different views and suggestions. A first generation immigrant community member’s experience with one of the Rouge Park meetings is described as follows:

“... [He] went to one part of the three Rouge meetings but it would have been before the national park ... And I think he had a very, I think he was very fed up with the meeting because the meeting was very much about the environmentalists, and the species and those people taking up a lot of space and feeling entitled to take up a lot of space ... was it really designed at all to incorporate people’s feedback, who do not have, like, environmental science degrees?” (PO8).

Some partner organizations recommend meeting with interested community members before attending public sessions to ensure they would be able to effectively communicate and
contribute to discussions. The idea is to clarify objectives and expectations (PO1) or discuss “what people should say at the meeting” (PO8) as the following interview excerpts indicate:

“So we kind of ... discuss what are the strategic things that we would want people to say or do at those meetings. And, you know, the point was to essentially put [the community] and the organization on the radar of the staff” (PO8).

“We do a lot of pre-meeting work. If we have people who are going to participate in the youth visioning workshops I think we will actually have meetings either with the students that are coming or the leaders that are bringing them to be really clear about what the expectations are, about what their objectives are, what they really want to hear and trying to actually get all of that set up at its place so that when the meeting starts every one of students has some level of comfort” (PO1).

Although these tactics have been used with the intention of enhancing first generation immigrants’ participation, they may be detrimental to an authentic contribution by imposing specific structures on immigrants’ participation and even influencing the content of their input.

4.1.2.2 How the approach influences the participation process

Reducing opportunities for direct interaction and learning by adopting a limited partnership strategy

Parks Canada works with organizations such as the Institute for Canadian Citizenship, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, David Suzuki Foundation, University of Toronto Scarborough, Centennial College, and Toronto Community Housing to reach out to its primary audience.

The agency cannot rely only on its small team and internal experience and expertise for connecting with diverse communities around the Park. The team, working on new Canadians’ engagement in Parks Canada’s national office had only two members at the time of the interview and the Rouge Park Initiative team had only one representative in Toronto. Moreover, the Social Science department had just gone through restructuring and as mentioned by one of the participants “a lot of them [planners] are let go with the cuts” (P10). This was resulted by major federal spending cuts in 2012, with particularly strong impact on Parks Canada. The layoff led to losing part of the tacit organizational knowledge and experience on community engagement and
reduced Parks Canada’s ability to conduct research on issues related to immigrants’ engagement (P10).

The fact that most of the existing national parks as well as those that are being established are far from metropolitan areas (P3) gives Parks Canada little opportunity to have direct experience with immigrants, especially as community members that are not just visitors and should be engaged in decision-making activities. Rouge Park can be considered as Parks Canada’s first formal experience in this area.

It is perceived that immigrants are not formally organized as other more established communities (for example Malvern community; Canadian Wilderness Association; naturalist interest groups; Mennonite Church Community; Locust Hill community) and do not have “legitimate representatives” or their representatives are not known to planners (P6). Therefore, it is more difficult to connect with them as explained in the following interview excerpt:

“They are not formally structured. So they are hard to reach and ... it is a barrier because when you are actually in the planning process you got to talk to the masses; you can’t just go and knock on people’s door so you got to find ways to tap into these various networks and depending on how people are formally or informally structured makes it easier or harder to reach them” (P9).

Hence, Parks Canada relies on organizations, trusted by members of ethnic communities and with already established relationships for connecting with immigrants. The partnership strategy also provides Parks Canada the opportunity to have access to some of the research being conducted by these organizations (P10).

The collaboration with partner organizations has been mostly focused on asking them to distribute information through their networks (PO8; CL11) and/or to recruit community members to attend public consultation meetings. Findings show that some of the community organizations and community leaders feel that their comments and input will not have any influence on decisions (PO2; PO4; PO6) partly because they do not receive any feedback after participating in meetings and consultation sessions (PO6; PO7).

Adopting the partnership strategy has been necessary and effective in connecting Parks Canada with local communities at this stage. However, limited direct interaction with communities, especially in the absence of an effective knowledge-sharing platform between
Parks Canada and its partners, may reduce the agency’s opportunities to learn about and from communities. This would not allow for gaining a deep understanding of the perspectives, potentials and expectations of diverse communities, which is essential for revisiting assumptions and establishing long-term relationships.

**Limiting roles by focusing on visitation programs**

Two levels can be considered for community engagement in a park context: participation at program or visitation level (i.e. participation in programs such as tree planting, walking tours, bird watching, and camping, mainly as visitors but also as volunteers) and participation at the governance level (e.g. decisions about the size of the park; how it should be funded; how it should be managed) (P6). Research findings indicate that Parks Canada’s emphasis has been on engaging community members at the visitation level, although no clear distinction has been made between the two levels.

“So obviously they will choose the level of involvement they will take but our work is to give them an opportunity to enjoy this place or to discover this place whether it is through an educational activity; a recreational activity; a volunteer opportunity; or a governance opportunity” (P2).

“[What] we really believe in is that we want people to feel that they have ongoing opportunities to be involved in the park and that’s very important to us. Some will become volunteers and they will obviously be involved that way. Some will be visitors. Some may be on committees, some may, you know, be involved in other ways” (P1).

Immigrants are considered more as potential visitors rather than members of host communities and the emphasis is on encouraging them to visit the Park, to participate in different activities, and ideally to become engaged as volunteers in implementing different visitation programs. The online survey used for collecting community input reflects this emphasis on visitation and volunteering. This philosophy is in line with the dominant “use → appreciation → support mantra” (Shultis & More, 2011, p.112), according to which visitation is considered as the first step toward higher levels of participation. It is believed that when people experience the Park as visitors they are more likely to relate to it and become “life-long supporters” and “stewards” (P2).
Low visitation is considered as a serious threat for the future of parks and protected areas as explained by one of the research participants:

“... [sic] our relevance as an organization and the relevance of our national parks, national historic sites, the key risk is not being relevant to new Canadians. That’s the key risk long-term. Populations are changing. The nature of their experience is changing. Their support for national parks, or not support, [sic] long-term is really tied to their ability to experience these places; being touched by them; and want[ing] to protect them like their family jewels” (P7).

It has been acknowledged by Parks Canada that visitation is lower in the three metropolitan areas (Vancouver; Toronto; Montreal) (P11), especially among “communities from different ethnic backgrounds” (P1; P2) and “new Canadians” (P3). The following comment from a senior manager at Parks Canada explains the current situation:

“The population makeup is not represented in our visitation statistics. Visitation is declining. It is not youth and it is not culturally diverse” (P16).

Low visitation can partly be attributed to relatively low awareness about national parks, and Parks Canada as an institution, among residents of urban areas regardless of the immigration status. This is due to the fact that most national parks are being established in remote areas (P1). Different perceptions about wilderness and considering national parks as “scary” places as well as accessibility are mentioned as other potential reasons for low visitation among first generation immigrants. Many of the newcomers may not have cars during the first years. Therefore, raising awareness in urban areas has been one of the main purposes of community engagement from Parks Canada’s point of view.

Not surprisingly immigrants’ participation is even lower at the governance and decision-making level as expressed by research participants:

“First generation Canadians are not participating enough in the actual public decision-making processes. They are starting to engage more and more ... I think they are getting a lot more involved, but not enough that they are actually in positions to really influence and to be the decision makers” (CL5).

“You got a meeting about the Rouge and there is not a lot of immigrants or first generation immigrants ... I don’t know where everybody is from. So I could be wrong ... [but] most of the people I do hear speaking at the meeting and the things that they speak about and their age and their accents suggest that they are not” (PO8).
Community leaders and organizations working with immigrants and cultural communities adjacent to the Park were not among the stakeholder groups invited for shaping the Park concept. A review of the planning documents shows that a group of “key stakeholders and partners” (The Monarch Park Group, n.d., p.6), mostly representatives of government organizations and environmental groups, were invited to provide “key elements and broad guiding principles” for the establishment of the Rouge National Urban Park (Miller & Sobel, n.d., p.2). The Park concept was formed based on these principles as well as inputs received from the two youth workshops. The draft was confirmed by the same group of stakeholders in a follow-up session and then presented to the public for further input and feedback. As a result, participation of stakeholders, who were not involved from the beginning, became limited to providing feedback on an already formed concept.

Visitation and volunteering can be very effective ways for encouraging less engaged community members to connect with the Park. However, this approach can cause concerns when there is no long-term plan for empowering community members, including immigrants, to participate at higher levels in the future. Too much emphasis on one dimension of a stakeholder’s role (e.g. immigrants as visitors) can automatically reduce the scope of participation. Consequently, the importance of an immigrant’s role as a local resident may eventually fade in the community engagement discourse.

**Placing attendance numbers over impactful participation by seeking tangible results**

Community participation in public decision-making activities needs to be examined in terms of the number of people attending public meetings and consultation sessions as well as their active participation in discussions and influencing decisions. Considering that engaging *new Canadians* in planning and decision-making activities is a relatively new strategic direction for Parks Canada, attempts have been more focused on the attendance numbers. Although, encouraging community members to attend meetings is the essential first step that allows planners to strengthen their relationships with the community, it does not necessarily mean that people who come to meetings and information sessions will participate in the discussions and express their opinions.
Funding conditions require community organizations to evaluate and report their performance based on quantitative measures rather than criteria that reflect quality and impact of participations. They need to show measurable (CL9; PO7) and immediate results (PO6) in order to receive funding. It is very difficult for community organizations to justify the need for projects focused on “bridging, connecting, and facilitating” community participation that may not result in tangible and short-term results (PO6).

“I have to say working in the non-profit sector, if you are trying to advocate in terms of getting more funding, more programming, or more resources for, like say, immigrant specific programs then you are going to need that [numbers]” (PO7).

Lack of enough financial resources leads to staff shortages and increased workload, which results in more focus on the process (the number of meetings and attendants) rather than the quality of participations, the impression it makes on participants, and how planners and community members learn from each other along the way. This issue is expressed in the two interview excerpts below:

“There is so much pressure that we need results, we need it now. We need 100 people to come out to this event. And you know, it’s not based on an authentic relationship. It’s all based on we need this, you better come. It’s not sustainable. You get them once, they didn’t have a good time or they weren’t heard and they don’t come back” (PO6).

“I think one thing that we don’t do enough of is learning how to listen and learning how to really understand what disengagement is and I say that because in the public sector and in the non-profit sector for sure, you are very resources limited ...it affects the dignity and the integrity of the process. If it’s just OK tell me what you think and then, you know, like a factory line. And often times we felt that way because our time is so limited... we have to get this done, we have to make sure we get this answered and this paper signed and if you do it over and over again then it does feel a bit like that and it is a bit, I think degrading. And I am not sure how people really feel about the process” (PO7).

**Restricting outreach by not having a specific strategy**

Parks Canada does not have a specific and coherent strategy for engaging immigrants or different ethnic communities. Although the heterogeneous nature of the host community and the need for using customized methods for each community are acknowledged as reasons for partnering with community organizations, they are not reflected in Parks Canada’s strategy when
directly reaching out to communities. Efforts for community engagement have been focused on engaging people who are living around the Park.

One factor contributing to adopting a more general approach is the belief that all Canadians, regardless of their immigration background, should be considered as equal and not be treated differently. This idea, which reflects Parks Canada’s focus on established immigrants, is captured in the following interview excerpt:

“It’s a fine line, sometimes I find people get so tied up with trying to segregate people out. Because, you know, you have established yourself. You are provided Canadian identity and you are a Canadian. [sic] So should I single you out as being, you know what I mean? ... Yes, there is a fine line and you have to be extremely careful and understand why and what are the purposes behind it because you don’t want to alienate people at the same time. I mean you have got people choosing this country. It’s their new home for a reason and as a result you are a Canadian citizen, and all the elements that come with that and the pride that comes with that, should I treat you different because you are from another country? You are Canadian” (P10).

Planners’ communication approach reflects the current targeting strategy (focus on established immigrants) as well as a lack of customized outreach methods for different communities. Parks Canada communicates with communities only in English and French, although increased collaboration with ethnic media and offering information materials in other languages are being considered for future community engagement initiatives.

Language barrier has been mentioned as a detrimental factor to first generation immigrants’ participation as they may have difficulties communicating in either official language and understanding the material (CL5; CL9; CL11; PO7) or not be comfortable speaking in front of a large group of native speakers (PO6). Especially when it comes to communicating criticisms or opposing thoughts, first generation immigrants may not be “equipped with the nuances of the language to express different opposing ideas” (PO7).

“Native English speakers, and this is a huge generalization, but native English speakers tend to be OK in large group settings. They will speak up; they will ask a question; they will debate to argue a point; they have a voice if they don’t agree. And from my experience, again a huge generalization, but hear less of that with newcomer communities, people who don’t speak English as a native language” (PO6).
However, there is a divide in participants’ views with regard to the importance of language barrier as a factor that hinders participation. Providing translation and interpretation has been strongly recommended by some of the research participants (CL1; CL5; CL7; CL9), whereas some others look at language barrier as a “false excuse” used by both sides (planners and community members) for justifying low participation (P15). It has been argued that despite challenges, first generation immigrants would be able to communicate in English if planners were “attuned to listening for the information” (PO6). One of the community leaders even shared her experience with immigrant community members that had felt offended, thinking that translating information means that planners’ assume they cannot communicate in English.

Another argument for not having specific strategies for immigrants is that it may contribute to further marginalization of people who tend to stay in their closed community (CL8; CL11).

“[sic] it’s always better a relationship when all members of the community will come together so they will learn to be together... No. I am against [sic] ghettoing” (CL8).

However, despite the fact that all Canadian citizens have equal rights to participate in public decision-making processes and it is their choice whether or not to use it (P1; P2), recent immigrants may not be fully aware of this right or not be able to use it:

“Because people are new they often don’t understand all the structures [that] work with the planning process or their right to participate” (P6).

Notwithstanding the above mentioned concerns, having a separate strategy is still considered as a potentially effective approach, which is discussed in greater detail as one of the suggested principles of a more inclusive engagement process. Even without considering specific characteristics of each community, connecting with the less engaged segments such as first generation immigrants may require adding an empowerment component to the general community engagement strategy.
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Figure 4-2. Planners’ approach in engaging first generation immigrant
4.2 Principles of More Inclusive Consultation Processes

The current approach to community engagement reflects a general strategy, which does not distinguish between different community segments and is based on the assumption that recent immigrants are not ready to participate. Moreover, immigrants are generally considered as visitors rather than members of host communities. Although the need for revising traditional assumptions and decision-making models has been acknowledged, lack of diversity in the planning team and limited direct interaction between Parks Canada and community members leave little room for these changes. Hence, despite recent efforts to adjust the outreach methods to the needs of a diverse urban population, the current community engagement approach is not reflective of heterogeneous local communities. The public participation process has been successful in connecting and collaborating with a relatively larger number of already interested and involved stakeholders (including long-term residents). However, in the absence of new and diverse voices it can reinforce current assumptions and hinder the change process. The homogenous image of the participating group may also result in further alienation of the disengaged community members.

It is noteworthy that research findings provide insights at two levels. First, findings can contribute to a better understanding of public participation processes in general (i.e. differences between assumptions and perceptions of planners and community members, benefits and drawbacks of having a separate strategy for engaging immigrants, risks of adopting a limited partnership strategy, and consequences of too much emphasis on tangible results). Second, insights are more specific to the context of parks and protected areas (e.g. restricting immigrants’ participation by highlighting their role as visitors and the risk of alienating them due to limited diversity in the planning team and among active community members).

In this section I highlight and connect the main research findings, and draw from the literatures on communicative planning; stakeholder theory; and learning theories to suggest underlying principles for the design and implementation of more inclusive community participation processes. The following five principles suggested by this study are discussed in this section:
- Adopting an on-going, long-term, and communicative approach
- Being open to new perspectives and willing to revisit assumptions
- Engaging in short-term and long-term learning
- Collaborating with community leaders
- Designing parallell strategies and customized tactics

4.2.1 Adopting an ongoing, long-term, and communicative approach

The importance of establishing and maintaining an effective and ongoing dialogue between planners and community members is emphasized as one of the key building blocks of a more inclusive community engagement process. Participants suggest that planners should keep community members updated and informed even if they are not interested or ready to participate immediately. Although it may start as a one-way distribution of information at the beginning, it would provide community members the opportunity to participate when they feel comfortable and ready.

“You provide information today, but you will also provide information tomorrow and whenever they feel comfortable or they would like to participate, they have that invitation and a comfort level that they could do that and participate ... It takes time for people to hear about what is going on; and to understand what is going on; and how they might be able to input” (P5).

“I think first thing, they [first generation immigrants] are going to be very reserved in the process of observing. You are going to be reserved because you are not sure how is it similar to what you are accustomed to or not, and so once you are able to do that then you feel comfortable among the people around the table you find that you are able to share your ideas and to share your perspective” (CL11).

This approach is aligned with the concept of communicative planning, based on Habermas’ theory of communicative action. It has gained interest among scholars and practitioners in the area of planning theory for many years now. The following definition captures the essence of communicative planning:

“A method of civic engagement in decision making based on reasoned discourse where the conditions of interaction – mutually respectful, inclusive, transparent, honest, impartial – lead to empathy, social learning, and mutual transformation toward collaborative solutions to defined problems” (Umemoto & Igarashi, 2009, p. 39).
Communicative planning is considered as specifically effective for planning in multicultural contexts and for engaging minority groups in decision-making (Umemoto & Igarashi, 2009). Taking a communicative approach and viewing community engagement as a dialogue between planners and community members is in line with community leaders’ perceptions of the community participation concept. Community leaders consider community engagement as an opportunity for sharing with and learning from others, whereas planners perceive community participation more as receiving input as well as informing and educating communities.

It is important for Parks Canada to be seen as the communication partner beyond the scope of specific projects. Adopting a short-term project based approach, focused on collecting community input on a specific project, or even selected phase(s) of a project or issue, may not be effective because “participatory capacity cannot be built like a road or dam; it must be developed” (Tosun, 2006, p.503). Communicative planning may not necessarily result in consensus in the short-term and during the time period that specific planning projects are being implemented (Matthews, 2012). Planners are encouraged to:

“focus on the longue durée, and the Lifeworld of lived experiences, where shared subjectivities over the built environment can develop” (Matthews, 2012, p. 139).

The discourse can continue between community members and the environment even after formal community engagement “projects or processes” are completed and in the absence of planners. This can be specifically relevant to cases like the Rouge National Urban Park, where “ensuring future protection” (P2; P7; PO4) through creating a sense of personal “connection” with and “stewardship” for the Park (P2; P13; PO4; PO3) is considered as one of the main objectives of community participation.

Providing new citizens with one year of free access to all national parks, protected areas and heritage sites in partnership with Citizenship and Immigration Canada is an attempt to initiate the relationship. However, it has been suggested that the Cultural Access Pass should be offered to immigrants as soon as they land in Canada. The ongoing communication sets the stage for community participation by helping immigrants to become familiar with these sites as well as

---

13 The scholarly debate on applications and limitations of communicative planning provides valuable insights and an appropriate foundation for presenting and discussing research findings. However, an in-depth and critical discussion of the theory is not intended here and is beyond the scope of this dissertation.
Parks Canada as an institution. This approach is important, when working with urban communities and particularly newer immigrants as they are less familiar with Parks Canada and the national parks system:

“People don’t know what Parks Canada does. They know about provincial agencies but not the federal. We were explaining to them who we are and why we are taking the responsibility for the Rouge Park ...
Awareness of Parks Canada is the lowest in Toronto because it is not present in Toronto” (P16).

4.2.2 Being open to new perspectives and willing to revisit assumptions

Different community subgroups (formed based on cultural, religious, philosophical, or other commonalities) have their own (sometimes conflicting) rationalities, value systems, and assumptions about an effective and inclusive planning process. Differences in planners’ and community leaders’ perceptions of the community participation concept, discussed in the first part of this chapter, is a good example of how key concepts can be perceived differently. The fact that new immigrants’ perceptions may change overtime as they become more established in the new country adds to the complexity of diverse communities. According to Watson (2006), the possibility of reaching consensus during the communicative planning process is very low in diverse contexts because members of each subgroup engage in the discourse based on their own value systems and world views. Therefore, there is no one “universal set of deontological values” that can be used as the basis for designing the planning process. Although her focus is on values “shaped by the neoliberal tradition” the argument can also be made about any other dominant philosophy or set of values (p.31). In the same vein, Bramwell (2004) emphasizes the importance of accommodating alternative “reasoning processes” and “the difficult translation between different world views” in the planning process (p. 546). Hence, it is suggested that planners consider adopting “moral philosophies which recognize the situated nature of knowledge” instead of approaching community participation from one specific point of view (Watson, 2006, p.32). This approach would allow for more flexibility and openness to accommodate alternative interpretations of abstract concepts. The importance of flexibility and openness in understanding first generation immigrants and adjusting planning processes accordingly is captured in the following interview excerpt:
“What we have learned is if they [Parks Canada] are serious about that, the organization has to be open-minded. It has to start from a position that if they are serious about that, they are going to have to listen and watch and learn from these people. They can’t come in with their kinds of assumptions and they have to be prepared to listen and adapt their concept, their proposal to the realities of this new group … We can’t make assumptions about the way they are going to visit and use the resources. We are going to have to search for those new balance points between their realities in their situations and our offer … they have to come into that process with an open mind and flexible attitude and true integrity” (P4).

Findings indicate that despite Parks Canada’s attempts for adjusting the consultation process to the needs and wants of a diverse urban population, it was still influenced by traditional assumptions and decision-making models, as expressed by research participants:

“Many years ago when there weren’t as many immigrants, we were reaching out to a good number of the community [ies]. More recently as more immigrants are moving into the area I think we are still relying on some of the old concepts. So our messaging, our communication, isn’t that effective and we haven’t developed the best strategy on communicating with all of the different immigrants and to make sure that we are getting their input” (P5).

“There has been a traditional North American way of managing parks but now the clientele is changing” (P17).

“… systems seem to be slow to change and especially with government and something as big as Parks Canada. It’s so old and entrenched in terms of structure that, I know they have been doing engagement and public consultation, [but] I am somewhat skeptical to be quite honest, of not this one case but in so many cases when they do public consultation. [sic] I don’t really know how much of an influence …, I think we actually need to change our decision-making model” (PO4).

There has been a considerable emphasis on “maintaining the strong tradition of community volunteering” (Parks Canada, n.d., p.3) and on “building upon the legacy of past efforts” (The Monarch Park Group, n.d., p.6). Although these statements are intended to show acknowledgment and respect for many years of engagement and support from long-term residents of the Rouge Valley area, they also imply dominant values and preferences. Traditional perceptions of and methods for community engagement may not necessarily resonate with and appeal to the increasingly diverse communities around the Park. In addition, as discussed in the first part of this chapter, too much emphasis on traditionally accepted and preferred ways of engaging with the Park may alienate new and less-engaged community members.
The neopragmatic approach to planning offers suggestions for enhancing flexibility and openness, specifically in the context of national parks and protected areas with a diverse group of stakeholders. According to Jamal, Stein and Harper (2002), emphasis on reaching an agreement on definitions of “abstract principles” among stakeholders in the early stages can be detrimental to the planning process. They suggest that participants spend time on sharing their understandings and perceptions of key concepts instead of starting with strict definitions. This dialogue among stakeholders would lead to emergence of shared definitions that are appropriate for the purpose of the specific project at hand. In addition, this approach reduces the risk of potential conflicts that may result from arguing for different viewpoints. Therefore, it would be more likely that stakeholders reach “some form of consensus or agreement” (p.173). Jamal et al. (2002) also suggest that focusing on meanings and core ideas instead of discussing them under certain labels (e.g. environmentalism) can enhance the dialogue by helping participants to be more open to commonalities rather than differences. Ideas are considered and discussed in a less value-laden context and therefore are less likely to be rejected based on assumptions about the category they are associated with. The neopragmatic approach advocates for using a neutral language, especially when working with a diverse group of stakeholders with conflicting value systems and perspectives:

“Normative language works if we are dealing with a unitary shared culture, but in a domain characterized by conflict among disparate values, it may be exclusionary and detrimental to dialogue and joint decision making to use general terms that come with historical, temporal, and essentialist baggage” (p.169).

Issues with designing the process based on strict definitions of abstract concepts can become more prominent when working with first generation immigrants that are not native English speakers. Although participants may be fluent in English and comfortable in routine interactions, when it comes to abstract concepts they may have different perceptions based on their native language and culture.

The above discussion on the role and importance of flexibility and openness to new assumptions and perspectives also offers insights into my experience as the researcher in communicating with participants. While community leaders seemed comfortable using the word immigrant, many participants in the planners’ and partner organizations’ groups preferred using other terms. Among the terminology used were cultural communities; new Canadians; First
generation settlers (encompassing all people that move to Toronto either from another country or province); newcomers; newer Canadians; people of colour. I often decided to use the term preferred by participants so that they could share their stories and express their opinions in the way that was more comfortable for them. During the early stages of the research I was focused on “people who arrived in Canada in their late teens or later” (Jensen, 2008, p.76) based on the assumption that immigrants who came to Canada at a very young age are less likely to face challenges associated with immigration. I questioned this assumption during the data gathering process. Adopting a flexible approach helped me to be open to new interpretations and perspectives on being an immigrant. I realized that the meaning is much more fluid and related to people’s sense of belonging and how comfortable they feel in the new environment rather than the number of years lived in Canada.

4.2.3 Engaging in short-term and long-term learning

Findings suggest that sharing and learning are defining elements of community participation from community leaders’ perspectives as described in the quotation below:

“To me ... it is like a learning process because if I am engaged with other people and share [sic], you know, share the things ... what I learned. It is a transformation of my knowledge, my information, my skills to others and I want to get their knowledge, their expertise, their whole, you know, their quality so that [sic] combinely it’s a journey of learning” (CL2).

From the community leaders’ point of view, learning happens mostly at the community level and among fellow community members. Planners, on the other hand, see learning as the exchange of knowledge and information between planners and communities mostly in the form of receiving input from community members and informing and educating them.

Transformative learning theory, rooted in the adult education field (see Mezirow, 1981), can be helpful in understanding and enhancing learning at the individual level, between different communities as well as planners and community members. Although mostly focused at the individual level, it also has implications for learning and change at “system, institutional, and social” levels (Marschke & Sinclair, 2009).
Transformative learning has two components: instrumental learning, defined as “task-oriented problem solving actions to improve the performance of current activities” and communicative learning, which refers to “individuals’ ability to examine and reinterpret meanings, intentions and values” (Armitage et al. 2008, p. 88). Instrumental learning can happen through participating in specific projects (Marschke & Sinclair, 2009). It can be facilitated by tactical changes (e.g. providing transportation, small group discussion, communicating the agenda in advance, forming advisory committees, and preparation before attending consultation sessions). Parks Canada’s efforts to increase participation in visitation programs (e.g. tree planting, walking tours, bird watching, and camping) enhance instrumental learning. Visitation programs provide opportunities for learning through focused and short-term interactions between different communities; community members and planners, as well as the Park itself. This resonates with Jamal et al. (2002)’s suggestion that starting with “smaller, narrower, and more concrete” issues can result in enhanced collaboration and dialogue by avoiding potential conflicts over philosophical views and value systems.

Communicative learning, as defined below, can contribute to the establishment of more inclusive and pluralistic planning processes by enhancing mutual understanding and openness to different philosophies among individuals and groups involved in planning. This type of learning will result in more fundamental and long-term improvements in community engagement endeavours.

“Communicative learning involves learning that pertains to understanding what somebody means or the process by which others understand what you mean. .... Communicative competence refers to an individual’s ability to negotiate meanings, intentions and values for oneself” (Marschke & Sinclair, 2009, p.207).

Another theoretical lens that can be helpful in understanding how communication and dialogue can result in learning and change at the organizational level is social learning theory. It also offers a framework for examining Parks Canada’s current situation.

Social learning happens through “sharing experiences, ideas and environments by others” at three levels:
“Single loop (correcting errors from routines); double loop (correcting errors by examining values and policies); and triple loop learning (designing governance norms and protocols)” (Armitage et al., 2008, p. 89).

Tactical attempts for adjusting the public consultation process of the Rouge National Urban Park to the needs and characteristics of an urban population can be considered as single loop learning. Organizing youth workshops, conducting an online survey, and setting up information booths in downtown Toronto are among new community outreach initiatives undertaken in addition to traditional public consultation sessions. However, single loop learning “is not adequate” for effective tourism protected area partnership, which happens in an increasingly complex and messy context (McCool, 2009, p.141). Research findings indicate that planners are aware of the importance of and the need for reaching out to less-engaged community members and that it requires changes in the underlying assumptions and philosophies as well as developing a trust relationship with communities. “Trust building efforts and active engagement with civil society” are among factors that foster double loop learning (Diduck, Bankes, Clark & Armitage, 2005 in Armitage et al., 2008, p. 89). Therefore, it can be inferred that the agency has entered, or is ready to enter, the stage of double loop learning. Triple loop learning, focused on examining and revising systems, policies, and the broader context within which single and double loop learning are happening, can be considered as a long-term goal and potential outcome of the ongoing dialogue between different stakeholders (Armitage et al., 2008).

Deconstructing learning and examining it as instrumental vs. communicative or single, double, and triple loop learning helps to highlight the practical aspect of community engagement and the fact that planners need to balance short-term and long-term learning goals with regard to first generation immigrants’ engagement. Attempts should be made to enhance participation in current decision-making opportunities like the Rouge National Urban Park. At the same time, it is important for all stakeholders to collaborate and move toward more inclusive community engagement processes in the future through capacity building and empowerment. Instrumental and single loop learning contribute to achievement of short-term objectives, whereas communicative and multiple loop learning may go beyond the scope of one single project and institution.
Limited expertise and experience in community engagement in diverse contexts is highlighted as one of the main barriers that Parks Canada is facing (P1; P3; P8; P9). The Rouge Park project can be considered as a milestone in Parks Canada’s efforts to engage a broader range of community members in urban areas and to reach out to first generation immigrants. Therefore, establishing a knowledge management system can provide a unique opportunity for the agency to facilitate and enhance learning by documenting, storing, and sharing the knowledge and experience that is being gained for future projects. This becomes specifically important when experts that have been involved in community engagement projects move to another department or leave the organization. Parks Canada’s social science department underwent major structural changes that resulted in considerable reduction in human resources during the establishment process of the Rouge National Urban Park. In addition, the make-up of the team working on the public consultation process changed during its development and one of the key team members moved to another country. A knowledge management system would help to capture and share valuable insights and personal experience gained by people involved in the project.\textsuperscript{14} Sharing knowledge and experience between partner and community organizations that work with first generation immigrants can also result in learning, synergy, and more effective collaborations.

4.2.4 Collaborating with community leaders

The complexity and heterogeneity of community subgroups as well as planners’ limited experience in working with diverse communities requires planners to engage communities from the beginning in “shaping” (P3) and “defining” the process. Otherwise, it would be almost impossible for planners to gain an accurate and adequate understanding of experiences, perceptions and preferences of all community segments. At the same time, these limitations hinder planners from connecting with communities in the first place. So, the key question is what would be the starting point for planners?

Connecting with community leaders can be the first step. Trust-based relationship is emphasized as a key factor in engaging first generation immigrants in public decision-making.

\textsuperscript{14} Parks Canada released several formal reports during the establishment process of the National Urban Park, including a Public Engagement Report, were prepared for the general audience.
activities (CL1; CL9; PO4; PO6; PO7). Considering the fact that creating trust and building relationships happens over time, planners need to rely on community leaders that have already developed these relationships and are familiar with needs and wants of their communities. They can be “gateways” to communities (PO6) and are connected to local networks. Therefore, they can help Parks Canada to distribute information. They can also share their knowledge and experience with regard to appropriate methods for connecting with their communities (CL11). In addition, successful community leaders (like politicians) can be role models and inspire less-engaged members of the community, especially youth, to get involved (PO5).

Community leaders that participated in this research defined themselves as: agents of change trying to make tangible improvements in their communities; caring about the needs of the community and taking action to address them; willing to enhance community wellbeing through identifying problems in the neighbourhood; volunteering to be the voice of the community; and helping community members to integrate and feel comfortable (CL1; CL2; CL5; CL7). They actively seek opportunities to volunteer with community organizations on local projects. Therefore, planners can, with dedicated effort, connect with them through these organizations.

My experience in recruiting community leaders as research participants resonates with planners’ comments on the difficulty of connecting with community leaders directly. It was very challenging to identify and contact community leaders and people who volunteer in local projects. Information on projects and volunteers are usually not available online. Even when I could have access to contact information through community organizations, it was mostly private emails that people would not check regularly. Therefore, the best way to connect with community leaders was to be introduced to them by community organizations’ staff in person or via email.

Community organizations can act as intermediaries and also provide familiar and safe environments for first generation immigrants and even newcomers to practice community engagement in their own cultural groups as a first step toward engaging with the broader community. First generation immigrants tend to feel more confident to participate in events as minorities when they are associated with strong community organizations. In addition, community organizations can help bridge “the transition gap” by identifying and empowering interested community members to participate in activities outside their own community, and then
share their learning with fellow community members (CL10). Participants suggested “identifying” and “developing” (PO3; PO6; P1; P18) “local champions” or “cheerleaders” and providing them with required resources for engaging their communities in local projects and decision-making activities.

According to Tosun (2006) “local Non-Governmental Organizations” can contribute to “a more participatory tourism development approach” through empowerment and “leading local people to take part in tourism development” (p.502). In the same vein, Berkes (2009) emphasizes the importance of bridging organizations in the context of co-management of natural resources and considers them as specifically important when “local knowledge is based on a different epistemology and worldview than government science” (p. 1696). Bridge organizations can play a range of different roles in connecting planners and communities as shown in figure 4-3:

![Figure 4-3. Berkes’ (2009) roles of bridge organizations in co-management](image)

A comparison between roles suggested by Berkes (2009) and the current state of Parks Canada’s collaboration with partner organizations, which is mostly limited to using their networks for distributing information and recruiting community members for public meetings, highlights opportunities for a more strategic relationship. Collaboration with community leaders and organizations can be most meaningful and effective if they become involved from the early stages and in the design of consultation processes (PO6). This is where community organizations can play a key role by sharing their knowledge and experience about communities and techniques that work best for connecting with them.

Garrod (2003) emphasizes the importance of leadership for a successful participatory planning process and suggests that this role can be best played by a group of community leaders.
“The more local community leaders that are involved, and the more committed they are to the participatory planning process, the more likely it is that the group will identify and address vital issues” (Garrod, 2003, p.39).

Forming “advisory committees” (P1; P7) or “stakeholders’ board of advisors” (PO4) is suggested as a first step for engaging community leaders in designing public participation processes. It is a very limited form of participation, considered by Arnstein (1969) as part of the “manipulation” stage at the very first level of her Ladder of Citizen Participation, which is also referred to as “nonparticipation” (p. 218). However, participants mentioned it as an opportunity for Parks Canada to start the conversation. It can be an effective method only if used as an empowerment technique and part of a comprehensive community engagement strategy that targets broader and higher levels of community participation. Becoming involved in local boards in general has been mentioned as an opportunity for first generation immigrants to become familiar with decision-making processes and learning “how things work” in Canada (P12).

A key factor in maintaining collaborative relationships with community leaders and organizations over time is providing feedback on how their inputs have influenced decisions. Research findings show that some of the community organizations and community leaders feel that their comments and input will not have any influence on the decisions (PO2; PO4; PO6) partly because they do not receive any feedback after participating in meetings and consultation sessions (PO6; PO7). It is also important not to limit participation to community leaders but to direct collaboration via community leaders toward empowerment and engagement of disengaged community members.

4.2.5 Designing parallel strategies and customized tactics

This study offers insights to differences between various community segments with regard to participation in public decision-making activities. Key points are summarized below:

- Members of some cultural communities, especially during the first years of their settlement, are less likely to participate in events and activities outside their community (CL6; CL7) and may be “backbenchers” even if they attend public meetings (CL9). In contrast, some cultures encourage citizens to express their opinions. Immigrants from these countries are used to participating in community
projects and attending public meetings, whereas in some other cultural contexts people may prefer not to get involved in order to avoid potential risks (CL1).

- First generation immigrants, or new residents of an area in general, may not be able to have an effective and meaningful contribution to discussions because they do not have enough background information about the specific issue or project at hand (P5). Access to knowledge, along with trust and power, is identified as one of the key conditions for designing successful tourism partnerships in the context of protected areas (McCool, 2009). Specifically when topics are related to history, heritage, and culture, adults who are raised in other countries may not feel confident to join the conversation.

- Some of the first generation immigrants feel more comfortable to speak in smaller groups (PO1) and among people of their own community (CL4).

- When specific groups dominate consultation sessions, specifically long-term residents of the area with strong environmental interests, less-engaged community members might feel that they do not fit in.

- Community segments and individuals are at different stages in terms of their readiness and willingness to participate and require different amounts of time to become familiar and comfortable with participation processes (CL8; CL11).

This study shows that smaller segments can be identified within communities adjacent to the Park at least based on two factors: life stage (e.g. newcomer youth, newcomer working age adults, established working age adults, newcomer seniors, and established seniors) and cultural background (e.g. Chinese, South Asian, Filipino and Caribbean as the four largest ethnic communities living in the neighbourhoods around the Park). Cross mapping these two dimensions results in several community segments, each requiring a unique plan as expressed by one of the planners:

“I think the idea is to get to know a particular community, know what’s required, what’s needed and then tailor a program that actually works best for that community at the right stage and with the right demographic” (P1).

The plan should be customized for each segment based on characteristics such as cultural background, level of readiness and willingness to participate, information gaps, and
empowerment and skill development needs. A more targeted and customized approach to community engagement resonates with the stakeholder theory literature (Dunham, Freeman and Liedtka, 2006; Buchholz & Rosenthal, 2005; Crane & Ruebottom (2011); Verbeke & Tung, 2013; Bridoux & Stoelhorst, 2014). Specific attention needs to be paid to creating appropriate learning environments that foster participation for each community segment (Armitage et al., 2008). Organizing smaller sessions (e.g. 30-50 people) can provide participants the chance to connect with each other at a more personal level and make it possible for facilitators to pay more attention to individual opinions (PO7). This approach would allow planners to adopt appropriate communication methods for each community (CL11); identify and work with facilitators from within community (PO5); and use tailored discussion questions (PO8). Organizing smaller sessions resonates with community leaders’ perception of the meaning of community participation, which emphasizes connecting and sharing with others and learning from them. In addition, participants’ experiences in working with non-native English speakers show that forming smaller groups results in better discussions as people feel more comfortable to share their ideas.

“Certain cultures feel uncomfortable speaking in large formats … I just came from a meeting where we had 35-40 people in a room and we broke it into groups of five so that people could actually engage and talk. We don’t expect them really to present but at least in smaller forms people are able to or are often more comfortable to express themselves” (PO1).

“Native English speakers, and this is a huge generalization, but native English speakers tend to be OK in large group settings. They will speak up; they will ask a question; they will debate to argue a point; they have a voice if they don’t agree. And from my experience, again a huge generalization, but hear less of that with newcomer communities, people who don’t speak English as a native language. And I mean from my experience, it’s confidence. Maybe their English isn’t perfect and they don’t want to speak in front of a group. They don’t want to speak in front of 50 people. But we get much better conversations and people feel more comfortable if it’s a small group setting. So if we, even if there is 50 people, if we break it to groups of five we hear much more information from newcomers. From people who don’t speak English as a native language. We get much more information if it’s a small group” (PO6).

Holding separate meetings for “newer voices” and “traditional views” was specifically suggested as a way to facilitate first generation immigrants’ participation in discussions, as reflected in the following interview excerpt:
“I think what happens [is], if you bring them into the same room, it polarizes what the Canadian experience is to what the immigrant experience is and, you know, being a first generation Canadian you try not to stand out differently. ... [sic] I think you actually target ... and create a safe environment for them to express their opinions and not use the process to set up the challenge between the traditional view and newer view. I think that’s what the management of the Park needs to do” (PO1).

Separate meetings might be considered as a way to address the power issue, specified as one of the main requirements of successful partnership (McCool, 2009). Opponents of communicative planning argue that it does not consider the impact of power, politics and conflict on discourse and decision-making (Dredge, 2006; Watson, 2006; Umemoto & Igarashi, 2009; Matthews; 2013). However, the downside of having separate meetings is that it may contribute to further isolation and the feeling of alienation among some first generation immigrants (CL11; CL8). These people may live in cultural “ghettos” with very limited interaction with the mainstream society even years after immigrating to Canada (CL5; PO7). Community participation processes should be designed in a way that helps them to connect with the broader community.

One suggestion would be to have parallel strategies with allocated time and resources focused on empowering and helping less-engaged community subgroups to develop the confidence and required skills to join mainstream decision-making processes.

“I think specifically with immigrant communities, it [is] always an objective in a lot of the projects that we do [sic] but, I think it does take some dedicated time and some specific resources in order to really do it well, and for example if I look at the Rouge there is a broad engagement process that needs to happen. So it’s happening all at the same time and not having any specific dedicated resources for that, of course something is getting done. Something gets done through partners but the results are limited. What I’m really hoping is through the actual establishment of the Park, that when we are talking about community engagement more formally not just “let’s create the Park” but once the Park is there the community feels the sense of ownership and they feel they are involved and they feel they have a say. I think at that point there will need to be some specific strategies in order to reach those several resident communities and I am hoping that with the establishment of the Park we will have more resources to do that” (P9).

Having a separate strategy helps planners to have a long-term plan for gradually enhancing the inclusiveness, quality, and level of community engagement. Some aspects of Parks Canada’s current approach may seem inadequate if considered as standalone activities and isolated approaches (e.g. emphasis on program issues and the quantitative approach to engagement).
However, as part of a more comprehensive strategy, they would be considered as necessary and successful initiatives. Development and implementation of these strategies calls for collaboration across a range of different organizations that work with first generation immigrants, and community organizations can play a key role in coordinating different players and initiatives.
5 Conclusion

In this chapter I will discuss research positioning as well as theoretical and practical contributions. The chapter concludes with a reflection on study limitations and suggestions for future research.

5.1 Research Positioning and Theoretical Contributions

This dissertation primarily contributes to the literature on stakeholder participation in tourism planning with specific focus on less-engaged community segments. To this purpose, ideas and concepts are drawn from various disciplines including studies on stakeholder theory, public planning, sustainable tourism development, immigrants’ participation in leisure activities, and learning theories. Research findings also contribute to the literature on stakeholder theory in the mainstream management field.

The approach adopted in this study is aligned with Darbellay & Stock’s (2012) definition of interdisciplinary research. They distinguish between multi and inter disciplinary studies by explaining that in multidisciplinary research, various disciplines contribute to the study by offering different perspectives. Theories and viewpoints are compared and contrasted but not integrated and merged. An interdisciplinary approach on the other hand, provides researchers the opportunity to integrate knowledge (Figure 2-2 is an example of how insights gained from stakeholder theory are integrated into tourism planning literature). Interdisciplinary research in tourism is defined as:

“a process of mobilising different institutionalised disciplines through dynamic interaction in order to describe, analyse, and understand tourism’s complexity” (Darbellay & Stock, 2012, p.453).

Tribe and Xiao (2011) suggest that interdisciplinary studies are more likely to result in “theoretical advancements in tourism”, compared to multidisciplinary studies.

Two approaches can be adopted in positioning the study in terms of choosing the respective area of literature: positioning it in the literature on community engagement in tourism planning, or considering the study as part of the broader literature on stakeholders’ participation and partnership in tourism planning, which can include the former as a sub-set. Local community
members have been traditionally among the least powerful and least engaged stakeholders. A content analysis of figures summarizing tourism planning models conducted by Mascardo (2011) reveals that “residents play only a minor role and are typically excluded from tourism governance” (p.423). Positioning the research in the stakeholders’ participation literature bases the discussion on the assumption that ideally all community segments should be able to participate at the same level as a powerful and salient stakeholder. This approach would encourage planners to try to create a more level playing field and empower community members (especially less-engaged segments) to become equal partners. Therefore, it provides a more appropriate setting for theoretical discussions. Framing the study within the boundaries of the more focused stream of research on community engagement might put it at the risk of aiming for more limited improvements, viewed in comparison to the status quo. Yet, a review of this literature was necessary because it clearly indicates the need for enhancing both scope and quality of community engagement and provides valuable insights to tactical aspects of community engagement. The main contributions to the literatures on tourism planning as well as stakeholder theory are discussed below.

### 5.1.1 Contributions to the tourism planning literature

The overarching goal of this dissertation is to provide a deeper understanding of the current approach to immigrants’ engagement in tourism related public decision-making activities. This deeper understanding supports the development of underlying principles for establishing more inclusive engagement processes in order to broaden and enrich stakeholders’ involvement in tourism planning. Figure 5-1 summarizes findings and how they address research objectives.

The first objective is addressed by exploring participants’ perceptions of the community participation concept as well as identifying building blocks of the current approach to engaging first generation immigrants.

In line with the assumptions of a naturalistic and interpretivist approach to research, my purpose was to understand the phenomenon from participants’ point of view. Findings indicate that community leaders see community participation more as horizontal relationships and as opportunities for connecting and sharing with their fellow community members. Their purpose for becoming engaged in local projects is to help their community and contribute to its
development. Planners on the other hand, see community participation as a chance to inform and educate community members, receive their input, and win their long-term support. Planners have a more result-oriented approach, whereas community leaders are more concerned with the process and quality of the relationships. The two perspectives (process vs. outcome orientation) are not contradictory but rather complementary. Bringing them together and designing the process in a way that reflects community members’ needs and wants can increase participation and is more likely to result in planners’ desired outcomes. Instead of considering the community engagement process only as a venue for planners to connect with community members and receive their input, it can also be viewed as a platform for enhancing communication and collaboration within communities and an opportunity for community members to connect and share resources and experiences among themselves.

The public consultation process designed and implemented for the Rouge National Urban Park is used as a context to study Parks Canada’s current approach in reaching out to a diverse urban population, with specific focus on first generation immigrants. As shown in Figure 5-1, participants’ understanding of and experiences with the current approach are influenced by their underlying perceptions. The current approach comprises six main themes. Although Parks Canada does not have a separate strategy for engaging multicultural communities, and specifically newer immigrants, the agency acknowledges new Canadians along with youth and urban Canadians as its priority audience. Specific attention has been paid to youth participation. Among the three groups, only youth were engaged in developing the first draft of the Park Concept. Urban Canadians, or the general public, were asked to provide input on the document later in the process. Attempts to engage new Canadians have been mostly directed at program or visitation activities (vs. engagement in planning and decision-making aspects) and are focused on established immigrants. This approach is reflected in the outreach methods and the fact that Parks Canada’s communication with its audience is only in English and French. Findings show adjustments in the traditional community engagement approach in order to adapt to the needs of a diverse urban population. However, the changes (e.g. online survey and attending community events) are mostly at the tactical and not the strategic level. The consultation process has been designed based on the dominant mental models and assumptions. This is partly because the diverse nature of local communities is not reflected in the planning team. As a result, community
members that do participate in the process are mostly long-term residents of the area, who have already been involved with the Park.

Parks Canada relies on its partner organizations for connecting with its primary audience. Yet, there are many untapped potentials for a deeper and more effective collaboration between the agency and organizations that work with local and immigrant communities. Findings also indicate that community organizations face pressures from funding entities to justify their community engagement projects by meeting quantitative performance evaluation criteria. This has resulted in too much emphasis on measureable outcomes such as number of meetings and attendants rather than intangible results (e.g. quality of interactions between planners and community members, inputs received and their impacts on decisions, and mutual learning).

The above mentioned characteristics categorize the public consultation process of the Rouge National Urban Park as local partnership and not community engagement. According to Bramwell (2010) community participation in tourism planning can happen in two forms: community engagement and local partnership. Community engagement is “voluntary action by individuals in local areas”. The informal nature of participation, “spontaneity”, and “self-governance” are considered as distinguishing factors between community engagement and partnership (p.241). Community partnership on the other hand is defined as:

“a relatively formal process of regular face-to-face meetings between parties with these meetings being based on at least some agreed rules and on intensions to address shared issues” (Bramwell, 2004, p. 541).

The second research objective is addressed by suggesting principles for designing more inclusive public participation processes that can accommodate the needs and expectations of both planners and communities. These principles are informed by the data gathered on the current situation and participants’ suggestions for enhancing immigrants’ engagement, through a process of further interpretation of the data from the perspective of related theories.
In a conceptual paper on design criteria for successful tourism planning partnerships in the context of protected areas, McCool (2009) suggests four criteria for developing and maintaining successful partnerships in such contexts: representing different and even conflicting views; creating a sense of ownership for the protected area as well as the plan; providing opportunities for double-loop learning to deal with complex and non-linear issues; and building strong relationships based on openness, honesty, mutual respect, and clear roles and responsibilities.

This research is specifically concerned with enhancing representativeness and inclusiveness of public decision-making processes by focusing on first generation immigrants as a less-engaged and under-represented stakeholder group. In line with McCool (2009) criteria, relationship is considered as a key success factor and the required foundation for the other four principles of more inclusive community engagement processes, as illustrated in Figure 5-1. With specific focus on immigrants, this study highlights the importance of establishing a long-term relationship, initiated by planners as soon as immigrants enter the new country. Findings indicate how limited resources and too much emphasis on gaining tangible outcomes can be detrimental.
to building a strong and authentic relationship. The relationship should be viewed at the institutional level and beyond the scope of one project to account for different levels of readiness and allow for continuous learning, capacity building, and revising dominant assumptions.

Establishing and maintaining an inclusive dialogue requires all players to be open to new perspectives and worldviews and to be willing to revise their assumptions as communities become more diverse. This is especially important for planners and participants, who have more experience and a longer history of community engagement, in other words traditionally salient stakeholders. Designing engagement processes based on dominant values and insisting on traditional ways of participation discourage less-engaged and newer community members from participation in the first place and from expressing their opinions if they attend meetings. It is recommended that planners and facilitators use neutral language and spend time on developing shared definitions for key concepts instead of using value laden terminology (Jamal et al., 2002).

Research findings also reveal that learning and sharing are considered as key elements of community participation from community leaders’ point of view. The importance of double-loop learning, as suggested by McCool (2009) is supported. In addition, the study provides evidence and specific examples of how participation in specific projects can enhance single-loop and instrumental learning, whereas the ongoing and long-term dialogue can result in double-loop and communicative learning. Ideally, triple-loop learning can lead to improvements in (or at least a better understanding of) the broader socio-economic, cultural, and political environment that influence immigrants’ engagement. The study shows how engaging in both forms of learning (referred to as short-term and long-term) is necessary for a more inclusive approach to community engagement. Learning extends beyond the scope of one project or one institution. It is an on-going process that happens within and between parks Canada, partner organizations, and communities.

This study takes a step back and looks at the very first phase of community engagement: initial contact with communities. Initiating the relationship and making the first contact, which is identified as one of the biggest challenges (if not the biggest challenge) for planners, may not be as significant in small and homogenous communities. However, differences between segments within diverse urban communities, coupled with limited resources (including knowledge and expertise) create a serious barrier for planners. This research highlights opportunities for
collaborating with community leaders and community organizations for overcoming this issue. Community leaders are “gateways” to communities and can help planners to win community members’ trust. Community leaders can be identified and contacted through local organizations as they are actively involved in local projects.

Bramwell (2004) suggests “capacity building among parties outside partnership” (p. 547) as a strategy for addressing barriers to stakeholder participation. He emphasizes that specific attention needs to be paid to marginalized groups and that capacity building initiatives should be implemented regardless of “whether or not they might subsequently join in multi-party initiatives” (p. 547). This study supports Bramwell’s point by indicating that different sub-groups or even individuals within the broader immigrant community are at various stages in term of readiness and willingness to participate. Therefore, capacity building should be a key priority in the long-term relationship and dialogue among Parks Canada, immigrant communities, and partner organizations. This approach would give less-engaged community members the opportunity to develop their skills and join the conversation at the time and in a way that suites them. Close collaboration with community leaders and adopting a targeted approach would enable planners to have a better understanding of the characteristics and needs of each community.

This study looks at inclusiveness in terms of participants’ diversity, as well as their effective engagement in discussions and influence on decisions. This is aligned with Bramwell and Sharman (1999)’s criteria for assessing the inclusiveness of local collaborative tourism policymaking projects, namely *scope and intensity of collaboration* as well as the *degree to which consensus emerges*, (p. 393). Findings indicate low participation in both domains and offer insights into barriers that can contribute to immigrants’ low participation in each of these areas. However, an interesting observation is that for community members with limited or no previous community engagement experience, especially recent immigrants, observation and listening can be considered as the first stage of participation. Although it may seem that they are not contributing to discussions, this silent observation is part of a learning process that helps them to become comfortable and ready for more active forms of participation.

Studies on communicative planning in general (e.g. Watson, 2006; Umemoto & Igarashi, 2009; Matthews, 2012) and in the tourism context in particular (e.g. Jamal *et al.*, 2002;
Bramwell, 2004; Dredge, 2006) discuss the impact of power structures on participation, especially among marginalized groups. This research provides insights into how traditional assumptions, mental models, and priorities shape decision-making processes and prevail in discussions. It is a result of limited diversity among planners as well as active and engaged community members. This homogenous image can lead to further alienation of disengaged groups despite being provided the opportunity to participate and to voice their opinion. Research findings suggest that there is potential in implementing parallel strategies, in collaboration with community leaders and local organizations, for addressing this problem. These parallel mechanisms can help disengaged community sub-groups to experience community engagement in smaller and friendlier settings that are customized based on their needs and preferences. Parallel strategies should be aimed at facilitating and accelerating immigrants’ participation in the mainstream decision-making process.

As shown in Figure 5-1, the long-term approach and on-going dialogue are closely related to openness and flexibility to new perspectives. Maintaining a long-term dialogue with a diverse group of participants is not possible without the willingness and ability to understand and accommodate alternative perspectives. At the same time communication and dialogue enhance flexibility and openness overtime through learning. A long-term approach is essential for communicative, double and triple-loop learning. It also contributes to instrumental and single-loop learning by allowing planners to have access to a broader range of community engagement skill and experiences gained over time. These conditions then provide a good foundation for more practical steps to be taken in terms of collaborating with community leaders and designing parallel strategies and customized tactics, typically in the context of specific projects.

5.1.2 Contributions to stakeholder theory literature

Freeman et at. (2010) encourage researchers to contribute to the stakeholder theory literature by providing “richer descriptions” of relationships between firms and stakeholders (p.288) and to “tell some interesting stories from companies’ and stakeholders’ point of view” (p.287). This study offers insights into relationships between three stakeholder groups, namely planners, community leaders, and partner organizations. It also provides rich descriptions of stakeholders’ perceptions about the notion of participation and their experiences with designing,
implementing and participating in public decision-making activities. In addition, this dissertation follows Freeman’s *et al.* (2010) call for conducting interdisciplinary research on stakeholder related issues.

The research draws on previous studies of stakeholder identification and categorization (Crane & Ruebottom, 2011, Dunham *et al.*, 2006). It is specifically focused on community as a stakeholder group and addresses the concern expressed by Dunham *et al.* (2006) with regard to *the problem of community*:

“One might say that community as a stakeholder has come to represent something of a default, a sort of error term containing all sorts of interests and externalities that fail to find homes within customer, supplier, employee, or shareholder groups. Such a broad-brushed approach to describing this (or, we would argue, any) stakeholder group can only result in superficial and broad-brushed ethical consideration and will inevitably ignore or fail to account of important and marginalized interests” (p. 24).

The study underscores the need for considering community as a heterogeneous and diverse stakeholder group, especially in urban areas. It also emphasizes the importance of defining modern communities in a way that reflects their dynamic and complex nature.

Aligned with the *new pragmatic* philosophy that has originally informed stakeholder theory (Wicks & Freeman, 1998, Freeman *et al.*, 2010) and its emphasis on practical usefulness and implications of scholarly works, this research offers practical suggestions, discussed below, for enhancing stakeholder engagement, with specific focus on less-engaged stakeholders.

### 5.2 Practical Contributions

Practical implications of this dissertation are summarized as follows:

- Parks Canada’s current approach in reaching out to immigrant communities is documented as part of the research findings and confirmed by the agency. This document can work as a basis for Parks Canada to start a dialogue with different stakeholder groups, especially community leaders and partner organizations, on the effectiveness of the current strategies and how they can be improved.
- In order to highlight the diversity within local communities and encouraging planners to adopt a more targeted approach, the study suggests cultural background and life stage as two potential criteria for identifying different subgroups.
- This study offers insights into barriers that can contribute to immigrants’ low participation (e.g. lack of diversity among planners and engaged community members, not having background information, cultural differences, not feeling comfortable to speak in front of large groups). This information can have direct applications in the design and implementation of community engagement processes and in eliminating some of the barriers to immigrants’ participation. Although the suggested principles are intended to provide general guidelines at the strategic level, findings also offer ideas for tactical changes that can lead to tangible improvements in shorter time periods.
- Understanding the differences between planners’ and community leaders’ perceptions of the community participation concept can be helpful in designing participation processes that reflect and address residents’ expectations.
- Collaborating with community leaders and partner organizations is shown to be essential for enhancing immigrants’ engagement. The study suggests potential roles that community leaders can play in facilitating and enhancing immigrants’ engagement. In addition, it explores the relationship between Parks Canada and its partner organizations, identifies some of the barriers faced by community organizations, and offers tactical suggestions for establishing more effective relationships between planners and community organizations.

5.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

- For the purpose of this study, community is defined based on the geographic region and looks at neighbourhoods adjacent to the Rouge National Urban Park. This approach was in line with Parks Canada’s definition and allowed the research to reflect the real situation and account for the diversity within the resident community. Further comparative studies can be conducted on specific cultural communities to
understand similarities and differences between them. It would also be interesting to compare the experience of immigrants from English speaking and other countries.

- I faced challenges similar to larger local projects in terms of connecting with and engaging community members, who are not involved in local projects and decision-making activities. Considering the fact that unlike these projects my research does not have direct impacts on community members’ lives, recruiting disengaged community members as research participants was not possible within time and resource limitations of this dissertation. However, hearing directly from this group could add valuable insights to research findings.

- Ideally feedback on research findings should have been collected from all three groups of participants. However, time limitations and challenges in scheduling meetings with community leaders and participants from partner organizations did not allow for sharing research findings with these groups and receiving their feedbacks.

- This study provides insights into potential roles that community leaders and community organizations can play in enhancing participation of less-engaged community members and specifically immigrants. More research is needed on mechanisms for effective and long-term collaboration between Parks Canada and community leaders as well as other potential partners including government and non-government organizations involved in tourism planning and working with new immigrants. Qualitative case studies can be particularly valuable in this area. It would also be interesting to study how the roles played by other salient and powerful stakeholders such as politicians and environmental groups need to be revised in order to engage a broader range of community members in tourism planning.

- The impact of immigration and citizenship policies (e.g. policies with regard to the immigration process, receiving Canadian citizenship, and family sponsorship) on immigrants’ sense of belonging and consequently participation in public decision-making activities can be an area for further investigations. One of the reasons mentioned by research participants for immigrants’ low participation is the fact that immigrants do not have the right to vote until they become Canadian citizens, which may result in decreasing interest for participating in decision-making activities.
Community engagement is closely related to the concept of volunteering. Research participants briefly talked about community leaders’ perceptions of and motivations for engaging in volunteer activities and how the concept is perceived differently by various community segments. More research is needed on this topic as volunteering lies at the core of many community engagement opportunities, especially with respect to programming and visitation.

Although the research is conducted in the context of the Rouge National Urban Park, findings can be useful for enhancing immigrants’ engagement in other similar settings. Many of the research participants had extensive experience in working with cultural communities on different projects, and therefore their thoughts and reflections were not limited solely to the Rouge National Urban Park project. It is also hoped that this study will be useful in enhancing participation of other less-engaged community subgroups.
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Appendix A: Map of Rouge National Urban Park

http://rougepark.com/explore/park_map.php
Appendix B: Rouge National Urban Park Establishment Process

Appendix C: Guiding Principles for Establishment and Management of the Park

- Maintain and improve ecological health and scientific integrity
- Encourage people (especially youth) to learn and connect with nature
- Collaborate to ensure multi-modal connectivity and access
- Foster a culture of community and youth volunteering, engagement, respect and partnership
- Inspire people to experience this park
- Respect and support sustainable agriculture and other compatible land uses
- Honour diversity, local heritage, cultural inclusiveness…past, present and future
- Environmental Leadership in Park Operations
- Inclusive, progressive governance led by Parks Canada (Parks Canada, n.d.)
Appendix D: Interview Questions - Planners and Partner Organizations

- What does community participation mean to you?
- What is the role of first generation immigrant community members in the public planning and decision-making activities?
- What has been your experience like in working with first generation immigrant community members in the past?
- How do you think the first round of public consultation process played out for the Rouge National Urban Park?
- Ideally, what would you like the public consultation process to be like?
- Do you have any suggestions about other people that I should talk to?
Appendix E: Interview Questions - Community Leaders

- Can you recall the first opportunity that you got to become involved in a public decision-making process in Canada? Could you talk a little bit about your story and how you became so engaged in decision-making activities as a community member.
- What does community participation mean to you?
- What has been your experience like in participating in public consultation processes in Canada?
- Have you had the opportunity to be involved in the public consultation process for the Rouge National Urban Park?
- If Parks Canada wants to plan another public consultation process in the future, what should be done to make sure you are involved?
- Ideally, what would you like the public consultation process to be like?
- Do you have any suggestions about other people that I should talk to?
Appendix F: List of Reviewed Documents

- The “What was heard” report of November 9th visioning workshop
- Canada's First National Urban Park - A Youth Perspective
- Rouge National Park Concept
- Follow up session on Rouge National Urban Park
- Rouge National Urban Park: Public Engagement 2012 Report
- Rouge National Urban Park- Management Plan
- Rouge National Urban Park- Concept (Draft)
- Rouge National Urban Park Concept Overview
- Youth Workshop - National Urban Park Concept (Summary)
- Newsletter - March 2012
- Newsletter - April 2012
- Newsletter - May 2012
- Newsletter - June 2012
- Newsletter - September 2012
- Newsletter – April 2013
- Newsletter - Summer 2014
Meaning of community participation:

- Engaging people in every step of the process
- Receiving immigrants’ insights & perspectives
- Parks Canada receiving input from community members
- People influencing the outcome
- People having a voice/say
- Making relationships for good & bad times; feeling secure
- Getting together; thinking in a positive way; listening to the community and its wants
- Mutual learning, sharing & transferring knowledge
- Going outside of yourself; giving your time; energy; knowledge & talent
- Transformative learning; a dialogue and shared responsibility

Meaning of Community Participation:

- Engaging people in every step of the process
- Receiving input from the community
- Connecting with others
- Sharing & Learning
- Purpose of immigrants’ engagement

- A group of people coming together to share a common objective or interest - genuine participation of a community towards development of their society or of the society
- Community drives the way the neighbourhood develops & evolves
- Participation of the larger community in the planning, designing & implementing the activities that are geared for the betterment of the group & of the life people
- Getting to know the community better, getting to know what they are thinking, their expectations, aspirations, hopes & frustrations

- Helping others & development of the community/society
- Informing & educating the community
- Informing & educating people
- Raising awareness (visitation leads to lifelong support)
- Trying to educate people & provide more avenues for how you can be involved with other people interest.

- Interest from the individual to the public; Creating an environment that encourages personal involvement in defining commons
- This is the level we can have impact
- Participation in planning & decision making is real participation
- Meeting & convincing people to come out

- Connecting with others
- Parks Canada receiving input from community members
- Making relationships for good & bad times; feeling secure
- Getting together; thinking in a positive way; listening to the community and its wants
- Mutual learning, sharing & transferring knowledge
- Going outside of yourself; giving your time; energy; knowledge & talent
- Transformative learning; a dialogue and shared responsibility

- Increased visitation
- Ensuring future generations’ support through creating a sense of connection
- Incorporating immigrants needs and wants in the park because they are "the Future of Canada"
- Ensuring future protection

The colour blue represents data gathered from planners, green indicates partner organizations’ data, and purple shows community leaders’ responses.
Parks Canada’s current approach to engaging immigrants:  

Different groups have various visions for the park in mind.

- Decisions being made by people who have been part of the establishment for a long time
- Engaging people who have already been involved
- Focus on the community around the park
- There is fine line between having a separate strategy & alienating immigrants
- Consultation has been more focused on program issues
- People choose their level of engagement

The need to find appropriate methods for each community

- Planners not familiar with immigrant communities’ communication channels
- Heterogeneous immigrant community
- It takes time to change old decision-making models/structures
- Difficult to connect with/ find legitimate representatives

Current Approach

- Partnership strategy
- National parks & protected areas not mostly established in urban areas
- Limited expertise, experience & resources for engaging immigrants

Visitation vs. engagement in governance

- Visitation: the first step toward higher levels of engagement
- Establishing a sense of ownership & connection to the park

Youth engagement

- Most youth in Toronto are new Canadians
- In Toronto youth represent diversity

Visitation: the first step toward higher levels of engagement

- Long speeches
- Youth friendly references were appreciated

Feedback on youth workshop

- Some youth didn’t feel their voice was heard
- The “Dotmocracy” process was perceived as “not authentic”

Consultation has been more focused on program issues

- No clear distinction between different forms of engagement (visitation; consultation; volunteering ...)

People choose their level of engagement

- The “Dotmocracy”

16 The colour blue represents data gathered from planners and green indicates partner organizations’ data.
Contributing factors to low community participation among first generation immigrants:\(^7\)

1. **Low participation**
   - **Language barrier**
   - **Inefficient processes**
   - **Low visitation**

2. **Accessibility**
   - **Different perception about wilderness**
   - **Prescribing narrow ways of participation**

3. **The system renders immigrants as incapable**
   - **Limited understanding of immigrants communities**
   - **Traditional models & structures**

4. **First generation immigrants not involved in designing the process**
   - **Not everyone is interested**
   - **Saying it’s hard to engage first generation immigrants is a cop out**

5. **People feel they don’t fit in**
   - **People are busy; public meetings are low in their priority list**
   - **Not attending meetings**

6. **At the beginning people are very reserved in the process of observing**
   - **Meetings can be hijacked**
   - **No active participation in discussions**

---

17 The colour blue represents data gathered from planners, green indicates partner organizations’ data, and purple shows community leaders’ responses.
Suggestions for enhancing first generation immigrants’ participation:\textsuperscript{18}

\textbf{Communication}:
- Following through/reporting back
- Working with local media
- Providing background information
- Communicating the agenda & expectations
- Broadcasting at the point of entry

\textbf{Offering incentives}:
- For volunteering & community engagement

\textbf{Forming advisory committees}:

\textbf{Customized tactics for each community}:
- Small group discussions
- Finding facilitators from within communities
- Customizing message & questions for each group
- Keeping the balance between specific questions & open discussions
- Using history & story telling

\textbf{Tactics}:
- Offering incentives
- For volunteering & community engagement
- Forming advisory committees
- Small group discussions
- Finding facilitators from within communities
- Customizing message & questions for each group
- Keeping the balance between specific questions & open discussions
- Using history & story telling

\textbf{Ongoing communication; mutual learning; and flexibility}:
- Mutual Learning & understanding
- Providing information on an ongoing basis & welcoming inputs at any stage
- Flexible approach
- Keeping the process open
- Starting a dialogue instead of pushing an agenda

\textbf{Engaging first generation immigrants’ in designing & implementing the process}:
- Having a specific strategy for engaging first generation immigrants & customized tactics for each community
- Putting first generation immigrants in leadership positions
- Engaging immigrants from the beginning

\textsuperscript{18} The colour blue represents data gathered from planners, green indicates partner organizations’ data, and purple shows community leaders’ responses.
Appropriate time for reaching out to immigrant communities:¹⁹

The colour green represents data gathered from partner organizations’ data and purple shows community leaders’ responses.

¹⁹ The colour green represents data gathered from partner organizations’ data and purple shows community leaders’ responses.
Working with community leaders and community organizations:

- Partner organizations become engaged in late stages
- People are more comfortable to participate when they are part of a strong community group
- When people feel comfortable in their own groups, they will feel comfortable working with everyone else too.
- Voids the transition gap
- Funders require community organizations to meet quantitative targets
- Getting funding is becoming more difficult in Ontario
- Limited dialogue/collaboration between organizations working with immigrants
- Planners are not comfortable to put out “half-baked ideas”
- Partner orgs & community members attending meetings do not receive feedback
- Negative perceptions about impact of Immigrants’ input
- PC not drawing on partner organizations’ knowledge & experience

Characteristics of community leaders:
- Caring about community needs & wellbeing
- Being an agent of change
- Volunteering for getting Canadian experience
- Having a positive attitude
- Becoming engaged through children’s schools
- Discouraging opportunities
- Perusing personal passions
- Helping community members to integrate & feel comfortable
- Identifying problems in the neighbourhood & volunteering to be the voice of the community

Role:
- Community Organization
- Connecting with communities through leaders
- To create trust
- To inspire & engage others
- To distribute information

Funding:
- Hard to fund Community organizations /projects
- Staff shortage
- Heavy workload & limited time
- Focus on process rather than content & impact
- In-authentic relationship

Motivations for becoming engaged (volunteer) with the community initially:
- Volunteering for getting Canadian experience
- Being an agent of change
- Caring about community needs & wellbeing
- Having a positive attitude
- Discouraging opportunities

“Suggested strategies and tactics”:
- There should be an incentive for volunteer work
- Developing community champions at local level
- Finding “cheerleaders” for peer-to-peer outreach
- Developing/identifying local champions/cheerleaders
- Downside: too much focus on leaders, not connecting with members
- Connecting with communities through leaders
- To create trust
- They know what works best
- To inspire & engage others
- To distribute information

“Lack of understanding of diversity…”

Forming partnerships to meet targets
- Offering “itinerary services” for enhancing community outreach

“Secondary immigration” to Ontario not recognized by the government
- More immigrants land in western provinces

“Commodifying” immigrants’ role - Barriers

The colour blue represents data gathered from planners, green indicates partner organizations’ data, and purple shows community leaders’ responses.
Appendix H: Coding Tables

Meaning of community participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>Initial Coding</th>
<th>Focused Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“It’s taking a group of people and say, do they have ownership. I think that’s one element. The other is, do they have an active voice. So am I an active participant? Is my voice heard? Can I actually become involved to the point where I am one of the people that is perhaps not, you know as far as co-managing but there is a piece of this that I am actively participating in. So from the engagement perspective that’s the other part of community engagement and involvement that we try to look at in most of the work we do as well (P11).”</td>
<td>People having an active voice</td>
<td>Receiving input from the community</td>
<td>Meaning of Community Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“For us it means that you have an active voice and an active role in influencing and shaping how different policies or different programs or different strategies that are being done on behalf of Canadians, how that is shaped (P10).”</td>
<td>People having an active role in influencing policies and strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“But for me community participation, community involvement is providing opportunities for people to have a say and have some input and have some degree of involvement the way they want it to be in a particular project (P9).”</td>
<td>People having a say and input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So I guess my answer is that it is extremely important to us. We need input. We are an organization, where because we are developing these places, we are creating a strategic vision and implementing it for a place like the Rouge. We are doing it for Canadians and as Canadians we need to make sure that we get various perspectives and we truly do understand [how] people are seeing these places now, what they are hoping to have this be in the future (P1).”</td>
<td>Having input from the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“To me it means having a legitimate process where you seek people’s view to influence the outcome of the decision (P6).”</td>
<td>Seeking people’s view to influence the outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Community participation can be at a very grassroots level whether volunteering in the park or historic site, it can be contributing to consultations around management planning ... More broadly it’s about awareness. If Canadians don’t know about our places then they won’t likely come and visit them and if they don’t come to visit them then they have less of a chance to experience and become lifelong supporters (P3).”</td>
<td>Raising awareness</td>
<td>Informing &amp; educating community members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Community engagement is about sort of seeing what forms organically and feeding that but also trying to educate people and provide more avenues for how you can be involved with other people, be it people from your neighbourhood or people with common interest (PO7).”</td>
<td>Educating people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

21 A tracking system is used for linking quotations to interview transcripts, which uses a combination of letters (P for planners, PO for partner organization, and CL for community leaders) and numbers.
“[sic] It depends on the context as well but as community engagement, looking at concept by itself, it is that interest from the individual to the public. So going from the personal to the public and seeing personal responsibility defining the public experience and the public ownership...[it] is creating an environment that encourages personal involvement in defining commons. And therefore, it’s stewarding the commons in a manner that is sustainable and equitable. In terms of a parks experience, that experience of the commons is interwoven with experience of the environment as well as an urban lifestyle that is, it’s a point of privilege right now. Not everybody gets to experience an environment in its diverse glories. So this, the community engagement in that perspective is greater emphasis on the need for equity (PO3).”

“We need to connect and engage with the community not because we need to but because it’s the right thing to do and that will help the relationships and those relationships ......so it’s not that we are connecting to the community only because we need to say to a city councillor that we talked to the community. It’s because of the value of actually talking to the community, the insights and perspectives that we may not have. And having them on as partners who are engaged in our initiative is valuable to the project, is valuable to the initiatives. And provides a different perspective and we are public institutions, we have a public obligation and so that’s what we are forgetting (PO1).”

“You got to connect, that connection, you have to make that connection (CL4).

“Making relationships for good and bad days”.  

“Sharing knowledge, information and skills”

“Giving your time, energy, knowledge and talent”
“It really depends on what the end is that you have in mind. For me I am interested in social movements. Like I am interested in not just getting people together to do something fun, I am really interested in shifting the cultural story. Right? I am interested in how do we move the environmental agenda forward ... over thousands of years we really kind of split from nature. There is human over here and nature over here. I am always interested in shifting that story and helping people kind of tune in and understand themselves in a different way... so for me community engagement really is about transformative learning. It really is about kind of a dialogue and shared responsibility (PO4).”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformative learning; dialogue and shared responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

“Because for me politics is community development and a politician’s role is to be an agent of change for community development (PO3).”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

“There is a community voice, the community is engaged in decision making, the community is part of and is driving the way that their neighbourhood develops and evolves (PO5).”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driving neighbourhood development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

“By community participation I mean, you know, people may participate in so many different ways but participation in planning and active decision making is real participation ... participation by the larger sections of the community in the planning, designing and implementing the activities that are geared for the betterment of the group and of the life of the people (CL9).”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Betterment of the group and of the life of the people.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

“for some reason I was thinking of it from the perspective of you go out and you participate in the community but it also means like a group of people coming together to share a common objective or interest. [sic] I also see it as, community participation refers to genuine participation of a community towards development of their society or of the society and that could also, community participation is a proven approach to addressing a situation and it is critical to community success whatever that means and now we all come from different cultures and different, you know, so when you come together you are able to share and look at what it is, look at the common goal, make a difference (CL11).”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of people coming together to share a common objective or interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Having common goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Making a difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“we had the youth and I would say it was 90%, ... was a very diverse group” (P2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“we knew that by reaching youth in those areas we were reaching sort of a diverse group of youth” (P9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“they were interested in consultation with youth which is a mixed population” (P6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“we are in urban, we are in Toronto, reaching youth but most of them, if you look over a 10 year span, they were new to Canada” (P3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So the youth focus, days that we did with Centennial college or that we did with U of T Scarborough were excellent because they already have a huge new Canadian population” (P11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“we thought we can get at the parents through the children”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So if you look at new Canadians ... most families have young kids. So how do we use the kids, from a positive perspective, of getting the kids out in the Park then bringing their parents in the Park” (P7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“the parents were as interested in what the kid was doing as the kid was being there” (P11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Newcomer youth are a little bit more open to trying up something new because everything is already a little bit new so it’s not scary and I have worked with some of the youth in a prairie neighbourhood square that their life experiences are pretty not wide because they tend to live in their neighbourhood and not get out of their neighbourhood as much as some other youth so I find the new comer youth much more willing to try something completely new. So if I say let’s go up to the Milner Park and plan some trees a newcomer youth how hasn’t done it before would say OK I’ll try it out. This is another thing I haven’t done before. Whereas some of the other youth I had would be much more afraid to step out of their comfort zone. But the newcomer youth are already outside of their comfort zone. So with some encouragement and, you know, make sure that it’s safe and they know what they are getting into, I feel they are much more willing to go try on new things (PO2).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“And they are much more likely to bring their friends, whatever friends that they have they are very likely to want to bring more friends with them, especially for activities that we go out and see the city (PO2).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think there is reality that when, in Canada or elsewhere, when you come to a new country the first year or two it’s really focused on establishing yourself and your family in your community. So finding a job, finding a school for kids, do the very basics. So I think it’s more awareness at that point ... after a few years people are now better equipped in terms of their situation as a family to really participate in our parks and sites. So I think there is an awareness stage at the beginning but I think in few years it’s mostly them wanting to discover Canada through our national parks and historic sites (P7).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So in the first three years really we give people the chance to see and the opportunity to come visit but [sic] from an active participation we understand that that probably not going to be at the top ... but once you get beyond that is, you know, as people move into becoming citizens of Canada there is a great opportunity there for learning (P11).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“But we recognized that new Canadians want to establish themselves right? So we tend to take that 10 year period, so the time that they are learning either if it’s the language or job or credentials that type of thing. So we use sort of expanding that definition, not being held so tight what the statistics Canada definition is to a new Canadian, and look at that broader ten year period (P10).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It also depends on where they are at, in their sort of involvement in Canada. Like, I think it’s for us, for the creation of the Park probably unrealistic to think that someone that just came to Canada two months ago, [sic] would actually be the first thing they’d be interested in to go and provide comments for a park (P9).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It’s been very hard and it takes several years for people to establish themselves in the immigrant community. Of course they are concerned about their job, housing, [and] kids’ education. There are few priorities. Things like a park, I think a lot of immigrants think well in this country there is so much land. There should be parks. You know, I don’t know if they think beyond that (P12).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If you have to work hard to put food on the table, having to work through the issues of how to learn a new government, new society and on and on and on. You maybe don’t have time to be consulted. Even if you are asked to be consulted you don’t have the time to give it. That’s also part of process (P14).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My experience with first generation Canadians has been very consistent, which is the Rouge Park means nothing to me. The parks in general mean nothing to me. I am happy to have everything but I am not going out usually, again there is a few exceptions in every rule, but in general they are not that politically active (P15).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Beyond that three to five period is when we are starting to reach out to them ... We are working with the Institute for Canadian Citizenship and through their research they are telling us that the first 2 years period, 3 years period, it’s hard and you won’t get their attention. Once they have been here; they are landed immigrants; they are settled in; they are getting their citizenship; that's the sweet spot. That’s when we say “hey, look at the country that you can learn about, discover, experience and enjoy with your family” and that’s where we are coming in with that cultural access pass (P3)”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaching out to immigrants after 3-5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important to find the appropriate time for reaching out to immigrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It may not be a good idea to go too early because they may be unable to get the most of what it is we have to offer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The other thing is that we have to recognize that when people come to a new country the early stages of them being in a new country may be very difficult for them to leave their new city their new town and start exploring national parks and national historic sites. They have lots of things that they have to take care of. I mean whether schooling for children, a place to live, you know, getting all the new documentation, you know, all of the things that are required. So I think we have to figure out what time in their stage of being new to the country is best for us to reach them. So we may not want to go too early because they may be unable to get the most of what it is we have to offer. So it’s really figuring out for each community what is going to work, you know, when is the appropriate time (P1).”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is important to find the appropriate time for reaching out to immigrants.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It may not be a good idea to go too early because they may be unable to get the most of what it is we have to offer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“So we see newcomers that arrived the day before and they will be in the Storefront the very next day. or we see them in a couple of months or whatever but the sooner that people engage and start making community connections the stronger they will feel about their community they are more connected to it and they will find that no matter what the entry point is, so it could be a cooking class, it could be an English class, it could be nature and parks, it doesn’t even matter. Whatever brings somebody in to a network like storefront or like a partner agency. Once they are in the web of connections is just multiplied and they understand that there is access to resources to help with housing and settlement and legal and health issues and you grab that person. Like as soon as they are in, you open doors for them and it’s a world that have they not connected it would have been that much harder to figure it out on your own” ... if somebody waited 5 or 10 years to get engaged with their community that’s a long time to be disengaged and to not have a say in what’s going on around you. If you live here you care about the water, you care about highway, you care about schools. You might not know it. It might not be front and center in your priority list but it affects you and if it affects you, you should have your say (PO6)”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newcomers participate in classes even within the first days and months.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“as soon as they are in, you open doors for them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“5-10 years is a long time to be disengaged”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Immigrants can & need to be engaged during the first 3-5 years. |

---
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“That’s a cop out. You know when people say that, that’s a total cop out. That tells me that they don’t have the tools or the knowledge or the experience to do the engagement. So they just say as a rationalization it’s hard and they don’t try. Because I can give you the number of, I just was at a graduation last week for the CAP project in my neighbourhood in Dorset Park and that was a three year project funded by the federal government for civic engagement. And everybody that was there were all first generation, the majority, and they received awards, they were all engaged, they were out doing things in their community and in fact I was thinking I should probably connect you to Anna because I think she would be a great interview ... It’s all about people are making judgements. So I think inherent in that finding that you say you are seeing or you are hearing from these people is a value judgement. And I think that’s quite problematic (PO5).”

“You are asking me two questions what do I think about that assumption and what can be done for those who are in the 3-5 years or under 3 years. Let me answer the first thing. What do I think about it. I think it’s a huge disservice. Because it speaks to my very first statement of it assumes that people don’t like nature, that they have no inherent experience of nature and only “Canadians” understand nature. It’s an assumption of power. It is an assumption of the norm. So it speaks to that. It’s a huge disservice because the first 5 years of settlement is the most stressful and that is when you do need to have a space to go into and reflect and if you need to cry, if you need to laugh, if you want to run, if you feel like sleep. And humans feel safe in nature and it is an opportunity that is being missed because those memories of the first five years stay with that first generation settler. And if those memories are formed in the Rouge National Urban Park. Guess who they are going to support. Rouge National Urban Park. Guess who they will want to volunteer with. Rouge National Urban Park. Guess who they will want to work diligently to grow and nurture and maybe even interact with on multi generational level. For generations to come there to their great grand children they will say you know when I first came to Canada this is this park that I sat down and I cried because I missed my birth home so much, or because I had to leave my brother behind and he died that’s a story and that’s when the narrative gets woven. So I sincerely believe it’s a disservice (PO3).”

“Because we have first generation immigrants, ... new comers who have come into the country 5,6 weeks, who come to my community meetings and they want to learn what’s going on, they want to engage and you know if they speak mostly Mandarin and a few words of English they are not going to understand what is going on and then be disengaged and leave and never come back again (CL5).”

Newcomers come to meetings even after 5-6 weeks to learn what is going on But they may become disengaged due to language barrier

That’s a cop out to say it is hard to engage first generation immigrants

“Not reaching out to immigrants in the first 3-5 years is a disservice.”

“ the first 5 years of settlement is the most stressful and that is when you do need to have a space to go into and reflect”
“we don’t want people to be ghettoised and if [we] don’t provide integration services for newcomers then that’s what is going to happen. They are going to live in these little ghettos never learning English or French and never be able to truly integrate into our community they will stay within the little ethnic or whatever cultural background they are from and stay within that little bubble and that’s all they will do because we as a community are failing them. We are inviting them into our country and then not helping them to contribute completely to the greater society. Yes, if they are working at a grocery store, you know I mean new Chinese immigrants living in a community that has lots of Chinese people and I work in a Chinese grocery store and I am organizing Chinese activities. Great I am doing stuff, I am helping, I am building the community. Yes, but nobody outside of the Chinese world knows all the fantastic work that you are doing and a non-Chinese person won’t be able to learn from your lessons and your mistakes and all the good stuff you are doing, the bad stuff you are doing, whatever it might be and if that’s the case then we as a society are failing that new immigrant (CL5).”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>Initial Coding</th>
<th>Focused Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Accessibility of the place. How they are going to go there and everywhere is the event is taking part that is not a proper place, there is no accessibility for disable people or elderly people that is also another reason. Because you can see elderly people are mostly retired they have enough time to come and you know watch the thing but they don’t come. If it is far they don’t want to come but if you are doing something in the building then they are OK in my building something is going on I will come (CL2).”</td>
<td>Retirees have enough time to come to the Park.</td>
<td>Accessibility is important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotes</td>
<td>Initial Coding</td>
<td>Focused Coding</td>
<td>Axial Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So part of your question is how do you deal with the outreach at immigrant population that has been here for 4-5 years. Well, so many students have actually been here for 15 or 20 years but their conflict is exactly the same as that student who have recently immigrated. And I think, you know, the challenge becomes how do you connect them and draw them into a consultation process whether it’s the Rouge Park or anything else that we are doing ... And, you know, it’s funny. We even have students who are second generation but they live in pockets where culturally the language they speak at home, the language they speak in their surrounded community isn’t English. It could be mandarin. It could be Hindu and so their whole social world outside of the university is actually completely in a different language but they are second generation Canadians. And so you can argue that they probably have a very strong immigrant experience. Because when they speak English they may have accent. So your assumption is they are from somewhere else but when you ask they say No my parents grew up here, I grew up here. So and I think it’s unique to a city like Toronto (PO2).”</td>
<td>People need different amount of times</td>
<td>“duration is not an indication of engagement”</td>
<td>There is no ideal time for engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“You know there are a lot of immigrants who have been, people who immigrated to Canada they wouldn’t necessarily consider themselves as immigrants but they have been living in Canada for quite some time and they are still very disconnected from the larger society. You know linguistically, culturally, employment wise, so I don’t think duration is necessarily a good measure of one’s integration let’s say (PO7).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There are people who like to get involved in all groups I think. Just you know, present opportunities and people will come (CL8).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A person maybe settled to some extent in his or her personal life while working a small or low paid job but integration for the whole society is more complex, more broad based (CL9).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I don’t know if there is an ideal time period I would say there has to be time for people to kind of settled in but, you know, it would be good to see some kind of advice given to new comers to take the time. I am not sure how that could be done (pO7).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| “I don’t know if there is an ideal time period” | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>Initial Coding</th>
<th>Focused Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“It is sort of an emerging area we don’t have a lot of research or are engaged in a lot of research right now (P10).”</td>
<td>Limited previous research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We don’t always succeed in the projects that I was involved, not by a lack of will but sometimes either the lack of resources or skills in order to effectively communicate, effectively reach out and .... tools or ways to be engaged that work with these particular groups (P9).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I don’t know that we have, to be honest, a lot of experience in targeting and reaching out to new immigrants to participate in the decision making other than maybe what’s happened in the Rouge recently or consultations that might have been taken place in bigger urban centers, where there are big populations (P3).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I know there is not a lot of expertise anywhere in working specifically with immigrant communities to plan a specific park perhaps (P8).”</td>
<td>Limited expertise &amp; skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Probably not in a dedicated way, but as part of our outreach and learning … , [sic] there are people there who have a fair bit of experience social science wise, any of the analysts, there is only a few, are working more recently with data, looking at larger cities of Canada, where there are more immigrant communities centered with a much better understanding of those communities today. Do they really have lots of expertise and experience? It’s hard to say. It’s not a long-standing exercise just yet. But in the last five-six years certainly more so than ever before (P8).”</td>
<td>Limited expertise, experience &amp; resources for engaging immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Because we don’t have people who can ... speak Cantonese or whatever so we need to constantly look at ways to get deeper (P1).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We are a small team working on the Rouge project with limited resources and I was the only staff in Toronto (P16).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I have a small team in my group and it’s only four people, two right now, and it’s new Canadian engagement. So new Canadians, urban Canadians and youth are priority audiences for parks (P3).”</td>
<td>Small team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The other [issue] is can you intermediate those relationships or there are people that are already trusted people that you can create the trust relationship with quicker. So you know, Toronto Community Housing for instance in Toronto has a great trust community relationship with a lot of new Canadians. So can you meet with Toronto Community Housing and say can we use that. The Institute of Canadian Citizenship has a great trust relationship with a lot of new Canadians. You know there are lot of publishers and media that have a great trust relationship, so often working through trusted other partners so, you know, if you are with New Immigrant Magazine that a lot of new immigrants to Canada get, they trust it, they like the information in it. [sic] Well if we can create a partnership with them so that they are inviting them to our places with us, great (P11).”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working with people/ organizations that have already established trust relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“And I sometimes think that even if we had the people I’m not sure if it would actually work. So for us it works when we use groups that have those relationships already established that have those particular channels that can help us translate, not translate in that perspective, take our message and take it the right way and with the right sort of questions to these particular groups (P9).”

“We had good experiences using, what I would call intermediaries or other associations, [sic] like whether it’s the YMCA or the Calgary Catholic association, so groups that are actually dealing and in regular contact with some of the ethnic communities are usually a good way for us to get into the community (P1).”

“Definitely it’s nice that the residents themselves, the farming community, they have that association and that group that we can converse with directly (P5).”

“They are not formally structured. So they are hard to reach and the same thing, it is a barrier because when you are actually in the planning process you got to talk to the masses you can’t just go and knock on people’s door so you got to find ways to tap into these various networks and depending on how people are formally or informally structured makes it easier or harder to reach them (P9).”

“People should, people who they are interested in working with, you might call them stakeholders, they should be involved from the beginning in helping to design the process. Because everything was laid out for us it was just come and bring 10 people, come and bring 20 people. But we have got experience working with people and other agencies as well. We know our communities. We know what is going to work for them. But there was no chance to even communicate that because everything was done by the time we were involved. So people don’t like to, and this is with Rouge Park too, people don’t like to put out half-baked ideas or projects or programs. It’s very uncomfortable to say “we are thinking about this, we don’t really know what’s going to happen, but are you interested in participating”. People are very uncomfortable with that. You know it takes a leap of faith or trust to put yourself out there and say I don’t actually know what the best thing is. So when you come to the Rouge Park thing that had already decided the place, the time, the agenda, who is facilitating, what questions were being asked. We didn’t have input with any of that. But I have very much liked to have been involved from the beginning to make sure that it was working for the communities that we were asked to help participate (PO6).”

Planners prefer to connect with a structured community group instead of individuals

Partner organizations should be involved from the beginning and in the design of the process not when everything is already decided

“people don’t like to put out half-baked ideas or projects or programs”

Communication between PC & partner organizations
"I felt it was not going to be if they had to spend some money for the first year, it might not be as successful as they would have liked it to be. And but I keep circulating and I keep communicating with this individual and then they were saying well can they leave their cars at home and let us know what intersections they would rather be and we will pick them up at certain intersections. But my understanding in the long run, it wasn’t successful at all because it was going to be different. ... so I am not sure how well it went because as we go back and forth by email I was saying well I cannot tell you to park, to bring a bus to the town centre and people will be waiting I think if people are going to be coming, they are going to be coming in their cars and I am not sure if they would want to be there for the weekend. ... it’s probably not going to work and it probably is not going to be successful and as I was saying to her I am just speaking from my opinion, right? I would love to be here even to go down to take a look at the site and see what happen but I was not going to be in the country. So I didn’t get to hear how it go (CL11)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One way communication; PC not drawing on partner organizations’ knowledge &amp; experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner Organizations only distributing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No follow up/ feedback to community members/ organizations after meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External organizations designing and implementing the consultation process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What we would do when these consultation meeting happened is I would send out an advisory notice or make an announcement at one of our internal meetings, well internal, one of our community meetings of our residents, one of our work group meetings and we would let community know or that sub section of the community, so those that are volunteering with us in some capacity, that these meetings were happening (PO8).

"I think in Scarborough there have been particular neighbourhoods where these community consultations or forms of engagement have taken place and, so an organization will come in, and when I say come in it’s important, you know this idea of this external organization, somebody who doesn’t really have any real vested interest in the community because they don’t work there or live there and hold all these meetings about oh we are really concerned about X, Y and Z and I’m sure there is real genuine concern and then they just leave and you never hear anything back. So that feedback mechanism is really important and how do you do that? I mean a lot of newcomers and I say newcomers because the area is primarily newcomers but community members here they went, I remember to a meeting that was hosted by a local politician to talk about an infrastructure issue and it was, you know, they shared and it’s great to get people a venue for sharing their ideas but to follow up on it is really important otherwise that whole process loses its legitimacy and value (PO7)."

| "So we will get, and I am not going to pin point one percent or one level and it’s not just government it’s other agencies as well, for example they will say here is a flyer can you please recruit? Can you get us 15 residents to come and talk to us about transit, for example. And we bring 15-20 residents, we show up and then that’s it. A lot of times we don’t even get report back, we don’t know, you tally all the information and you synthesise it and you analyse and you know you should be reporting back to the people that helped you gather that information. Most times that doesn’t happen. We never see the reports. We never see follow up. So it’s like being used in a way and people feel that (PO6)." |
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“I have worked with, you know, you talk about engaging residents and then you have the distinction between residents and the community services, sort of service sector let’s say. And one thing I have seen is a real lack of understanding of what anybody else does, right? So you will see, you know, you will bring like health and social services and you know other kinds of organizations together and they really have no idea about what each other does and on top of that they don’t really understand the issues that immigrants are facing. So there is a huge educational piece that has to take place and I don’t know how to get beyond that but it’s part of what you are talking about, right? (PO7)”

| Lack of collaboration and communication among organizations working with immigrants | People see no repercussion of their input |
| Communications among organizations working with immigrants | Not feeling heard |

“I haven’t seen it with Parks Canada yet when they actually get a voice to say. Like their ....has been taking to mean anything yet. This is a lot of times that you get asked for your input but you don’t actually see any repercussions on your input being asked. A year ago they did an activity with the youth, my youth, where they actually got them to on large papers, to draw in groups what would you do, what would an urban national park look like. And they drew teenagers doing different things. They had different ideas of what’s important. Parks took it. Rouge Park took it. it wasn’t Parks Canada it was Rouge Park that took it; and they kept all that. Like they ask youth to explain it; and what the newcomers were looking for in the Park. Why did you design it this way and they all had some common features that all the newcomer groups had and I have no idea. Part of it was more amusement park than nature park but they had certain characteristics and the Rouge Park staff were generally why did you design it and why is there have to be a clear cut entrance. This is the way you go and this is the path you take as oppose to just [...] so there are certain things that they were interested in but I don’t know if it was, if there was any follow up with that. Because, I mean there is a lot of people who have an interest in the Rouge Park. We were tree planting up there on a Saturday and there was a large, since last time I was up at this area, there was a huge sub-urban development took place in the middle of the Park. So a whole bunch of houses that wasn’t there the last time I was there. And so I mean that’s a huge amount of money that has a huge huge voice in the Park and I don’t know if the voice of the community will be heard on top of that loudness (PO2). ”

“I am somewhat skeptical to be quite honest of not this one case but in so many cases when they do public consultation. I don’t really know how much of an influence, like I think we actually need to be, we need to change our decision making model ... So it’s not about the individuals but I think the structures are really limiting and so when for example the Rouge, what they did the first thing is they had a larger engagement for key stakeholders. We were there, Friends of the Rouge, like so those are the more official leaders in the movement but then they did community consultations and youth consultations. They were done very quickly. They didn’t kind of send out huge swath of invitations. It had to happen fast. So they are like OK let’s grab these people and let’s talk to them. I don’t know how meaningful it was. I think they could kind of tick their box: we did consultations. And again it’s not that the intensions were bad in this case. Like I think it happens and there are a lot of times where it’s just optics. In this case I think they were trying but they had limited money resources, limited time. And so it’s like OK we got 24 youth together.
I don’t even know where they found them. Certainly our youth weren’t really invited. You know like, I don’t think it was particularly effective. And I don’t know how much that content really influenced the decisions anyway on that level. I think the stakeholder meeting where Faisal was invited; our director that had a little more impact and influence and certainly the David Suzuki Foundation has had a lot of influence but the people who are living in the community I would say probably fairly low. That’s my sense (PO4).”

“Right now one group of people are running the Park; Parks Canada is going to be coming in but they don’t know what is going to look like. It would be hard to believe that your voice would mean anything. Because you don’t know, you don’t even know what’s happening too much. It’s going to take a long time. I mean there is large sections in the park, which are farm land which is being converted to forests. It doesn’t look much like a park, we were tree planting on Saturday it just not look like a park at all. So I don’t see it being a priority for the newcomers and I don’t see them, the amount of influence that they will have on something, I don’t think they are going to care about too much in the near future. I don’t see it being a priority for them (PO2).”

But there are some people who are pushing very strongly and I had the impression that I was not heard. Like everyone was so set on this idea and because they were talking that it was done in New York area somewhere and it was a great success and I am asking what kind of success it is when people will be coming and breathing this polluted methane you know and I didn’t think that I was heard; that it mattered what I was opposing to... as I said, you know that I was involved twice and the result was very good but this one I am not satisfied because it was like although there is a consultation but this is just to have it in the books that there was consultation but people who are making decisions are not interested in changing their mind or even checking the information. So this is how it was... I didn’t feel heard because [sic] people who are organizing, they already made decisions.

“But it was the one on University of Toronto Scarborough campus. And I took a group of 15 youth and then there was about, there was probably about 50 youth in total in the room. So other groups and other individuals that were just invited and so I had 15 and this was my immediate reaction. Right? So referencing that Andrew from UTS and Malcolm they thought it was a great event but they are not really used to working with youth and doing youth engagement. So the youth that I work with have been trained in facilitation. They understand how to do consultation and stuff so they have a very different take and you can use this in your research if you want. So I mean like they were very attuned to how the process was rolling out in that one consultation but they didn’t actually feel like their voices were heard so it’s interesting (PO6).”

<p>| “I don’t even know where they found them. Certainly our youth weren’t really invited. You know like, I don’t think it was particularly effective. And I don’t know how much that content really influenced the decisions anyway on that level. I think the stakeholder meeting where Faisal was invited; our director that had a little more impact and influence and certainly the David Suzuki Foundation has had a lot of influence but the people who are living in the community I would say probably fairly low. That’s my sense (PO4).” |  |
| “Right now one group of people are running the Park; Parks Canada is going to be coming in but they don’t know what is going to look like. It would be hard to believe that your voice would mean anything. Because you don’t know, you don’t even know what’s happening too much. It’s going to take a long time. I mean there is large sections in the park, which are farm land which is being converted to forests. It doesn’t look much like a park, we were tree planting on Saturday it just not look like a park at all. So I don’t see it being a priority for the newcomers and I don’t see them, the amount of influence that they will have on something, I don’t think they are going to care about too much in the near future. I don’t see it being a priority for them (PO2).” | Hard to believe your voice would mean anything |
| But there are some people who are pushing very strongly and I had the impression that I was not heard. Like everyone was so set on this idea and because they were talking that it was done in New York area somewhere and it was a great success and I am asking what kind of success it is when people will be coming and breathing this polluted methane you know and I didn’t think that I was heard; that it mattered what I was opposing to... as I said, you know that I was involved twice and the result was very good but this one I am not satisfied because it was like although there is a consultation but this is just to have it in the books that there was consultation but people who are making decisions are not interested in changing their mind or even checking the information. So this is how it was... I didn’t feel heard because [sic] people who are organizing, they already made decisions. | I didn’t feel heard because decisions were already made. |
| “But it was the one on University of Toronto Scarborough campus. And I took a group of 15 youth and then there was about, there was probably about 50 youth in total in the room. So other groups and other individuals that were just invited and so I had 15 and this was my immediate reaction. Right? So referencing that Andrew from UTS and Malcolm they thought it was a great event but they are not really used to working with youth and doing youth engagement. So the youth that I work with have been trained in facilitation. They understand how to do consultation and stuff so they have a very different take and you can use this in your research if you want. So I mean like they were very attuned to how the process was rolling out in that one consultation but they didn’t actually feel like their voices were heard so it’s interesting (PO6).” | Youth didn’t feel heard |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>Initial Coding</th>
<th>Focused Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The number one way that we find that people get that sense of ownership and that sense of connection is through the visit. So it’s about five, four and a half to one, the number of people that feel engaged. So, 90% of people that have visited feel engaged immediately to the places. So it’s easier then to get them to participate, to get them become active participants in conversations (P11).”</td>
<td>People get the sense of ownership and connection through visiting the park.</td>
<td>It is easier to engage people who have visited the park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“we have an activity assessment that we would like communities from an immigrant perspective to come in and say OK so we really enjoy cricket, we really enjoy kite fighting, so let’s take some of those activities and say OK let’s assess them and say [sic] ya do they make sense or under what circumstances do they make sense within a national park or a national historic site. So a lot of that work is the work that we are doing hopefully with immigrant communities and that’s really where we would like to be with those communities, is into that dialogue where, you know, they are doing the same as any other group of Canadians so, you know, that we are hearing a voice that we haven’t yet heard (P11).”</td>
<td>Engaging immigrant communities in designing activities in the park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It’s a different level of connection and then you can speak to it and you can be a bigger champion if you actually have that firsthand experience because the likelihood of you caring more about a place if you have actually experienced it is more than if you just read about it in a magazine. So I think that’s why there is a push to engage communities because we know from our visitation base that they are not there (P11).”</td>
<td>You can be a bigger champion of the place if you actually have that firsthand experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think fairly for them it’s difficult to get involved in decision making or to have protection of our natural and cultural heritage top of mind if they don’t get a chance to connect with it … I think the way we organize and shape the park will create or not the level of interest that people will want or will need in order to get involved in decision making (P2).”</td>
<td>Park design and activities influence people’s interest to get involved in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think the next stage would be to say all right you have seen these places now it’s time to maybe volunteer; to help us out; to bring your families to other places; to come out to a consultation; to tell us what you think and how we can best reach you. So, [that’s] one concrete step in that direction that we hope will lead to more general participation in the management of our places (P3).”</td>
<td>Visitation is the first stage towards higher levels of engagement/in management of the park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“I think even in the Parks Canada review now their consolation is [sic] about, although it includes a lot of new immigrants, is what should the programs be? Should we have trails? Should we have camping site, should we have this and that and trying to ensure that the programs are attractive to the people who live there. They haven’t really debated or asked for suggestions on the size of the park; how it should be funded; how it should be managed. That, sort of, has been more of an internal [decision]. So it’s different from other processes we have community groups trying to influence and determine what the future should be. So it came about from a different way from that point of view ... I think when federal government, when Parks Canada are trying to develop their program direction there’s good consultation with the immediate community. The public meetings they are holding and did have, so that is the level of consultation. It’s basically what should we be doing in the park to attract people to use it and to satisfy the users rather than should it be a national park or not. That was a decision that was made at the political, policy level at the beginning (P6).”

Consultation has been focused on visitation and program issues

“My hope is that the community and type of people that are interested in it just keep growing over the years. [sic] As they start getting their team, their staff and they get more involved and they start having more activities, different types of groups that come in the park they will start reaching out and having more opportunities for a more diverse audience to stay involved in a way that make sense to them, whether it is by going to the park, whether it is by providing input, whether it is by volunteering, whether it is by renting space or just actually being interested and actually caring about the place (P9).”

Focus on visitation and program issues

“So from our perspective, we have done a lot of looking at where do we have people having that connection and then where are we not getting that connection as well and that’s where the Rouge really comes in, as in most of our downtown areas of the three big cities so, Vancouver; Toronto; Montreal (we often refer to them as MTV) so in those areas there are somewhat doughnut holes in the middle of where people aren’t visiting, where people don’t feel connection to either the history or the nature of the country ... as we look at that doughnut hole that we talked about, another area of the Canadian population where we are underrepresented as far as visitation and as far as people having a positive feeling about Parks Canada and national parks and national historic sites, is in the new Canadian or the immigrant population (P11).”

Visitation is low in urban areas and among “new Canadians or the immigrant population.”

“When you look at the demographics of Canada there is significant population of new Canadians that we are not reaching. I mean the first few years that the people are here they are focused on the basics (P3).”

“If you read some of our corporate documents you will see that there is an acknowledgement that we are not necessarily successful in reaching different communities from different ethnic backgrounds. Not because we didn’t try but because where they are located in urban centers they don’t get to hear or enjoy or venture out of the urban area to discover Parks Canada (P2).”
“You know we have been doing a lot of research on visitors that we currently have to the Parks Canada family of protected areas, and I am not speaking just about the Rouge I am thinking more broadly across the country, and I think that we are definitely getting into an urban area into a variety of ethnic communities but there is still small numbers you could say coming to our parks and sites in the larger urban areas of Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver (P1).”

“The population makeup is not represented in our visitation statistics. Visitation is declining. It is not youth and it is not culturally diverse (P16).”

“I mean in Scarborough, especially as Scarborough evolves over time, newcomer families or first generation families are quite predominant and it’s getting more and more so. So, I mean Rouge Park is right there. This is who is most likely to use the park, and when we do tree planting and stuff, that’s not who is there. It’s mostly the many generation Canadians of European descent, who are the ones that tend to be the ones that are in the park (PO2).”

“It’s just not an accessible place yet. Once there is the infrastructure there to go to and it has some basic necessities like a place to go to the washroom, it kind of eases a lot of the panic about going to a place that’s new (PO2).”

“They also felt that access to the park was a major issue since most of our youth don’t have access to cars. While this idea is probably outside the scope of Parks Canada, they didn’t feel it was properly acknowledged. Many of the youth and families who live with limited financial means miss out on wonderful opportunities because of the barriers of even accessing them (PO9).”

“Well I don’t see many. That’s the bottom line...I mean you got a meeting about the Rouge and there is not a lot of immigrants or first generation immigrants. There is not a lot of non-whites. I mean, I don’t know everybody’s story, right? I don’t talk to everybody; I don’t listen to everybody’s accent. I don’t know where everybody is from. So I could be wrong. Everybody could be first generation. Most of the people I do hear speaking at the meeting and the things that they speak about and their age and their accents suggest that they are not. But you know, I mean, I might hear 15 people out of a meeting of a 100 people. But also at a meeting of a 100 people when you don’t see any people of color, you know, that’s not very reflective of Toronto and Toronto’s immigrant community, especially Toronto’s immigrant community in Markham, Pickering and Scarborough (PO8).”

“First generation Canadians are not participating enough in the actual public decision making processes. They are starting to engage more and more in the local level I think, [sic] building for both like at municipal level and through ....politics I think they are getting a lot more involved but not enough that they are actually in positions to really influence and to be the decision makers(CL5).”

Rouge Park is not accessible.

Participation at the decision making level is low among immigrants
“So obviously they will choose the level of involvement they will take but our work is to give them an opportunity to enjoy this place or to discover this place. Whether it is through an educational activity; a recreational activity; a volunteer opportunity; or a governance opportunity (P2).”

“[What] we really believe in is that we want people to feel that they have ongoing opportunities to be involved in the park and that’s very important to us. Some will become volunteers and they will obviously be involved that way. Some will be visitors. Some may be on committees, some may, you know, be involved in other ways (P1).”

“This is a personal decision to be more or less actively involved. So, some are going to want to just be aware, some are going to want to have a deeper understanding, some are going to want to be visitors, some are going to want to be volunteers. So basically [sic] what our role is to help them be able to do all of these things whenever and however they want to be involved (P1).”

Not distinguishing between different levels/forms of engagement
People choose their level of involvement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>Initial Coding</th>
<th>Focused Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“That was really what we were looking for. You know, [sic] to treat everybody knowing that there is a high immigrant population around the Rouge; that we were going to get a good immigrant population as we went into this. So we didn’t have any specific targets. It was more how can we engage the community that’s in and around the park. So through mail drops, through community newspapers, we did tons of interviews; we did tons of proactive work with community newspapers, community mail drops, those types of things. So it was more from that perspective (P11).”</td>
<td>Not having a separate strategy for engaging immigrants.</td>
<td>Focusing on the community living around the park</td>
<td>No separate strategy for engaging immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So again for me we never had the specific target in terms of how many immigrants would actually provide [input] and what would be the percentage. We were looking at the broad overview of who is the Canadian population that’s near the park and we want to make sure that we provide opportunities for any of those Canadians that are interested. Some of those may be youth some of those may be new Canadians, some of those are seniors, [and] some of them are neighbours. They all have specific particularities and what we want is to make sure that we provided tools that could respond to those various individuals and their various needs (P9).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“At some point someone was saying, well where is your strategy for new Canadians? and I was saying no it is a strategy for Canadians that live around the park because you know among youth more than half are new Canadian. So it’s not a group that’s out there, it’s a group that we are dealing with we got to find ways to reach them and it really became sort of a key component of what we are doing in Toronto because it’s really what the population is in Toronto (P9).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“However in thinking about this and going over your questions it actually made me think about, you know, have we looked at the communities that we haven’t done, that we haven’t got into the park? Whether it’s Lithuanians or it’s African communities that kind of thing. Have we done any outreach to work with these communities in coming here? Because we are open to every community group or every immigrant community group that wants to come in and do something. We are definitely open to it. But have we opened up the opportunities for them to feel welcome to come in? (P13)”</td>
<td>Not having a separate strategy for engaging ethnic communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Realizing that, you know if you have been here and you are a Canadian citizen, you have Canadian citizenship you are a Canadian. So should I be treating you any differently? You are a Canadian. So it’s a fine line sometimes I find people get so tied up with trying to segregate people out because you know you have established yourself, you are provided Canadian identity and you are a Canadian. [sic] So should I single you out as being, you know what I mean? ... Yes, there is a fine line and you have to be extremely careful and understand why and what are the purposes behind it. Because you don’t want to alienate people at the same time. I mean you have got people choosing this country. It’s their new home for a reason and as a result you are a Canadian citizen and you know all the elements that come with that and the pride that comes with that, should I treat you different because you are from another country? You are Canadian (P10). “</td>
<td>There is fine line between segregating/alienating first generation immigrants and having a separate strategy for enhancing their engagement</td>
<td>Downside of having a separate strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“It should be together, there is not, even if immigrants have some language problems they still can participate and voice their ideas you know, I don’t see, [sic] it’s always better a relationship when all members of the community will come together so they will learn to be together... No I am against [sic] ghettoing (CL8).”

“‘That’s a tough one. That’s a though one because you don’t want to put in specific strategy or maybe eliminating without even realizing but on the other hand how are you going to get them. right? How you are going to get different groups to participate and to, it’s hard and I think, what I always say is to get community leaders around the table and let them take it from there (CL11).’”

<p>| “It should be together, there is not, even if immigrants have some language problems they still can participate and voice their ideas you know, I don’t see, [sic] it’s always better a relationship when all members of the community will come together so they will learn to be together... No I am against [sic] ghettoing (CL8).” | It is better to continue with general meetings |
| &quot;‘That’s a tough one. That’s a though one because you don’t want to put in specific strategy or maybe eliminating without even realizing but on the other hand how are you going to get them. right? How you are going to get different groups to participate and to, it’s hard and I think, what I always say is to get community leaders around the table and let them take it from there (CL11).’&quot; | Risks of having a separate strategy |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>Initial Coding</th>
<th>Focused Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“There has been a traditional North American way of managing parks but now the clientele is changing. (P17)”</td>
<td>There has been a traditional North American way of managing parks</td>
<td>Relying on some of the old concepts despite the fact the community is changing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Many years ago when there weren’t as many immigrants, we were reaching out to a good number of the community. More recently as more immigrants are moving into the area I think we are still relying on some of the old concepts. So our messaging, our communication, isn’t that effective and we haven’t developed the best strategy on communicating with all of the different immigrants and to make sure that we are getting their input. (P5)”</td>
<td>Relying on some of the old concepts despite the fact the community is changing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[sic] Right, that means that, you know, part of consultation just, they are going to do more consultation I think, other than just post something and say provide your comments. I think there has to be another engagement approach and maybe that’s building it before you are actually going to consolation to raise that awareness. Putting something up to say provide me with your feedback isn’t going to engage people. Right? [sic] It’s that very, it’s a passive approach. I mean that’s what consultation and in a way the approaches are. But I think it’s, I think they have to do the grass root work to build the awareness, to engage communities to say there is an opportunity here before you just go with: OK provide me with your feedback. So it’s either a lot more work up front or this slightly different approach to how you actually go and engage people in consultation. And maybe, you know, whether it comes to open houses, you know it just tends to be a lot the ways that the consultation is being done. Maybe, depending on what the issue is, you find different ways to go. You don’t go to your traditional way that you go to all the time. Find some other venues and in different areas that you traditionally don’t go to. So you first step outside the box and go how do you engage different people? You got to be in different places that you traditionally aren’t. And I think that’s a bit of a risk in some ways because sometimes we don’t, it’s new for us but I think you got to expose a lot more people to some of the issues that we need to address and try doing things in slightly different ways. (P10)”</td>
<td>Current approaches to community consultation are passive</td>
<td>Relying on traditional models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think we tend to go to our traditional audience through our traditional channels, tried and true type of thing. You know if we got email and contact lists we keep going back to the same people and so those are the people that either they already know about the places, they already know about the processes, they already know what the strategies are. They know what it is that we do and I think you know moving forward we have to engage a lot more people and a much more diverse audience of people. I don’t mean just necessarily culturally but I mean people that either not know about us and try to engage people who don’t know about us (P10).”</td>
<td>Going to traditional audience through traditional channels</td>
<td>Engaging people who have already been involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Parks Canada would be a much better place today if we had involved and considered immigrant communities sooner but we kind of got a little, I would say isolated and thinking and planning around those, who were already users and we did not include immigrant community members. But we open those doors now. We opened the window to look, because the key to the future sustainability lies there ... I worry that we haven’t been able to be flexible enough to get everybody, to get sufficient views of [sic] other but I say that very tempered. OK? Because I think generally it was quiet good ... But the only thing I’m concerned about is that planner and partner organizations, as far as I know, we have involved people who have been involved previously with the Rouge and we need to ensure that we have gone further than that list, further than that group of traditional people that we would talk to in such situations (P8).”

| “We did look at our attendance and we know it’s not necessarily very multi [...], you know [we] usually reach the older people who have been knowing Parks for a long time (P2).” | Reaching older people who have been knowing Parks for a long time |
| “I guess there is two voices that probably don’t get heard because often decision makers are like me older people, who have been part of that establishment. One is the immigration communities themselves who aren’t fully franchised and the other is youth, which of course includes immigrant youth too (P6)” | Decision makers are like me older people, who have been part of that establishment |
| “So we have wonderful people in my riding that you know where ever possible we try and get them a public appointment on a board of some sort, whether provincial appointees or anything like that so that it’s a learning experience for them plus they bring their input. Of course sometimes boards can come sort of completely so used to each other. I would say this is like what the Rouge Park Alliance was, you see? Same people were talking to each other for 30 years. Basically there were no new ideas. And that’s why they were into preserving the butterflies and the snakes and they forgot about people (P12).” | Same people sitting on the Rouge Park Alliance for a long time |
| “However, the interesting thing about Rouge Park, Rouge National Urban Park, is that it really was, except for a few involved in programs [like] tree planting and a few other things like, that it was all, you got to get used to my name[s], it was all euro-Canadians ... But it is quite interesting that generally who runs the park is euro-Canadian and long standing families. Why? Because it goes back to the open climate. There are parks in Canada [sic], parks, national parks, big parks, potential of the wilderness which is just not very far away. It’s just out there. And so that has infused the nature of Canada to the community or to the culture. It’s part of the culture just like hockey. I mean certain things maple syrup and hockey and beavers and national parks and so it fits into that category. It’s long standing Canadian and what you don’t see is the involvement of newer Canadians, immigrants in the park process (P14).” | Generally who runs the park is euro-Canadian and long standing families |

| First generation immigrants are not involved in designing public engagement processes | |
“I think one of the biggest barriers is lack of understanding of who they are reaching out to and how to reach out to them. So this speaks volumes to the disparity in cultures of communities. There is this assumption of the norm and norm is a sliding scale. But whoever is in a position of power in any conversation gets to define the norm. For example, in this dialogue that you and I are having, you [are] looking for information from me. Inherently I hold the power to withhold the information that puts me in the position of power to then define the norm of what I will communicate. That will do a disservice to your need if I don’t acknowledge it. So whoever is on the forming end of the equation in defining how they do the outreach gets to define this norm. If those individuals inherently don’t have, for example anti-racism analysis; or don’t have an awareness of cultural and social diversity; or [don’t] have an intrinsic understanding of economic diversity; mobility, for example, they will not be able to effectively manage the outreach (PO3).”

So with our parks program, which is about to change, I have told my staff, well they are not my staff. [sic] My staff are amazing. But the Parks’ staff are traditional bureaucrats. They work from 9-5 and they go home. They are beautiful people but they work in the silo (P15).”

The first generation settlers have not been as effectively engaged in the process. And there is a reason. Because a lot of the historical stakeholders of that footprint aren’t from first generation settlers. They are first generation settlers but they have had a very long history on that footprint. They are not relatively new. So I am saying not under 10 years or certainly not under 5 years. [sic] That speaks to the norming, as to what was defined and how are the mechanisms of outreach. I think a key turning point that happens is when you have municipal and provincial and federal political leaders starting to engage in this process. You have in Markham and in Scarborough political leaders, who are self-identified as first generation settlers, taking the responsibility (PO3).”

“I think first generation immigrants are often underestimated in many ways, you know, many come with, like I said a lot of knowledge, a lot of insight, a lot of just intelligent people, and I mean like socially intelligent and academically intelligent, a lot, but we sort of narrowly look at people as immigrants. I think it take something away from them. So, you know, we don’t hear a lot essentially. I think there is a tendency let’s say across the field and maybe it’s the function of modern society and the ... society, ya reducing people to OK immigrant, immigrant, immigrant, so we had a lot of immigrant voices at our consultations. So that means you know we are successful in having a very diverse consultative process but really it’s all about who is doing the looking. And often times it’s from the perspective of the people who organize the event or the person who is writing the report, fair enough right? But you know, what does that perspective look like and I think people sort of look, not down upon you know, immigrants, first generation immigrants are often considered as having, not being capable, but it’s the fact that the system that renders them as quit incapable, right? So I think that shapes kind of that whole process to, [sic] of the kinds of questions you ask people and we expect and what we hear to (PO7).”

| Lack of understanding of who they are reaching out to and how to reach out to them | Whoever is in a position of power in any conversation gets to define the norm |
| Planners work in the silo | A lot of the historical stakeholders who define the mechanisms of outreach are not first generation settlers |
| First generation immigrants are often considered as not being capable | The system renders first generation immigrants as incapable |
| Limited understanding of immigrants |
“If we say you have to participate or you should participate or you should come out to a monthly meeting and you come every third Wednesday of the month and if you miss anything you are a bad person. It doesn’t fit everybody’s lifestyle now. You know, we don’t know what kind of jobs people are working. Maybe they are working night shifts. Maybe they have got kids at home. So prescribing very narrow ways to participate is a problem. Keeping it as wide open as possible, you’ll catch people and they will come back again and again because they know that there are different opportunities (PO6).”

“I don’t know if I have any easy answer for that because systems seem to be slow to change and especially with government and something as big as Parks Canada. It’s so old and entrenched in terms of structure that, I know they have been doing engagement and public consultation. I am somewhat sceptical to be quite honest of not this one case but in so many cases when they do public consultation. I don’t really know how much of an influence, like I think we actually need to be, we need to change our decision making model (PO4).”

“Prescribing very narrow ways to participate is a problem.”

“Community engagement has been mostly done based on traditional models. “Parks Canada is a 100 year old institution”

“First generation immigrants feel they don’t feel valued and welcome They fell they don’t fit in...”

“People feel they don’t fit in”

“First generation immigrants don’t feel valued and welcome They fell they don’t fit in...”

“First generation immigrants may be engaged at “one off activities” but they do not have a “transformative impact on the organization”

“Yes, generally community don’t [participate] partly because as I said earlier they feel more comfortable within their community [sic] by language, by culture experiences and also by habits as well too. And by the food [sic] fit with their taste as well too. So that’s, naturally they gravitate [sic] in more communicate within themselves. And secondly it’s not just the comfort zone in themselves but also they are not really welcome at all as well too. Some of them, few, when they go there if [sic] they don’t have the comfort zone they are not going to go back again. ... Yes, that’s why, they can go there and then sometimes maybe a misconception in a way misinterpreted but sometimes they don’t feel the things, that they are not being valued at all. Sometime they feel that they don’t really fit in, OK? Because [sic] it’s only one or two and then the other people you feel uncomfortable already unless you’re already recognized like myself. [sic] I can feel comfortable in doing that way and people recognize, I know them. But not everybody will be able to [sic] but and then when they go, if they feel that way, it filters back and then other people will feel the same, not even going there, not even gone they already have that misconception that won’t even bother want to do that way. They don’t want to be feeling that way, why should they do that (CL10).”

“I do feel as there is like, bit of ignorance there and, yes, OK, so some of those people have been fighting this fight for 30 years and they love to talk about it. Without any disrespect but they just honour this, like, old lady ... who is like 106 and did like 40 years of fighting for the Rouge la la la la. But it’s really, I looked at that and went like, this is your image that you put out there. Right? It’s very clear that, like, if somebody looks at this they are like, I don’t fit with this group, you know. I mean even though that group also works a lot with, you know, school groups to do the tree planting and this and that. But you know they probably could also tell by the staff, like most of the staff that I remember from the group were white, right? And you know, most of the activists they see at the meeting, that group has, are white. And so they have been challenged and I am sure they are totally under resourced, you know, but like I look at a group like that, that I have known for a very long time since I was in grad school, because of course they were coming
to my school and you look at their engagement with community and their profile and it hasn’t really changed that much. You know, they probably can count a lot more diverse, young, one time volunteers do this tree planting and so on, where they had a lot of local kids going. But in terms of people that have a transformative impact on the organization and that’s like, I guess where we want to see engagement of first generation immigrants, is like, is not like how diverse can my one off tree planting activity be, which is great because that’s a step up from none of these people in Malvern engage [with] the park, right? But like what is the impact that people have within their organization and its culture (PO8).”

“You know the environmental movement has largely been white and middle class in Canada and probably many other places, certainly in North America and Europe, and that just seems so limited because that doesn’t reflect the reality of the world or our country anymore. So it just doesn’t make sense. Do you know what I mean? Like if this is the land then you just take a chunk of people and that’s what you got that’s a representation of who lives here and has shared responsibilities and not just certain groups of people (PO4).”

...[a first generation active community member] went to one part of the three Rouge meetings but it would have been before the national park. [sic] There was about, like a Parks Trails master plan, those meetings and it was hosted in Markham. And I think he had a very, I think he was very fed up with the meeting because the meeting was very much about the environmentalists, and the species and those people taking up a lot of space and feeling entitled to take up a lot of space and not really think of was it really designed at all to incorporate people’s feedback, who do not have, like, environmental science degrees.... there is a lot of criticism about the environmental movement in North America being predominantly white. Right? And that we need to shift away from that predominantly white paradigm of environmental issues. When somebody comes up....well for sure if it’s about the environment,[sic] we’d like to see, or what I like to see from my personal perspective because I don’t think this really has anything to do with the project per se, is a bit broader , is that I’d like to see more people of color involved; more immigrant experiences; less kind of like silos in the environmental movement and the .... [sic]restoration people and anti-oil and gas industry and they are kind of like still that Greenpeace kind of image that’s kind of kept on since the 90s. You know the tree hugger, granola eating, grunge wearing, like hippy; postmodern hippy ... is at the forefront of the movement. We have to really adapt our..., the messaging behind that movement and the opportunities for people to contribute (PO8),

Most of the staff of environmental group organizations are white (related to traditional models)

“The environmental movement has largely been white and middle class”

There are Silos in the environmental movement
“So when I first started off, and again our demographic is changing, but the weakness of the environmental movement was that it was a 100% white European, period. I would go to the room and again usually older people, and some of it can be explained. People who are 22 years old like ..., they are busy going to parties and dancing and falling in love and doing all the things that 22 year olds have. So 22 year olds no matter what country they are from, are they all interested in public policy? Again in general, they are partying, falling in love. That’s what they are supposed to do. Playing squash; playing tennis; going in marathons. That’s sort of like an age (P15).”

“They are afraid; they are afraid of the wilderness; they are afraid of sleeping outdoor; they are afraid of looking stupid not knowing how to set things up; they are afraid of going to a national historic site because they feel like they don’t know enough history (P3)”.

“... someone who may not be from Canada may see this kind of space as either scary or, you know, a place where you shouldn’t be, or as a resource, you know, coming in and taking things to use in your own home as a benefit kind of thing (P13).”

<p>| Members of the immigrant community may have a different perception of wilderness. |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>Initial Coding</th>
<th>Focused Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“So coming to a new country and new culture, first of all many of them have language barriers … (CL9).”</td>
<td>Many newcomers have language barriers to express their opinions</td>
<td>It’s good to have a translator in meetings</td>
<td>Language barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It depends because I speak English but [sic] if someone else who doesn’t know English it’s good to have translator (CL1).”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Language barriers may result in difficulties in understanding what “community engagement” and “public” means</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think amongst immigrants, and I am not sure how one can fully conceptualize it, but my sense is that a lot of immigrants particularly those with linguistic barriers and particularly those immigrants, who come from countries that are socially and politically very different from Canada, there are a lot of difficulties understanding what community engagement is and also what public means for them and consultation (PO7).”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Translation is helpful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[sic] There are some people who just don’t try to engage them because they say, let me back track. I try to engage first generation immigrants, quite a bit. Because I have a lot of them in my community and I grew up with a lot of them and to be able to deliver my message to them, actually to be able to deliver my message to anybody I need to speak in their language. So if I am speaking to young people then I speak to them in their language which is more down to earth, street language. But if I am speaking to, you know, making a speech in the parliament I am not going to use street language. I am going to use more professional language and if I am making a presentation to Tamil seniors I am going to speak to them in Tamil. If I am trying to reach out to a Chinese community I am going to make sure that there is Chinese interpretation available and [sic] all of my community meetings that I have, that’s the first thing we do usually. It’s to find out what languages there are in the room and if there are any language barriers … because we have first generation immigrants, serious newcomers who have come into the country 5,6 weeks, who come to my community meetings and they want to learn what’s going on, they want to engage and you know if they speak mostly Mandarin and a few words of English they are not going to understand what is going on and then be disengaged and leave and never come back again (CL5).”</td>
<td>If people do not understand what is going on in the meetings they will leave and never come back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“If you were dealing with, let’s say Canadian born population I think people would find the language to express different opposing ideas. They might be framed very nicely but you can still bring those out, whereas maybe newcomers are not equipped with the nuances of the language or ways in which they might be able to communicate something that is perhaps, you know, that’s not going to be welcomed by other people or people may feel offended by that. So I found that to be a very insightful observation to see OK so I am not sure if that person facilitated the meeting even thought about that... I wouldn’t say that all Canadian born individuals can. I am just saying that in general, you know, there might be some differences and I think, you know, and it comes with cultivating and it comes with having a culture in which you do nurture a kind of wider community based discussion that is not so informal but not so formal too, where you can say OK, you know, let’s talk about the traffic issue here without attacking other individuals or on a personal level but let’s look at it sort of from that larger community perspective (PO7).”

Immigrants may not be equipped with the nuances of the language to express their opposing opinions properly

“I think this is one of the difficulties that you have, big organizations and they are all used to speak in this, using institutional formalities and if you can’t sort of fit into that then you are not listened to, you know, that’s not a very good way of going about things (PO7).”

If people are not used to communicate in the institutional language, they are not listened to

“[sic] Sometimes it’s not getting that information out correctly, not knowing whether they understand. But one thing I found out, you have to be careful about. Which is, I thought it was a help when I wanted to let people know something, I asked, I said you know we have people who might want to know this but they don’t know English. Can we have, I thought it was a good idea to have things in different languages. Well they were highly offended: you think we don’t speak English? It wasn’t for the people who spoke English. It was for the people who didn’t speak English. But the people who spoke the two languages or whatever, how many of that, they were kind of offended. So I thought well OK unless they ask me, maybe they get other people to interpret it. So you have to be careful. [sic] It may not be that they don’t want to be involved, it may not be they are not interested...Language is a barrier ... In all fairness, you should [provide information in other languages] but what I found, it is easier to do ... in my building I asked for a little space ... there is a space, where we have flyers dropped off, I put them there and that’s about what I do. I don’t try to get it translated anymore (CL7).”

Some members of the immigrant community may be offended if information is translated

“There is an old mythology that I have seen, saying well everything is in English. If you just translate it ... in Farsi or Hindu or Chinese or Spanish then people would come out. They don’t. I have done the dance. I am a city councillor for 10 years; I worked for a politician for 9 years in a heavily Chinese area. And it wasn’t, like right now we have a healthy mix of the whole world. There is not one dominant group and that’s probably a good thing but where I worked before, Agincourt, the dominant group was of Chinese-Hong Kong descent. So there is Hong Kong people and white people, and the rest of the united nations were scattered about but there were two groups. So all the white people would show up and there would be a meeting filled with white people in an area that has mostly Chinese people. Why aren’t the Chinese people here? And then one nice Chinese lady would raise her hand and say well most of the people here hardly speak English, which is not true. Most people come and do speak very good English.

“The language barrier has been a false excuse on both sides”
Even if it’s broken or has a thick accent they are very smart people so the old standby excuse that well if you spoke Tamil they would come. No. And the old excuse well, we have failed to reach out to this community because haven’t put our notice in Tamil and that’s why they are not coming. No. All of those people get telephone bills. You talk to any Tamil person in Scarborough about a cell phone. They will tell you everything in the world about their cell phone. In whatever language they want to speak, but let’s just assume English for a minute, they know everything about their cell phone. But cell phones’ stuff doesn’t come out in Tamil. It’s mostly English. Sometimes there is different languages that you can, you know, if you look on page four, oh there is my language. But people are smart they know what’s going on. So I wouldn’t use that as an excuse never to advertise in a Tamil newspaper or a Persian newspaper or in an African Canadian newspaper. You should be doing those things and I think the national park tries to outreach to that different medium. But the language barrier for me has been a false excuse, on both sides. People maybe, who don’t like one group for example they don’t come because they don’t speak English. That’s not true (P15).”

“I mean we don’t always need translators. Sometimes we have but sometimes we don’t. But people communicate fine. They really really do and if you are attuned to listening for the information, you get it and you can communicate, no problem ... People aren’t showing up because they don’t understand English. They are not showing up because they are busy (PO6).”

“People communicate fine if you are attuned to listening for the information” Language barrier is not the reason why first generation immigrants do not show up in meetings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>Initial Coding</th>
<th>Focused Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“In the funding world unfortunately often times there is a lot of competition for funding and in agencies they don’t know who has worked collaboratively across the sector because of that competition piece (PO5).”</td>
<td>Partner organizations compete over funding (results in less collaboration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sometimes we are asking people to facilitate that kind of input on top of all the other things that we are doing which doesn’t always work well. ... So there is a lot of resistance because a lot of these organizations are under-funded and don’t have a lot of resources and it’s difficult for them to leverage an additional project or responsibility on top of what they are already carrying (PO5).”</td>
<td>Community engagement becomes an additional project/responsibility on top of other activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So it’s sort of a new concept because across the city or across even the province or country you have a multiservice hub, every community has got a community center, you can go to dance program or some crafts but a community development lens in an approach like this doesn’t happen and that’s the time and resources that people won’t invest in. It’s hard to get funding. It’s easy to get project funding. If I want to run a dance program for the Roma community I could get 10000 dollars if I apply for a grant, run the program, program ends and we are done but this bridging, connecting, facilitating role, it’s very hard to fund and that’s where the learning happens and it’s disseminated in, and brought back together and disseminated again. right? And it’s an ongoing process but if there is nobody to do it, I don’t understand how it’s supposed to happen just organically. So a lot of communities lack that connector piece and it’s pure lack of investment from funders and donors because it’s not immediate result (PO6).”</td>
<td>It’s easy to get project funding but not community development funding because it does not have immediate result</td>
<td>Funders look for immediate result</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So that’s the requirement for receiving the funding. So if you don’t meet your targets, you know, even if you achieve 80% of the target funder is satisfied. It’s hard to achieve 100% target especially at this time when immigration has tightened quite a bit these days and more and more people are going to western part of the country as the result we are facing funding cuts here and government has a feeling that more and more people are going to the western part of the country but they, the government, they do not realize that there is a secondary immigration. People go there fast within 2 months or 3 months they come back here, but they don’t take that factor into consideration (CL9).”</td>
<td>Funding cuts in Ontario due to the perception that more immigrants are going to the west (not taking “secondary immigration” into account)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“When you are working you are so involved in all of things that you want to get done. Right? And there is a lot do. To plan and then you are doing your research, you are trying to do analysis. And so you are very much focused on your own work essentially. But I think one thing that we don’t do enough of, is learning how to listen and learning how to really understand what disengagement is and I say that because in the public sector and in the non profit sector for sure, you are very resources limited. I mean people-wise and you know, and there is something exiting about that too when you are working with those challenges, right? Because you are getting, you do manage to get a lot done with very few resources and there is something very rewarding about that. But you can really miss out on what’s happening as a result. And I think, you know, “OK, we did this we facilitated the meeting and we got this input” and you got all your notes and you try to measure how it went and oh yes we had a really good turn out and everybody had something to contribute. This was a success, right (PO7)?”

| More focus on process rather than content due to staff shortage and heavy work load |
| “one thing that we don’t do enough of is learning how to listen and learning how to really understand what disengagement is” |
| Community engagement feels like a factory line because the time is limited |
| Putting quantity over quality |

“If it’s just OK tell me what you think and then you know like a factory line, and often times we felt that way because our time is so limited. OK you know, we have to get this done, we have t make sure we get this answered and this paper signed and if you do it over and over again then it does feel a bit like that and it is a bit, I think degrading. And I wouldn’t, I am not sure how people really feel about the process...Ya, you know what? And I sympathise with that but that also said I have to say working on the non-profit sector, if you are trying to advocate in terms of getting more funding, more programming, or more resources for, like say, immigrant specific programs ten you are going to need that and I think it’s hard. it’s hard to say look this is kind of what we need to do to show the larger public that these resources are important and if people are feeling “well, you know, you are just comodifying me or am not really that meaningful to the process”, you know, it’s tricky (PO7).”

| Community engagement feels like a factory line because the time is limited |

“From the funders point of view also we have a target that every year we have to achieve. So we have to do aggressive outreach to reach our target. Each counsellor has to serve 700 clients per year. That’s a lot of clients .... Our counsellors spend 100 hours per month doing community outreach, each of them...They go on their own car, or by bus. Stopping at particular location in the community, distribute flyers in bookstores, libraries, schools, shopping centres, malls and try to contact, try to inform the community that here is an organization that is working for them, that can help. So people come after receiving those information... (CL9).”

| Funders set quantitative targets for partner/community organizations |

| Partner organizations need numbers for getting funding |

Ya, you know what? And I sympathise with that but that also said I have to say working on the non-profit sector, if you are trying to advocate in terms of getting more funding, more programming, or more resources for, like say, immigrant specific programs then you are going to need that and I think it’s hard. it’s hard to say look this is kind of what we need to do to show the larger public that these resources are important and if people are feeling “well, you know, you are just comodifying me or am not really that meaningful to the process”, you know, it’s tricky (PO7).
“Most people do have associations and organizations represent them. Again it’s not perfect representation but they are represented. I don’t think in my, again this is my 25 years now of trying to engage people to save the earth. I want every human being; I want every bum I can find in a seat because that’s how we win politically. Very hard to draw people from their very very busy lives (P15).”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Politicians win by numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

“There is a quota every year and funders also ask us to form partnerships with other organizations. And given the funding challenges that is coming every year there is no better way to deliver service without partnership. So partnership is very important. Of course there are problems between good partners and bad partners, big partners versus small partners. Big partners always try to impose their decisions on the small partners. It happens. But as long as there is an understanding and resource sharing. Some services we cannot offer here because of lack of space. I ask my partner if they can give us some time, or someday to deliver that kind of workshop at their places. That sort of thing we are doing (CL9).”

| Funding challenges and the need to meet quotas result in partnership between community organizations |