

Lost in translation: a framework for analysing complexity of co-production settings in relation to epistemic communities, language and culture.

Varvara Nikulina^{a,d,1}, Johan Lindal^b, Henrikke Baumann^c, David Simon^d, Henrik Ny^a

^aDepartment of Strategic Sustainable Development, Blekinge Institute of Technology, SE-37179 Karlskrona, Sweden

^bMistra Urban Futures Stockholm Node project (SNOD), OpenLab, Valhallavägen 79, SE-11427 Stockholm, Sweden

^cDepartment of Environmental Systems Analysis, Chalmers University of Technology, Vera Sandbergs allé 8, SE-41296 Gothenburg, Sweden

^dMistra Urban Futures, Chalmers University of Technology, SE-41296 Gothenburg, Sweden

Abstract

Planning in modern urban environments requires skills to address complexity in order to move towards sustainability. Co-production of knowledge in transdisciplinary groups was found to be a useful tool in such contexts. Using the concepts of multilingualism, epistemic communities and culture, the article proposed a conceptual framework for analysing complexity of co-production settings, as an indispensable means of managing complex challenges. The framework was evaluated based on inclusiveness, cross-sectoral understanding, applicability in different contexts and time perspectives. Moreover, it was compared to other studies. Based on the framework, several suggestions to maintain were put forth for a process leader (facilitator) when preparing for a co-production process: linguistic equality between participants, disciplinary integrity, a working culture of mutual respect, simultaneous mitigation and informed facilitation. Finally, the article suggested possible future research questions, related to development of the framework: identification of levels of complexity and mapping specific tools to address complexity at each level; integration of other factors of diversity, such as gender, age, as well as political and institutional contexts.

Keywords: transdisciplinary, multilingual, multicultural, epistemic communities, multi-stakeholder dialogue, urban planning

1. Introduction

The metaphor *'lost in translation'* here can be understood in three ways. It applies not only in literal terms – message being lost due to language constructions – but also for transdisciplinary spaces where the languages of different epistemic communities of practice (networks of experts that share a common knowledge-base”) (Haas, 1992) become a barrier. The third underlying angle of being *'lost in translation'* is the aspect of culture that cannot easily be depicted in words but still plays a

¹ Corresponding author.
E-mail address: varvara.nikulina@bth.se (V. Nikulina)

crucial role in interpersonal communication of co-production processes. These three aspects therefore also take part in shaping the experience of such processes.

1.1. Transdisciplinarity

Modern cities face the increasing complexity in relation to planning necessary to address to move towards sustainability. The present capacity of our society is inadequate to do so (Brown, 2008). This challenge is relevant for local, national and international contexts, meaning that policymakers are in ever greater need of expert knowledge to be able to make well-informed choices. Experts are now found in diverse areas within and outside of academia and their joint forces – here, co-production of knowledge in transdisciplinary groups (Polk & Kain, 2015) – are necessary to tackle such complex challenges. In Western tradition, specialised knowledge became a barrier for social learning necessary to address complexity (Brown, 2008). This also affected non-Western countries whose local knowledge became inaccessible. In transdisciplinary teams, challenges of knowledge diversity are accelerated for a number of reasons such as different contexts within and between regions of the world; less shared epistemological understanding or theory of knowledge (Creswell & Poth, 2018); power relations between diverse actors and societal sectors, and culture in terms of practice, traditions, values and norms (Simon, Palmer, Riise, Smit, & Valencia, 2018). The challenges of unequal dispositions and power relations in co-producing knowledge are evident and need to be managed if the outcomes are to match the purpose of combining diverse expertise. As a starting point, one discipline must not be favoured over another (Pohl et al., 2010).

The level of complexity in transdisciplinary planning is severely increased when language barriers are present. Still, English is generally used as the everyday language as if virtually unproblematic, although it is certainly acknowledged that language is intimately linked to relations of power. This challenge has recently been highlighted by the German linguist Tilo Weber as a major obstacle for equal participation in transdisciplinary processes (Weber, 2018).

1.2. Multilingualism

Multilingualism is a widespread phenomenon in many contemporary states and urban areas. Canada, for example, has a long experience of mitigating the linguistic differences between French and English speaking citizens (Sullivan 2004, p. 991). Sweden also has five official minority languages, Finnish, Jiddisch, Romani, Meänkieli and Sámi, each with its own historical legacy and legislative protection as well as some guaranteed administrative support to its speakers (Sundberg, 2013). Kenya has two official languages – English and Swahili, however there are many local languages and dialects, and even within the same city it is difficult to facilitate a dialogue (Nikulina, Baumann, Simon, & Sprei, 2018). One can also find many other examples of such contexts around the world.

Today, the need for multilingual dialogue is greater than ever. Different linguistic communities within the same region or stakeholders from regions in different countries need to co-operate in order to tackle complex societal problems, the UN and the EU being major examples of a much wider and everyday-based development. For example, the Sustainable Development Goals² invite

² See: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org>

nations to collaborate in addressing a number of challenges formulated as goals. The challenges and possibilities of multilingual dialogue are essential elements in an era of globalization, multicultural societies and linguistic pluralism. Multilingualism is influenced and challenged by a still widespread universalist ideology of one common language (or *lingua franca*) claiming *lingua franca* as a prerequisite for maintaining vivid democratic dialogue (Lüdi 2015, p. 214). This is accompanied by increasing provincialism and nationalism throughout the world while the need for co-producing solutions to complex societal challenges within and across nation-borders is evident.

Georges Ludi (2015, p. 215) says:

“The steady increase in the numbers of migrants, expatriates, exchange of scientists, etc. and the globalisation of communication through electronic media entail many forms of social multilingualism at the workplace, i.e. people with very different linguistic and cultural background are brought to work together in mixed teams”.

Taking into account the challenges described above, solving issues across different scales will require both local and general expertise, which entails encountering both linguistic and epistemic differences (Haas 1992, pp. 12-13).

1.3. *Culture*

Working in a shared space of co-production in multi-stakeholder transdisciplinary group can lead to a culture shock: entering a group different from yourself (Leslie and Storey 2003, pp. 122-127), where, based on personal and working culture, a new group culture should emerge in the process. While personal culture is often subdued, working culture can become a barrier, for example, when certain stakeholders are not used to participatory approaches and feel uncomfortable openly sharing their opinions and thoughts. Cultural awareness both on a personal and on working level becomes another condition for creating an inclusive environment for the participants in the dialogue (Brouwer, Woodhill, Hemmati, Verhoosel, & van Vugt, 2016; Simon, McGregor, Nsiah-Gyabaah, & Thompson, 2003).

Being part of the same epistemic communities is argued to support such a dialogue through a shared systemic view of the challenge, enabling the identification of local needs, the framing of debate and negotiation, and, finally, the identification of suitable solutions and policies (Simon et al., 2003). These researchers also claim that local context plays a key role in co-production processes as even within the same epistemic community, challenges may arise.

1.4. *Aim and target audience*

These three concepts, multilingualism, transdisciplinarity and cultures are not novelties and they are separately used by different epistemic communities. Based on the literature review, we could not find effective frameworks that support the process of simultaneously managing these concepts. This risks creating major obstacles for bringing matters forward in some of the most complex and pressing contemporary and future problems and creating well-informed decisions. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to present a framework for analysing complexity of co-production settings in relation to epistemic communities, language and culture.

The paper is mainly intended for facilitators, itself a diverse and ambiguous group (Mackewn, 2008). Facilitators here refer to professionals taking on the role of guiding diverse working groups, such as the cases of multicultural, multilingual transdisciplinary urban planning groups observed here. Providing facilitators with developed frameworks for such settings enables them to exercise their role and skills in a more productive way.

2. Methodology

In order to improve the ways for dealing with the challenges of understanding each other in co-production settings, a multidimensional framework that enables the analysis of translational, epistemic and cultural problems was developed.

2.1. *Framework development*

In order to develop a framework, we did a literature review of three areas: epistemic communities, language and culture, which was later synthesised. The results are outlined in the section 3.

2.2. *Application of the framework*

The developed framework was tested in three geographical locations across the South Baltic area. There, multi-stakeholder workshops for sustainable public transport were observed (see section 4 for more details) and followed by four interviews with the local table leaders (people who were managing small group discussions, often in their mother tongue). The list of interviewees can be found in the Table 1 (see Appendix).

Observation enables systematic documentation of events in a chosen context (Agar, 1996; Scheyvens, 2014). It creates a “textual picture” of the situation. For this specific study, the *observer as participant* stance was selected (Kawulich, 2005). It means that the observer can take part in the event, but priority in the process is given to the observation. During the workshops described below, the role of observer was combined with the role of facilitator. The limitations of this approach can be seen in researcher bias (Kawulich, 2005). As suggested in the literature, the reflexivity approach (May & Perry, 2017) was used to reflect upon the observations. Moreover, a set of short interviews was conducted shortly after the events.

For the purpose of this study, semi-structured interviews were used (Agar, 1996; Flowerdew & Martin, 2005; Mikkelsen, 2005). In the qualitative interviews with the facilitators of small group discussions (table leaders), the main themes were predetermined, whereas specific questions were raised in the process. The advantage of this approach was that an interviewee could lead the discussion and reveal information that might not have been foreseen by the interviewer.

2.3. *Evaluation of the framework*

The framework was then evaluated in relation to inclusiveness of co-production processes, cross-sectoral understanding, applicability in different contexts and time perspective, which constitute some of the main aspects of the co-production approach (see section 5.1).

3. Framework development

The framework that is proposed below is based on previous research and takes its origins in the literature related to epistemic communities, multilingualism and culture. These concepts are therefore described below.

3.1. Epistemic communities

Epistemic communities (Haas, 1992), or *thought collectives* (Fleck, Trepp, Merton, & Bradley, 1979), are to be understood as groups with shared and agreed forms of knowledge, *thought styles*, differing from or even fundamentally opposing those of other groups. Examples are engineers vis-à-vis social scientists in academia and public servants vis-à-vis entrepreneurs in other societal sectors. Due to various contextual, historical and contemporary reasons, these groups share specific knowledge often difficult to integrate into other fields. When successfully integrated, however, co-production of knowledge through collaborating thought collectives provides a more balanced understanding of a specific complex problem and its solutions, while also enabling more integrated research (Baumann, 2009; Haas, 1992; Pohl et al., 2010).

Even within the same epistemic community, challenges may arise and change according to local context (Simon et al., 2018). No single thought style is able to derive the same results and knowledge everywhere, especially from a global perspective, as stated by James Esson and his colleagues (2016, p. 40) in a study of Accra's mobility systems:

"The overarching argument that emerges from bringing a holistic approach that combines transport, mobility and livelihoods into conversation with the empirical findings is that conceptual frameworks such as the new mobility paradigm derived entirely based on conditions in the global North, are inherently limited, despite their implicit claims of global relevance".

3.2. Language

Sue Wright (2011) has argued for a *lingua franca* – that is English – in order to promote equal opportunity to evaluate information and make judgements and decisions in a European democratic context. This is based on a monolingual ideology with its roots in 16th century Europe, reaching its breakthrough during the late 18th century revolutions and Enlightenment (Lüdi 2015, p. 214). According to this ideology, communicative problems are to be mitigated through the use of one single language, whereas multilingualism is problematic and undesirable.

There are several reasons why this attempt at a solution is deceptive. Language acquisition is not merely a matter of a teaching and learning effort, but it is affected by ideologies, social identities, power and agency. In a socially and economically unjust urban environment, policing a diverse population to communicate using the same second language becomes, at best, a privilege reserved for the most prosperous communities. As Peter De Costa and Bonny Norton (2017) conclude: "Language learning is situated and attentionally and socially gated". In addition, multilingual individuals experience obvious benefits that are particularly valuable to knowledge production, such as enhanced cognitive functions and a higher likeliness of gaining new and creative insights (Yanaprasart & Lüdi, 2017).

Multilingual inequalities and its effects concern questions of recognition, identity, and, ultimately, morality. In the scientific tradition emanating from German philosopher George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1977 [1807], pp. 113-114), recognition is either mutual – and therefore equal – or non-mutual and therefore unequal. An individual's lack of recognition with regard to their identity is considered a form of oppression or negation of the self's expected rights (Honneth 1992, p. 190). Due to a historical paradigm shift of class or estate partly losing its significance in favour of other foundations for social identity, such as ethnicity, gender and sexuality, language is today considered more intimately connected to recognition than before (Taylor 1994, pp. 31-32; 53-55). Not being equally recognized as a speaker means not being fully recognized as a conscious being.

A significant share of studies on multilingualism has been conducted in the educational sphere. Some findings state that in multilingual regions, such as Barcelona and Switzerland, enabling the use of multiple languages in education is not only possible but also adds value to students. Universities in both regions use innovative ways of teaching, team work and interaction – such as communicative applications and instant translation tools – required to make multilingualism productive and feasible in an organisational environment (Yanaprasart & Lüdi, 2017). In the case of the private and public transnational trade sector, Amy Artelt and Judith Sawaf (2013) observe a vast range of auxiliary devices supporting various European partners in successfully conducting multilingual operations.

One of the tools aiding multilingual dialogue is interpretation. The challenges of interpretation are well documented. First, naturally, the extra time spent on interpretation is roughly double that of a 'normal' dialogue. Second, data loss, for example, when data showing essential sociological variables – such as dialects and sociolects – are being translated into a standard version of the language being interpreted. Third, using a non-professional interpreter from the local area or a particular ethnic group during field work can often result in the researcher staying unsure of whether they have thoroughly understood the purpose of their research or if there has been a misunderstanding. Fourth, the nuances of irony, humour, rhetoric and politically ambiguous concepts all run a severe risk of being lost in translation (Bujra 2011, pp. 5-6). Finally, the perception of time could be a challenge. Indo-European languages have past, present and future tenses (with some variations), whereas many other language groups do not. This aspect can be easily lost in translation. Another side of the coin is '*economic time*' vs '*social time*', often creating misunderstandings in the development of co-operations (Mikkelsen 2005, p. 329).

3.2. *Culture*

Culture in terms of working and personal culture, for example traditions, procedures and perspectives, has large implications for the interrelations and interactions between the collective and the individual. An individual's behaviour is often dramatically affected by the working group and workplace they are a part of or interacting with due to institutionalized cultural practices associated with that place and group. However, individuals themselves are also capable of affecting workplace culture to a certain extent, since they carry with them personal attributes, of which some are in turn affected by outside norms and identities such as gender (Somerville, 2005).

There is no one answer to questions of whether increased diversity between individuals is beneficial or restraining to working cultures. Indeed, there exist certain benefits of linguistic and/or ethnic

homogeneity in work teams such as reduced misunderstandings and increased consensus and efficiency, whereas mixed teams can contribute to stress and anxiety. Simultaneously, known positive outcomes of mixed teams include reduced prejudice (Offermann, Matos, & Basu DeGraaf, 2014). In any case, many parts of today’s workforce are becoming increasingly diverse by design or by default, partly as a necessity and partly as a deliberate attempt at tackling challenges of discrimination. In the end, the main issue is therefore not to define whether diversity is beneficial, but rather how to optimize management of an urban environment of ineluctable linguistic diversity and its consequent communication challenges (Yanaprasart & Lüdi, 2017).

As experience from an international project between researchers and practitioners from Ghana and the UK shows, there is a need for reassessment in addressing multiple or conflicting world views even within the same epistemic community in order to help support intended beneficiaries of such projects to meet their needs and fulfil aspirations (Simon et al., 2003). Patchareerat Yanaprasart and Georges Lüdi (2017) conclude that, in the case of academia, little is yet known about how to practically manage diversity challenges in general, as the objectives in diversity policies are mainly set at a strategic level, such as to favour gender mainstreaming. Managing linguistic diversity is not expected to be an exception from the rule and could therefore be considered a blind spot for academic institutions.

3.3. *Framework for analysing complexity of co-production settings in relation to epistemic communities, language and culture*

Based on the literature review, we suggest the following visualisation of the framework (Figure 1).




Figure 1. *Conceptual framework for analysing the complexity of transdisciplinary co-production settings in relation to epistemic communities, language and culture.*

The edges of the triangles on each base of the prism represent three parameters that define transdisciplinary co-production groups. These include the epistemic community that participants more or less belong to (see more in section 3.1), the language(s) they speak to a varying degree (see section 3.2) and the culture they more or less share (see section 3.2).

Epistemic community is here differentiated on the personal level (see the edge named ‘individual’) – which school of thought each individual group member belongs to – and the epistemic community of the group as a whole (see the edge named ‘group’). The level of diversity could be different too: for example, a transdisciplinary group in the co-production process could be looking at transport planning (edge ‘group’, low diversity) and have academics and practitioners working with this issue from different angles (edge ‘individual’, high diversity), compared to a group consisting of urban planners, where participants may well stem from various departments (edge ‘group’, high diversity) but share a similar education, working culture and perspective (edge ‘individual’, low diversity), and thereby end up looking at the same issue from the same or adjacent angles.

Language is differentiated between individual and working (see the edges named ‘individual’ and ‘working’ respectively). If *lingua franca* is spoken, then on the ‘working’ edge it would be low diversity (everybody is sharing the same working language). If there are several languages used as working languages (there is no common language in the group), the level of diversity of working languages would be high and the more different working languages is spoken, the higher diversity would be. Level of diversity on the edge ‘individual’ would depend on the amount of mother tongues present in the group: if there are, for example, just two languages, it would be a low diversity; if participants of co-production processes, for example, speak six different languages as a mother tongue, the level of diversity would be high on the ‘individual’ edge.

Cultural differences within the group and at work (‘group’ and ‘working’ edges respectively) add up to the complexity that a co-production facilitator could be facing. Participants of co-production processes could have different working cultures, for example, in one culture to address senior colleagues with the title and last name (e.g. Dr. Lane) and in another culture with the first name (e.g. Marcus). The diversity on the ‘working’ edge would be higher depending on how many such differences can be identified. On the ‘group’ edge, culture would refer to a combination of personal ideas and customs reflected in a group. For example, the group culture would be of low diversity if all the participants of co-production process would be coming from the same country, female, vegan and share the same interests, among other aspects; whereas the level of diversity would be high if the group was international, with different worldviews, all genders and diverse interests among other aspects.

The level of diversity of each parameter separately and together as a complex entity would define what one should be prepared for and further lead to the selection of suitable methodologies and tools to support it.

4. Empirical application and findings from the three selected locations

4.1. *Context of empirical studies*

The context of the empirical study is three workshops (WS) within the INTERCONNECT project³ an ongoing international project (2017-2020) that received a flagship status on the European level. The project aims to reduce car dependency in the South Baltic area by providing user-oriented sustainable public transport in and between the participating regions and cross-border commuting. There are nine main partners and 11 associated partners from the Blekinge region (Sweden), the Guldborgsund municipality (Denmark), the Rostock municipality (Germany), the Tricity metropolitan area (Gdansk, Gdynia, Sopot, Poland), the Klaipeda municipality (Lithuania), and the Viimsi municipality (Estonia). Within the project, three main areas are in focus – demand, supply and governance of public transport. One of the project working packages called “Evidence, knowledge and experience” aims to assist local stakeholders of the partner areas in identifying current and future needs of the passengers, to facilitate co-production of a vision for sustainable public transport in the region, to identify a selection of sustainable solutions in order to address current and future challenge and to create a pathway to achieve it.

Through a co-production process between Blekinge Institute of Technology (the hosting institution that provided the project with the team of facilitators) and Region Blekinge (the project manager)⁴ the format to support a working package with stakeholder workshops in focus was defined and agreed upon. It was based on a community planning process model (Robèrt, Borén, Ny, & Broman, 2017) which aims to define an approach to sustainable transport planning. Development of this model was guided by the Framework for Strategic Sustainable Development (Broman & Robèrt, 2017) with its backcasting from principles approach (Holmberg & Robèrt, 2000). The model is based on four interdependent planning perspectives: resource bases, surfaces, technology and governance.

To get a better understanding of the local context of three selected partner cities, Karlskrona (Sweden), Gdynia (Poland), and Klaipeda (Lithuania), local partners of the project were invited to a dialogue that was ongoing for several months before the workshops. Local stakeholders as well as international partners got an invitation to attend the event. The main language of the workshops was English, while in each location different interpretation services were implemented.

As mentioned by Barbara Kawulich (2005), an observer can be excluded from the process due to the language of certain epistemic communities to which the observer is unfamiliar. In all three workshops, an additional layer to the risk of exclusion was the lack of a common spoken language that all participants were fluent in. A facilitator understanding both Swedish and Polish was at hand in two of the three workshops that occurred in Sweden and Poland, respectively. This enabled not only observation of the process and participants’ behaviour, but also understanding of the content of the discussion. In the last workshop, taking place in Lithuania, however, interpretation of the content was achieved only through oral presentation of summaries during the day and written forms with the notes from the discussions that were translated into English. However, nuances

³ See <http://interconnect.one/>

⁴ For more details, see Thematic Report for the project (Borén & Ny, 2018).

related to language as metalanguage (expressing underlying meanings) (Agar, 1996) could have been 'lost in translation' in all workshops.

In the first workshop (WS1) in Karlskrona, in February 2018, there were 43 participants originating from different countries, speaking different first languages and representing diverse epistemic communities. Most of the participants were local stakeholders living and working in the Blekinge region, with the exception of those project partners living and working in Germany and Poland. There were representatives from academia, public and private sectors, all working with questions of transport from different angles. English was spoken as a *lingua franca* in the large group discussions and presentations. However, when it came to break-out sessions in small groups, Swedes preferred to speak Swedish if the group was linguistically homogeneous. This meant that multilingual table leaders were collecting information delivered orally in Swedish and documenting it on flipcharts (for later presentation) and other reporting forms in English. The experience seemed not to have affected the group dynamics much, although, as one of the table leaders said: "In the mixed group participants were a bit more hesitant to express themselves [than in the native language groups]" (Wälitalo, 2018). Despite the diversity of thought collectives, participants came to the same or very similar conclusions in regard to the future of transport in the region. Many of these participants had worked together in the past, which might help to explain their resembling ways of thinking.

In the second workshop (WS2) in Gdynia, in February 2018, there were 53 participants coming mainly from Poland, in particular from Pomerania, Warmia and Mazury, represented by stakeholders from the local government, municipalities, service providers, academia and other relevant institutions. Most of them spoke Polish and only some of them understood or spoke English. Moreover, there was one participant who spoke English and French, but not Polish. It was the first time that many of the participants met and worked together. For the duration of the workshop, an interpreter was hired who performed simultaneous (whisper) translation in smaller groups and consecutive interpretation for the entire audience. Simultaneous interpretation saved a lot of time; however, it was often a summary of what had been said. Consecutive interpretation doubled the time of the sessions, at the same time delivering interpretation paragraph after paragraph, which created the additional challenge of keeping the attention of the audience.

From the working culture perspective, workshops are not commonly used in Poland to facilitate multi-stakeholder dialogue. In order to attract participants, local organisers decided to change the title of the event from 'workshop' to 'seminar', which could be seen as misleading. During the event itself, participants were visibly uncomfortable with the format: they were unwilling to express their opinions during the sessions or ask questions at the presentations; when the question for discussion was not perceived as important for them, the session went very quickly, as not many people wanted to participate actively. Some of them left at different stages throughout the day. However, the questions of direct relevance that were identified as 'burning issues' (challenges they are facing right now at work) created very lively discussions, expressing different, sometimes contrasting opinions (Kuik, 2018; Wolniarska-Roszak, 2018).

In the third workshop (WS3) in Klaipeda, in March 2018, there were 17 participants representing the Klaipeda region. They were all either working for the municipality or for the city authorities. Most of them spoke Lithuanian and some spoke and/or understood English. As a solution to the

multilingual challenge here, simultaneous translation through headphones was provided. Although it seemed like an optimal solution for saving time and providing sufficient interpretation, some words got lost in translation, for example, ‘accessibility’⁵ in Lithuanian was translated as ‘prieinamumas’ and back into English as ‘reachability’⁶. These two terms can have different definitions and underlying assumptions and can therefore not be assumed to be used interchangeably. Moreover, in the process of simultaneous translation it was difficult to monitor whether the intonations were kept to underline certain statements. As culture and background of the participants were if not the same, but very similar, the discussions were calm, and conclusions corresponded to one another (Valadka, 2018).

4.2. Testing of the framework in three geographical locations

Based on the empirical study, we can place our workshops within our suggested framework as follows (Figure 2):




Figure 2. Conceptual framework for analysing complexity of co-production settings in relation to epistemic communities, language and culture tested in the selected workshop (WS) locations.

Workshop 1 (WS1) involved several epistemic communities (medium diversity on the ‘individual’ edge), but most of them were working with questions of transport (meaning that the ‘group’ edge

⁵ “Accessibility is the ability of people to reach goods or services as measured by their availability in terms of physical space, affordability and appropriateness. But accessibility also refers to the provision of services and facilities, job opportunities, education and housing, as well as the means of reaching them” (Simon, 2016; Waters, 2016).

⁶ According to Oxford Dictionary, reachable means “able to be reached; accessible or achievable”, as well as “able to be contacted”, purely in terms of being able to reach something: “a lush tropical island only reachable by seaplane” or “make sure that you set goals that are reachable” (‘reachable | Definition of reachable in English by Oxford Dictionaries’, n.d.).

was of a medium diversity). Participants spoke several languages (a bit higher than medium diversity on the ‘individual’ edge), including the *lingua franca* (a bit lower than medium diversity on the ‘working’ edge). Personal culture was diverse (medium diversity on a ‘group’ edge), as participants originated from different cultures. However, with the exception of the partners from Germany and Poland, the rest were accustomed to Swedish working culture (relatively low diversity on ‘working’ edge). The workshop was designed to highlight the Swedish traditions of, for example, *fika* (coffee break) and celebration of *semla* day (the day of special pastry called *semla*, a cream-filled bun). Celebrating diversity and welcoming all the different thoughts and opinions was a way to reunite everyone in a traditional way and get to know each other better.

By contrast, Workshop two (WS2) was characterised by a high diversity of culture, thought collectives and languages. It was multilingual (with no common language, high diversity on ‘working’ and ‘individual’ edges), multicultural (representing different cultures and working in different contexts, high diversity on the ‘group’ and ‘working’ edges) and involved different epistemic communities as participants represented a wide range of stakeholders (high diversity on ‘individual’ and ‘group’ edges). Such a context was very demanding from the organisers’ side as they came with their own cultures, epistemic communities and languages. The size of the group created additional pressure of keeping the attention and motivation throughout the day.

The last workshop (WS3) was quite homogenous among participants (low diversity on ‘individual’, ‘group’ and ‘working’ edges in relation to epistemic communities, language and culture), but organisers came from very different contexts, which created a challenge in facilitating the day as the language barrier was the strongest obstacle. One cultural element that united them all was the International Women’s Day that was widely celebrated in the past, but only seldom nowadays. It was used as a starting point for the day to share a cultural tradition with all participants.

These three observations illustrate how epistemological, cultural and linguistic diversities intersect and interact in the shaping of a transdisciplinary multilingual urban planning dialogue. The diversity of epistemic communities was especially evident during the first and second workshops, when conversations were ongoing at the breaks, but these had quite different outcomes nonetheless. The co-production process at these workshops provided a good platform for knowledge co-creation, as diversity of epistemic communities in small discussion groups was encouraged (both on voluntary basis – participants were invited to create discussion groups with people they have never worked with before; and through planned distribution of participants based on their affiliation). The third workshop, however, does seem to indicate that linguistic and cultural diversities do not categorically endanger transdisciplinary group work when intentionally managed. However, the presence of ‘calm’ discussion and absence of differing conclusions and critique may equally so be viewed as a lack of co-production of knowledge, in which a certain degree of critique and conflicts can be beneficial (Brouwer et al., 2016; Perry & Atherton, 2017).

Discussions in all three workshops were facilitated by a common understanding of the issue, but this was dependent on efficient communication between participants. When language barriers emerged, common understanding decreased somewhat. The first workshop, on the other hand, maintained a *lingua franca* ideal of English while Swedish was being used as an informal majority language, apparently leading to some participants being less active. In that way the questions of recognition, identity and morality were addressed by the organisers for the formal part of the event.

However, in the breaks the participants were left without an interpreter, which means that networking and socialising was affected by it and the group naturally fell apart into those speaking one common language or *lingua franca*.

Furthermore, throughout all three workshops, cultural norms – such as the presence versus absence of workshops as part of the professional routine – contributed to challenging the degree to which discussion matters were treated. The professional cultural background was one of relative familiarity during the first and third workshops, whereas participants in the second workshop experienced a clash of both epistemic and cultural collective values while simultaneously facing the challenge of multilingualism. Participants of the third workshop had more in common epistemically, linguistically and culturally than those of the second.

4.3. *Additional findings from the framework application*

The starting point of this article was to investigate whether providing proper means for equal possibility of using one's language in multilingual dialogue should be considered essential although insufficient in the context of multicultural transdisciplinary urban planning groups. Furthermore, each particular context needs to be addressed beforehand on its own terms with regards to its diversity challenges. The three observed geographical locations experienced only small differences with regard to official content and purpose but were significantly affected by nuances in culture and multilingualism, on top of the aforementioned general challenges of epistemic diversity. All things considered, the workshops displayed a relative awareness and preparedness regarding multilingual challenges, but were less concerned with the sum of linguistic, epistemic and cultural clashes. As we see through the lens of the framework, multicultural, multilingual transdisciplinary groups require thorough preparation for co-production facilitation in order to address the topic of discussion and acknowledge diversity yet in a just way. It was found that the following elements should be taken into consideration to promote effective co-production:

Linguistic equality between participants. Participating actors, stakeholder groups and individuals need to be able to speak a language of their choosing, rather than a predetermined *lingua franca*. One language must not be favoured above others and participants must still be prepared to work together rather than in enclosed linguistic communities. This principle needs to be routinely reinforced and acknowledged, in order to secure the active participation of all stakeholders in mitigating a complex issue. Different types of interpretation can be at hand in this process, especially when moving towards a higher complexity, however the organisers need to weigh all the pros and cons of different forms of interpretation and be ready to compensate for risks.

Disciplinary integrity. The prerequisites for each participating discipline or profession need to be taken into account. Some may have less access to intellectual content than others, and others may have limited experience of practical problem-solving. Regardless, maintaining an equal ground for each discipline and profession to partake in group work, discussion and knowledge production is essential. This challenge may risk being overlooked in situations also facing linguistic diversity.

A working culture of mutual respect. Whereas participants hail from diverse normative conditions and traditions of working, that is working culture, it is essential that an additional culture of mutual respect needs to be fostered in a multicultural, multilingual and transdisciplinary group. This

requires both understanding and a certain level of attention paid to the background of various participants. Naturally, however, facilitators of workshops, meetings and other urban planning contexts have limited access to information regarding the background of the participants.

Simultaneous mitigation and informed facilitation. The main challenge is to combine and tackle the aspects of epistemic communities, language and culture during the same event or situation. This challenge needs to be mitigated by introducing awareness-raising models, as described in Figure 1. If facilitators are made aware of the complexity of group diversities when preparing for the event, the likeliness of them being able to manage such diversities is significantly increased.

5. Evaluation of the framework

5.1. Critical assessment

There are several aspects of co-production that we can assess the framework upon (Polk, 2015), such as inclusiveness, cross-sectoral understanding and applicability to different contexts. Additionally, we assess the framework from the time perspective.

The proposed framework accounts for potential differences in a transdisciplinary group to prepare process leaders (or facilitators) to conduct more inclusive workshops or meetings. Enabling every participant to express themselves and understand others fully empowers an individual to contribute to the process and confirms their recognition.

One could argue that there are other aspects that could be included into the framework. We are not suggesting that it is comprehensive as it would not increase its usefulness. Alternatively, we suggest that there could be supporting tools and methods that could go along with the framework to, for example, quantify the assessment of the situation that process leaders are concerned with and recommend concrete steps to change their process.

One of the underlying purposes of co-production is to increase the understanding between different sectors in a transdisciplinary context. Addressing complexity of transdisciplinary groups could lead to more inclusive processes and provide a platform for a more open and efficient sharing of knowledge and experiences. Of course, using this framework does not ultimately mean that a better understanding between the sectors will immediately occur. However, not addressing aspects discussed in the above framework might hinder mutual understanding substantially.

Finally, the aspect of time can be evaluated differently using this framework. On the one hand, *time is money*, and in a Western planning model (Mikkelsen, 2005) ‘economic time’ plays an important role in the planning of processes. We intend to do more within a shorter period of time: in other words, to be more efficient. In this case, an increase in complexity would require more time for preparation of the workshop or event and the workshop or event itself would last longer, for example, due to the chosen type of interpretation (see section 0). On the other hand, time can be seen as an asset in the process – the more time is put into dialogues (considering there is a well-prepared process and content), the greater are the chances for understanding the situation and each other’s perspectives and for avoiding segregation in the group. It is suggested by Britha Mikkelsen (2005) that in a Western tradition ‘social time’ has lost its value while this is not true for indigenous people, for example.

The framework developed in this article, based on the literature and empirical studies, is expected to be possible to use to assist in preparation for facilitation of many different kinds of dialogues, not only in transdisciplinary contexts of complex problem-solving. It could also be a potentially useful assessment framework for participatory processes in a wide range of contexts such as kindergartens, schools, governance and businesses in which diversities pose communicative challenges. The framework could perhaps also be used as a basis for the development of new and innovative communication tools, applications and strategies for facilitating groups encountering these diversities. We further believe that such a framework could be used as a complementary tool to a certain community planning process model (Robèrt et al., 2017), as a starting point for the planning of transdisciplinary co-production work on local, national and international levels.

5.2. *Comparison with other studies*

In our literature studies we have not been able to find a framework for the assessment of complexity in multilingual multicultural multi-stakeholder transdisciplinary environments. The identified publication that was the closest in relation to the context was written by Derek Armitage and colleagues (Armitage et al., 2011). There, they describe the challenges they have been facing during the co-production process – the role of power, the varying degree of shared understanding and the normative context. The role of power in their work was defined as the “willingness to recognise and accept existence of different systems of understanding and practices” (Armitage et al., 2011, p. 997). Compared to the aspects of our framework, it is somewhat similar to the combination of disciplinary integrity and a working culture of mutual respect (see section 4.3). In relation to that, Derek Armitage and his colleagues write about shared understanding in terms of acceptance of different schools of thought. We, on the other hand, view normative context – shared desire to use knowledge – as an embedded value of co-production and as more related to the content of the workshop or event rather than to the work with participants in its own.

Another study that our framework could be compared to is dealing with multilingualism in education. Emma Dafouz and Ute Smit suggest the ROAD-MAPPING framework with six relevant components (Dafouz & Smit, 2016, pp. 403-409): “Roles of English, Academic Disciplines, (language) Management, Agents, Practices and Processes and Internationalisation and Glocalisation⁷”. The authors address academic disciplines (closely related to epistemic communities in co-production processes) and language management (using similar concepts as we do) similarly to our approach, analysing the participants’ side of the process. Furthermore, they look at factors – agents, practices and context – that we view as external and that could be monitored but do not affect the complexity of transdisciplinary environments.

What is interesting to note, is that studies performed by two different groups of scholars, whose research is described in this section, and us, are attempting to increase inclusiveness in co-production processes. This underlines the importance of the work that we present in this article.

⁷ Glocalisation – “the practice of conducting business according to both local and global considerations” (‘glocalization | Definition of glocalization in English by Oxford Dictionaries’, n.d.; Robertson, 2014).

6. Concluding remarks and further work

In line with its purpose, this article has presented a framework for analysing complexity within urban planning by integrating three significant factors of contemporary diversity challenges: multilingualism, multiculturalism and varying epistemology. These three factors play major roles when present in dialogue and need to be approached to create the best conditions for moving forward with the issues that such dialogues are supposed to manage. The framework is aimed at the process leaders, mostly facilitators of workshops or co-production processes. It was found that, while being skilled in mitigating conflicting interests and ideas between participants, facilitators need further developed techniques for dealing with wider multiple challenges of diversity within groups.

Future studies on the subject also have the potential of further developing the here suggested framework by identifying levels of complexity and mapping specific tools to address complexity at each level, as well as by integrating other factors of diversity, such as gender, age, as well as political and institutional contexts.

Acknowledgements

We thank the INTERCONNECT project for giving an opportunity to discover and address the challenge, as well as to performing the empirical study. We are grateful to Mistra Urban Futures' Research School for supporting the development of the idea. We are thankful to interviewees for empirical data, and reviewers and colleagues at Blekinge Institute of Technology for constructive feedback.

Funding. This work was supported by the Researchers at Risk programme from MISTRA, the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Environmental Research; Blekinge Institute of Technology, Chalmers University of Technology and Mistra Urban Futures.

Appendix

Table 1. List of interviewees.

Name	Date	Location of the WS	Role in the WS
Lisa Wälitalo	March 18, 2018	Karlskrona, Sweden	Table leader
Anna Wolniarska-Rozak	March 26, 2018	Gdynia, Poland	Table leader
Rokas Valadka	May 28, 2018	Klaipeda, Lithuania	Table leader
Jarosław Kuik	May 31, 2018	Gdynia, Poland	Table leader

References

Agar, M. (1996). *The professional stranger: an informal introduction to ethnography* (2nd ed). San Diego: Academic Press.

- Armitage, D., Berkes, F., Dale, A., Kocho-Schellenberg, E., & Patton, E. (2011). Co-management and the co-production of knowledge: Learning to adapt in Canada's Arctic. *Global Environmental Change*, 21(3), 995–1004.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.04.006>
- Artelt, D., & Sawaf, H. (2013). Speech-Enabled Unified Communications: Overcoming the Multilingual Challenges of the European Market. In A. Neustein & J. A. Markowitz (Eds.), *Where Humans Meet Machines* (pp. 59–77). New York, NY: Springer New York.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-6934-6_4
- Baumann, H. (2009). Don't fence me in. In *The Social Embeddedness of Industrial Ecology*, Frank Boons & Jennifer Howard-Grenville (eds). Edward Elgar.
- Borén, S., & Ny, H. (2018). *Summary from activity 3.2: Workshops on sustainable paths for public transport* (No. Thematic report (WP 3.2)) (p. 33). Karlskrona: Blekinge Institute of Technology.
- Broman, G. I., & Robèrt, K.-H. (2017). A framework for strategic sustainable development. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 140, 17–31.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.10.121>
- Brouwer, H., Woodhill, J., Hemmati, M., Verhoosel, K., & van Vugt, S. (2016). *The MSP Guide: How to Design and Facilitate Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships*. Practical Action Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.3362/9781780446691>
- Brown, V. A. (2008). A Collective Social Learning Pattern. In *EuroPLoP* (Vol. 2008, pp. 1–14).
- Bujra, J. (2011). Lost in Translation? the Use of Interpreters in Fieldwork. In Vandana Desai & Robert B Potter (eds.): *Doing Development Research* (pp. 172–179). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches* (4th edition, international student edition). Los Angeles London New Dehli Singapore Washington DC Melbourne: SAGE.
- Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2016). Towards a Dynamic Conceptual Framework for English-Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(3), 397–415. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu034>
- De Costa, P. I., & Norton, B. (2017). Introduction: Identity, Transdisciplinarity, and the Good Language Teacher: Introduction: Identity, Transdisciplinarity, and the Good Language Teacher. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(S1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12368>
- Esson, J., Gough, K. V., Simon, D., Amankwaa, E. F., Ninot, O., & Yankson, P. W. K. (2016). Livelihoods in motion: Linking transport, mobility and income-generating activities. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 54, 34–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2016.04.008>
- Fleck, L., Trenn, T. J., Merton, R. K., & Bradley, F. (1979). *Genesis and development of a scientific fact* (Repr. 11. Aufl). Chicago [u.a]: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Flowerdew, R., & Martin, D. (Eds.). (2005). *Methods in human geography: a guide for students doing a research project* (2nd ed). Harlow, England ; New York: Prentice Hall.
- glocalization | Definition of glocalization in English by Oxford Dictionaries. (n.d.). Retrieved 22 October 2018, from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/glocalization>
- Haas, P. M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination. *International Organization*, 46(1), 1–35.
- Hegel, G. F. W. (1977). Lordship and Bondage. In *The Phenomenology of Spirit* (translated by A.W. Miller) (pp. 111–119). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Holmberg, J., & Robèrt, K.-H. (2000). Backcasting from non-overlapping sustainability principles—a framework for strategic planning. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*, 7(4), 291–308.
- Honneth, A. (1992). Integrity and Disrespect: Principles of a Conception of Morality Based on the Theory of Recognition. *Political Theory*, 20(2), 187–201.
- Kawulich, B. B. (2005). Participant Observation as a Data Collection Method, 6(2), 28.
- Kuik, J. (2018, May 31). Table leaders facilitation.
- Leslie, H., & Storey, D. (2003). Entering the field. In *Development Fieldwork edited by Scheyvens and Storey* (pp. 119–138). 6 Bonhill Street, London England EC2A 4PU United Kingdom: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Lüdi, G. (2015). Monolingualism and multilingualism in the construction and dissemination of scientific knowledge. In *Jessner, Ulrike & Kramsch, Claire J. (eds.): The Multilingual Challenge: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives.* (pp. 213–238). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Mackewn, J. (2008). Facilitation as Action Research in the Moment. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury, *The SAGE Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 615–628). 1 Oliver’s Yard, 55 City Road, London England EC1Y 1SP United Kingdom: SAGE Publications Ltd.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848607934.n54>
- May, T., & Perry, B. (2017). *Reflexivity: The Essential Guide* (1st edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Mikkelsen, B. (2005). *Methods for development work and research: a new guide for practitioners* (2nd ed). New Delhi ; Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications.
- Nikulina, V., Baumann, H., Simon, D., & Sprei, F. (2018). Sustainable Transport Futures: Analysis of the Selected Methodologies Supporting the Planning Process Towards

Achieving Goal 11 Sustainable Cities and Communities. In *Handbook of Sustainability Science and Research* (pp. 473–488).

Offermann, L., Matos, K., & Basu DeGraaf, S. (2014). ¿Están hablando de mí?: Challenges for multilingual organizations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(6), 644–660.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-10-2012-0315>

Perry, B., & Atherton, M. (2017). Beyond critique: the value of co-production in realising just cities? *Local Environment*, 22(sup1), 36–51.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2017.1297389>

Pohl, C., Rist, S., Zimmermann, A., Fry, P., Gurung, G. S., Schneider, F., ... Wiesmann, U. (2010). Researchers' roles in knowledge co-production: experience from sustainability research in Kenya, Switzerland, Bolivia and Nepal. *Science and Public Policy*, 37(4), 267–281. <https://doi.org/10.3152/030234210X496628>

Polk, M. (2015). Transdisciplinary co-production: Designing and testing a transdisciplinary research framework for societal problem solving. *Futures*, 65, 110–122.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2014.11.001>

Polk, M., & Kain, J.-H. (2015). Co-producing knowledge for sustainable urban futures. In *Co-producing knowledge for sustainable cities: joining forces for change* (pp. 1–22).

Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY: Routledge.

reachable | Definition of reachable in English by Oxford Dictionaries. (n.d.). Retrieved 19 October 2018, from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/reachable>

Robèrt, K.-H., Borén, S., Ny, H., & Broman, G. (2017). A strategic approach to sustainable transport system development - Part 1: attempting a generic community planning process model. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 140, 53–61.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.054>

- Robertson, R. (2014). Globalisation or glocalisation? *Globalizations*, 11(4), 447–459.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2014.951203>
- Scheyvens, R. (Ed.). (2014). *Development fieldwork: a practical guide* (2nd edition). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Simon, D. (Ed.). (2016). *Rethinking sustainable cities: accessible, green and fair*. Policy Press.
- Simon, D., McGregor, D., Nsiah-Gyabaah, K., & Thompson, D. (2003). Poverty elimination, North-South research collaboration, and the politics of participatory development. *Development in Practice*, 13(1), 40–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0961452022000037973>
- Simon, D., Palmer, H., Riise, J., Smit, W., & Valencia, S. (2018). The challenges of transdisciplinary knowledge production: from unilocal to comparative research. *Environment and Urbanization*, 095624781878717.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247818787177>
- Somerville, M. (2005). 'Working' culture: exploring notions of workplace culture and learning at work. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 13(1), 5–26.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14681360500200212>
- Sullivan, R. (2004). The Challenges of Interpreting Multilingual, Multijural Legislation, 29(3), 985–1066.
- Sundberg, G. (2013). Language Policy and Multilingual Identity in Sweden Through the Lens of Generation Y. *Scandinavian Studies*, 85(2), 205.
<https://doi.org/10.5406/scanstud.85.2.0205>
- Taylor, C. (1994). The Politics of Recognition. In *Taylor, Charles & Appiah, Anthony (eds.): Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition. Edited and Introduced by Amy Gutmann* (pp. 25–73). Princeton: N.J.: Princeton University Press.

- Valadka, R. (2018, May 28). Table leaders facilitation.
- Wälitalo, L. (2018, March 20). Multilingual group facilitation.
- Waters, J. (2016). Accessible cities: from urban density to multidimensional accessibility. In *Rethinking sustainable cities: accessible, green and fair* (pp. 11–60). Policy Press.
- Weber, T. (2018, October 2). Language matters in transdisciplinarity. Retrieved 4 October 2018, from <https://i2insights.org/2018/10/02/language-matters/>
- Wolniarska-Roszak, A. (2018, March 26). Table leaders facilitation.
- Wright, S. (2011). Democracy, communities of communication and the European Union. In *Linguistic diversity and European democracy*. Adamo, S. & Kjaer, A. (eds.) (pp. 35–56). Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Yanaprasart, P., & Lüdi, G. (2017). Diversity and multilingual challenges in academic settings. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1308311>