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Abstract

In 2004, a Supreme Court of Canada ruling established that the Crown has a duty to consult and accommodate when there is knowledge that land use proposals may impact Indigenous rights. In 2015, the Canadian federal government’s Truth and Reconciliation Committee [TRC] published a report that deviated from past practices by recommending the creation of working relationships with Indigenous peoples that recognizes the need for reconciliation, by honouring Indigenous knowledge, by displaying “intercultural understanding, and by demonstrating empathy, and mutual respect” (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada [TRC], 2015, 63, iii).

Canadian industry, provincial and federal governments recognize that authentic engagement with Indigenous peoples is required, but local governments often face difficulties in enacting effective land use negotiations. The purpose of this interpretivist, phenomenological study is to use appreciative interviewing to draw knowledge from the experiences of six participants previously involved with successes in land use consultation with local governments to identify the elements that contributed to success to answer the research question and sub-questions. A thematic analysis of their stories yields a model of “the consultation journey” that sets out factors to guide the design and protocols for future land consultations.
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Introduction

Background

A Supreme Court of Canada ruling in 2004 established that the Crown has a duty to consult and accommodate when there is knowledge that land use proposals may impact Indigenous rights (Fraser & Viswanathan, 2013; Peach, 2016; Imai & Stacey, 2014). Indeed, the courts continue to uphold the duty to consult, to the point where they have recognized Indigenous claims to ownership of their traditional territories, as in the recent 2014 Tsilhqot’in case. Canadian industry and governments recognize that authentic engagement with Indigenous peoples is required, but the difficulties local governments face in enacting effective land use negotiations indicate that further academic study is needed on how to effectively conduct consultations regarding land use at the local government level (Williams, Penrose, & Hawkes, 1998).

I am a white woman born in North York, Ontario. My interest in this topic started with my visit at age 9 to my godparents in Chisasibi, Quebec in Cree territory, which was not accessible by road, at the time. It was the first time I had been to an Indigenous community. Later as a teenager and adult, working with Indigenous communities in northern Ontario through the Junior Ranger program and taking Indigenous courses at Lakehead University in Thunder Bay, Ontario, I felt that Canada did not have a healthy relationship with the Indigenous people with whom we shared the land. I was shocked to discover much later, that during my time at Lakehead University learning about residential schools, there had still been one open in Canada—at the time, I had thought I was learning about past injustices. As I moved west across Canada, my anecdotal experiences and the documentation released from the Canadian
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government and other sources of displaced/relocated northern Indigenous communities and the residential schools, it seemed apparent that the relationship between Canada and Indigenous peoples, seemed broken. This was later reinforced as I moved across Canada from Ontario and moved to British Columbia, becoming active in local government.

After attending university in Alberta, as a newly qualified high school teacher, I moved to the Village of Slocan in southeastern British Columbia in 2003. After encouragement from my neighbours, I ran in a by-election for the position of Councillor on the Village council. I was elected onto the Village of Slocan council in 2008, and during this experience as an elected representative for local government in rural British Columbia (BC) it became apparent there was a need for new consultation practices for rural local governments to engage in productive and respectful discussions with Indigenous peoples regarding land use. The Village of Slocan was seeking to construct a micro hydro project that involved construction on Crown and municipal lands. The requirements by the provincial government were vague and optional for the municipality, yet explicitly stated that the province held the legal obligation for consultation for this development proposal on Crown lands. The Village did not have any known relationship with the participating First Nation communities, nor did we know how to start a conversation, or with whom we should start the conversation. At that time, the provincial documents guiding development proposals on Crown lands suggested the Village send letters regarding the proposal, as the engagement process (the stage of the proposal was too early for development plans), providing any available supporting documents with information regarding the proposal to the eleven First Nation communities that could be affected by this project. To date, very little has changed in the process for local government development proposals on Crown land. This did not
seem to me to be an exemplary process for engagement with First Nations that was meaningful or respectful to the Indigenous peoples in whose traditional territory we lived, nor did it convey the intent I believed was a desire to develop positive and respectful neighbour-to-neighbour relationships. At the time, I recognized the limited resources and capacity of the Village of Slocan and the possibility of that also being the case for the First Nations communities involved. As a Council member and community leader, I believed there must be a more meaningful process for intercultural stakeholder engagement.

Before discussing the three recent historical events that continue to change the landscape of Canadian consultation regarding Indigenous peoples as stakeholders in land use decision-making, it needs to be noted that the term “stakeholder” is an academic, theoretical, and historical strategic management discussion unto itself (Freeman, 2010). The academic debate regarding the term “stakeholder” and possible historical or present controversy in the use or definition of the term are vast enough for a research paper unto itself (Freeman, 2010; O’Riordan & Fairbrass, 2014); however, this research recognizes the potential debate and offers findings with a model that transcends the term through an ethical, inclusive, and collaborative process that creates mutually beneficial outcomes for all parties involved in land use consultations. Therefore, for the purpose of this paper, stakeholder will be generally defined as a group or individual that has an interest (O’Riordan & Fairbrass, 2014) and “whose support is necessary for the continued” success (Freeman, 2010, p. 34) of the consultation and engagement process.

Calls for further research on stakeholder engagement with local governments and Indigenous peoples on issues of land use abound (Devin & Lane, 2014; McLeod, et al., 2015; Peach, 2016; Sloan, 2009; Tobin, French, & Hanlon, 2010), stemming from three recent
historical events that have further enshrined the requirement to address Indigenous interests in cases of land use negotiations. First, the 2014 Supreme Court of Canada’s Tsilhqot’in court case ruling just noted has recognized 1750 square kilometers (the largest to date due to the Tsilhqot’in people’s nomadic traditional culture) as traditional Tsilhqot’in territory, constituting the first acknowledgement by the Canadian courts of Indigenous title rights that extends beyond Indigenous rights to engage in traditional activities, such as, trapping and hunting (Gunn, 2014). Indigenous title extends legal rights of fee simple of ground surface and airspace, that also includes the right to: decide how the land will be used; occupancy and enjoyment of the land; economic benefits; and to pro-actively manage and use the land (Gunn, 2014). This has implications for consultation, insofar as the process now must abide by the rights accorded to the Indigenous side of land use negotiations, a consideration that was not formerly required. Second, in June 2015, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) released a report (Calls to Action) stating the need of all levels of Canadian government to change consultation practices and intercultural relationships with Indigenous peoples.

The TRC Calls to Action (2015) report states the need for the Canadian government to change historical practices by recognizing past mistakes and working together in an equal, respectful government-to-government relationship with Indigenous peoples. The TRC report also recommends action in creating different working relationships from the past with Indigenous peoples that should recognize the need for reconciliation, honour Indigenous knowledge, and display “intercultural understanding, empathy, and mutual respect” (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada [TRC], 2015, 63, iii). Finally, the TRC report refers to the third historical event, which the federal government recently announced. In May 2016, the federal government
announced it was in full support of the *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (*UNDRIP*), reaffirming a commitment to adopt and implement the document as a framework for reconciliation (Government of Canada, May 10, 2016a). The *UNDRIP* recognizes the need for effective mechanisms to respect Indigenous peoples’ cultural values, ethnic identities, and knowledge and ways of knowing, for equitable and sustainable environmental management and development (UN, 2007).

The lack of consistency between the TRC mandate to create collaborative consultation and the traditional colonial consultation structure creates challenges in establishing land use agreements that are respectful, and amenable to all stakeholders (Devin & Lane, 2014; McLeod, et al., 2015; Peach, 2016; Sloan, 2009; Tobin, French, & Hanlon, 2010). In addition, the *UNDRIP* omits mention of local governments in the statement for a nation-to-nation relationship with Indigenous peoples (Government of Canada, May 10, 2016). Therefore, at the level of local government, the new relationship and collaborative engagement for implementation of the *UNDRIP* will not be experienced, which could address the inconsistency between the TRC mandate and the traditional colonial consultation structures. Although there is a provincial guide for local governments (Guide, 2014), the exclusion of local governments from decision-making and relationship building demonstrates the need for more information regarding culturally aware consultation with local governments and Indigenous peoples. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to create a framework for consultation with local government and Indigenous peoples that reflects the findings of the Tsilhqot’in court case, the intent of UNDRIP, and the TRC report.
These three documents state clearly the need for a change in the relationship between Canadian governments and Indigenous peoples with legal decisions explicitly stating that there is no choice in the matter. Although the TRCs’ findings are not legally binding, they are supported by a legal decision made in 2004, before the Tsilhqot’in court case that requires all levels of government to reconsider how consultation is conducted, and to recognize that, in some cases, the consent of Indigenous communities is required, and can be legally withheld or withdrawn if the duty to consult is not adequately met. Currently, it is not well understood and it is unclear how the court’s ruling declaring title rights to the Tsilhqot’in Nation will influence future discussions and decisions regarding land use in Canada. Lawyer John Rowinski has argued that it is likely that the Supreme Court of Canada would find local governments accountable even if they do not have a legal obligation to consult (Fraser & Viswanathan, 2013).

Therefore, to avoid costly lawsuits and to achieve land use goals, it is important for local governments to have the capacity and practical resources to engage in a meaningful consultation process that honours Indigenous peoples in future land use planning and decision-making. To that end, this study explores the question of how rural local government in British Columbia can build on current legislative land consultation processes and engagement practices with Indigenous communities to create positive consultation outcomes. Additionally, there are two important sub-research questions: What elements need to be in place to ensure a well-designed, ethical consultation process? In particular, how can the stories of successful consultation between non-Indigenous and Indigenous community leaders be used to inform future consultation and engagement?
To answer the research questions, this study was conducted within the interpretive paradigm through a research design that is sensitive to power relations and the need for intercultural understanding. A key objective in the study was to understand how to conduct meaningful intercultural consultations amenable to both dominant and Indigenous worldviews while simultaneously demonstrating respect for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous communication protocols and ways of conducting business. An Appreciative Inquiry (AI) approach guided the data collection procedure seeking stories that illustrate the important elements of consultation when it is working well (Reed, 2011; Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stravos, 2008), to ensure that the meaning of “successful consultation” is defined individually by the participants during the interviews to accommodate differing cultural perspectives on the meaning of land and the meaning of consultation. Thematic analysis was then conducted on the personal narratives to arrive at a set of “design principles” for planning effective intercultural land use consultations at the municipal level.

As previously mentioned, colonial and Indigenous worldviews are significantly different, and Indigenous perspectives frequently are overshadowed by the dominant, non-Indigenous cultural perspective brought by governments to consultation contexts. As European settlers came to North America, they colonized Indigenous lands and imposed European knowledge and systems in the creation of Canadian government and society (Munroe, Borden, Orr, Toney, & Meader, 2013). Therefore, in recognition of these disparate worldviews and power relations, this study is grounded in an overarching, phenomenological theoretical underpinning of “ethical space”.
One of the most respected and well-known frameworks for engagement with two societies with disparate worldviews is Cree ethicist Willie Ermine’s (2007) concept of the “ethical space” of engagement, which supports the intent of the TRC (2015) report in creating collaborative, respectful relationships in the intersection of Canadian and Indigenous law (2007). The three pillars of ethical space are the removal of hierarchies in the way the research is designed, designing dialogue so there is diversity of perspective, and ensuring there is space and time for subjective reflection (Ermine, 2007). This theory, developed first by Roger Poole (1972) and elaborated on by Ermine (2007) in the context of Indigenous/government communication, recognizes that the hegemonic cultural context of the consultation process (the fact that local government is based in a colonial worldview that has historically marginalized Indigenous peoples and their worldview) requires careful communication process design if it is to be able to acknowledge and respect Indigenous cultures, knowledge, and ways of knowing. To mitigate the power differential between Indigenous peoples’ ways of knowing and the dominant colonial culture of Canadian government and traditional academic research, this research incorporated a strengths-based, story-based approach that, by design, eliminates hierarchies, ensures diversity, and invites subjective reflection (the three “pillars” of ethical space).

The personal narratives of non-Indigenous and Indigenous local community leaders provided valuable insights that allowed for development of a template for future consultation and engagement. Using an over-arching lens of “ethical space” for intercultural consultation, the results are presented in a model that takes a metaphorical “journey” through a three-part engagement process: Packing the Essentials, which covers the necessary elements as the process begins; Creating a Safe and Productive Journey, which considers elements needed for building
relationships and mutually beneficial outcomes; and, Preparation for Destination, which considers the elements needed to help ensure the correct outcomes are created with appropriate jurisdictional representation for arrival at the best outcomes for a successful journey with long-lasting, positive effects.

The purpose of this research has been to create practical, ethical solutions for positive consultation and engagement practices between Indigenous communities and local rural governments in BC, and perhaps beyond. Although this is a small qualitative study it has sought to produce transferable consultation process and values considerations to serve as a foundation for creating truly ethical, intercultural consultation practices at the level of local government (Rapley, 2014).

**Literature Review**

The literature review begins with an examination of research on the background of the legal and legislative context of local government consultation with Indigenous peoples to provide the Canadian government context of consultation for local governments and Indigenous peoples regarding land use. Next, the TRC *Calls to Action* report (2015) is discussed within the context of current government grey literature on consultation with Indigenous peoples to demonstrate discrepancies between the TRC mandate and current consultation practices. Then, a review of scholarship on stakeholder consultation and engagement is provided to demonstrate that the intent of the TRC *Calls to Action* report to change historical relationships can be achieved by changing consultation practices to *intercultural engagement* best practices (which is elaborated in further detail later in the Literature Review). Finally, a more theoretical section reviews research on the clash between colonial and Indigenous worldviews, and how looking at the issue
from an intercultural communication perspective can inform the basic requirements for consultation processes that the shared understanding can lead to more mutually beneficial outcomes and ethical consultation procedures. Together, these literatures provide the framework that informs the research design of study aimed at creating an equitable and respectful relationship and framework required for land consultation outcomes and for aligning with the implications and expectations of the TRC recommendations, UNDRIP, and the Tsilhqot’in decision.

**Legal and Legislative Consultation with Indigenous Peoples and Canadian Government**

This section outlines the gaps and complexity in legal and legislative documents for local government consultation with First Nations. The *Local Government Act* (LGA) (2016) and the *Community Charter* (CC) (2016) are the two main legislative documents in BC that outline an extensive and detailed legal framework and set of powers and duties for local governments to represent their communities. Although local government is granted powers by the provincial government to govern the community, provincial and federal laws and regulations take precedence over all powers, duties, and decisions of local governments. What is evident in the LGA (2016) and CC (2016) governance documents is the lack of autonomous local authority to make decisions regarding municipal lands, Crown lands, or the Crown’s duty to consult (Sossin, 2010). This creates a gap for local government who lack the authority to make land use decisions autonomously as provincial governments preside over local government, and Indigenous peoples’ treaties are held by the federal government. However, the fourth level of government—that of Indigenous peoples—works with the various levels of Canadian colonial government. The
result is a paternalistic system involving many stakeholders, and is emblematic of the
labyrinthian bureaucratic obstacles identified in the TRC report’s calls for change.

**Gaps and complexities in grey literature for local government consultation.** It is
important to note at the outset of this section that the term *engagement* and *consultation* are not
synonymous with the legal term “duty to consult” (Fraser & Viswanathan, 2013; Government of
British Columbia [BC], 2014; Natcher, 2000), which is a specific term that defines a legal
obligation of the Crown (McLeod, et al., 2015). It is this legal term that creates a gap and
complexity, and will be discussed in turn, in the next sub-section of the literature review.

The gaps and complexities stemming from the confusing language and lack of local
government powers, duties, and resources create significant barriers for meaningful change in the
relationship with Indigenous peoples and local government in land use consultation and
engagement. One notable gap is the significantly lower number of direct references to local
governments in the grey literature than to the federal and provincial governments, which could
be the result of the power to make changes in societal structures such as, treaties, education, and
health, falls under provincial and federal jurisdictions (Government of BC, CC, 2016;
Government of BC, LGA, 2016; TRC, 2015). Despite the TRC’s *Calls to Action* report (2015),
which stated the need for change in three levels of Canadian government in relation to all aspects
of societal relationships with Indigenous peoples, guidance for changes for local governments is
notably less. The language used in the document created to guide local government’s framing of
the legal consultation process presents another gap. As a case in point, in 2014, the province of
BC published a consultation guide for local government engagement with Indigenous peoples,
which explicitly states that the duty to consult is that of the Crown, not the local government.
This confusion of roles poses the question of what role local government does have. Since, the Guide states there is neither a legal nor a legislative obligation for a local government to initiate a consultation process, engagement practices, or neighbourly relations (Government of BC, 2014). Rather, it is merely suggested as a good thing to do as part of a neighbourly relationship (2014). This leaves local governments to decide if a relationship might be necessary; which contradicts the TRC recommendations. To add further confusion, the provincial Guide is not considered legal advice, but merely a tool regarding statutory requirements for approval for only one type of land decision on a case-by-case basis, that is subject to change at any time due to future law or treaty changes (2014). This creates uncertainty regarding what consultation means as part of the process for local government (as the Crown has a legal duty to consult) and if legal changes will be shared and within a timely manner. Therefore, local government, despite being an order of Canadian government, lack legal and legislative frameworks with resources and incentives to follow the TRC recommendations and engage with Indigenous peoples in land use decisions.

The language used to express the lack of legal obligation to consult in consultation and engagement processes may also create barriers for positive change. The 2014 provincial Guide refers to both consultation and engagement in the document as interchangeable terms. However, this could lead to confusion due to the legal term of “duty to consult”, and the implied different meanings of consultation and engagement, discussed in greater detail below. The Guide offers practical information, such as suggested engagement best practices, and a mapping database to research the Indigenous peoples that may be affected in an area (Government of BC, 2014), but lacks practical intercultural considerations. What is needed is: clarity on both engagement and
consultation practices (and how they differ and relate); ways of building capacity for relationships between local governments and Indigenous communities; and, guidance on best practices for intercultural engagement. The omission of these three aforementioned practical considerations are gaps that may create barriers for local governments to overcome autonomously in isolation from the two other levels of government, rather than establishing them as important stakeholders in the Canadian government’s relationship with Indigenous peoples. Since local government is not legally or legislatively obligated to create neighbourly relations, it is up to the individual communities’ desire to follow the TRC recommendations to build a positive relationship with Indigenous communities.

While there currently are no studies explicitly focused on land use consultation that can help to resolve these gaps, there has been research that presents general principles on which best practices for local land use consultation could be built. My study takes its inspiration from public health sector research that uses alternative research methods with government documents for bridging the gap between social change and policy that includes federal and provincial initiatives (Timmons, et al., 2007). The study by Timmons, et al., (2007) reflects the importance of implementing recommendations made by Federal Advisory Councils (such as, the TRC) in academic research for meaningful societal change to occur. Tobin, French, and Hanlon (2010) state the need for appropriate engagement with Indigenous peoples’ communities that are respectful and sensitive to Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore best practices of consultation and engagement with research methods that align with the intent of the TRC recommendations through equal inclusivity of Indigenous and colonial worldviews, supporting mutual cultural respect and understanding by paralleling
principles of ethical space of engagement (Ermine, 2007) and intercultural communication (Oetzel, 2005).

The Search for Interculturality in Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement

My purpose here is to begin by defining consultation and engagement as they relate to the Canadian legalities of land use, to review examples of best practice in the literature that is growing around community consultation and engagement models in practice, and finally, to identify how these defined terms relate to Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities and reflects the need to recognize the importance of intercultural principles for local land use decision-making processes.

The consultation process is a colonial construct within Western culture that is based on those worldviews, which can differ from an Indigenous worldview. Intercultural communication is an area of theoretical study that recognizes disparate worldviews are often involved in an intercultural dialogue exchange and focuses on interpersonal communications between culturally heterophilous groups, or “people from different national cultures” and consequently delves into the communication challenges of differing beliefs and values systems (Gudykunst & Mody, 2002, p. ix) that also acknowledges differing power and hierarchies within that diversity (Ermine, 2007; Rowe, 2010). It is in-between the positioning of differing cultural views that intercultural communication explores the unknown space between disparate worldviews, the space in-between cultures where a framework for dialogue fraught with contradictions can be constituted into new ways of thinking for effective and transformative outcomes (Ermine, 2007; Rowe, 2010). Therefore, there is a need to recognize and work within this “in-between” cultural
Due to the unique communication challenges related to disparate worldviews in intercultural decision-making groups, a framework for working together is required as discussed in the effective intercultural workgroup communication theory developed by John Oetzel (2005). Although it is not a critical theory, it allows for an approach that recognizes the interconnected importance of balancing both work and relational outcomes for effective group decision-making, with the assumption that communication theory should be applied for the improvement of relationships. Effective communication for culturally diverse workgroups (decision-making groups) is defined by Oetzel as: “equal participation/turn taking, respectful communication, consensus decision making, and cooperative conflict behaviour” as culturally appropriate behaviours due to “their positive relationships with both task and relational effectiveness” (Oetzel, 2005, p. 360). This theory, though it lacks an explicit critique of differential power relations, demonstrates alignment with the ethical space discussed by Ermine (2007). This alignment addresses the intercultural communication challenges of diversity in perspectives and power differentiations that exist with heterogenous workgroups that Oetzel discusses in his theory (2005), with the goal of centring an Indigenous worldview perspective, as per Ermine’s (2007) ethical space of engagement framework. As Ermine (2007) has noted, the purpose of ethical engagement is to create a space in between two disparate worldviews, especially between “the fragile intersection of Indigenous law and Canadian legal systems” (p. 193); therefore, it presents a powerfully culturally appropriate framework for intercultural best practices in
consultation with Indigenous peoples and local government, discussed in further below in the Literature Review and Methods sections.

**Canadian legalities for land use decisions.** The term *consultation* within a legal or legislative context is not synonymous with terms such as cooperation, equality, or subjective reflection (Government of BC, 2014; Government of BC, n.d.), thus, omitting the integration of intercultural communications for the creation of the space in-between disparate worldviews for transformative solutions, all of which *are* part of an intercultural communication best practices for an “ethical space” of *engagement* (Ermine, 2007; Rowe, 2010). Indeed, the terms *consultation* and *engagement* are used in many sectors and areas of government with just as many definitions in practice (Bowen, Newenham-Kahindi, & Herremans, 2010; Fraser & Viswanathan, 2013; Government of BC, n.d.; Lewis & Sheppard, 2006; O’Riordan & Fairbrass, 2014; Pun, 2016; Schreyer, 2008; Sloan, 2009; TRC, 2015). The legal term *duty to consult* as it pertains to *consultation* and *engagement* is also just as convoluted and confusing in BC provincial-level government procedural documents in land use decision-making processes involving Indigenous peoples (Government of BC, n.d.). From an industry perspective, consultation is often defined as a legal obligation (*duty to consult*) as the Crown may involve a proponent in procedural aspects of consultation for fulfillment of the *duty to consult* as mandated by the Supreme Court of Canada, (Government of BC, n.d.; Government of BC, 2014; Natcher, 2000). The legal duty to consult process for land use decisions parallels the information provided to local governments for only one type of land use decision that requires statutory approval by the provincial government; all other land use decisions are exempt from the legal consultation process; and therefore, do not require any type of communication with Indigenous peoples.
The problem is this: the use of the terms consult, consultation and engagement in the grey literature previously cited for local governments demonstrates the disconnect of the TRC (2015) recommendations regarding land use decisions and Indigenous peoples’ relationships with all levels of government and the current BC provincial guidance documents (Government of BC, 2014). It is the Government of BC (2014) that must ensure appropriate and adequate consultation and accommodation as part of the legal duty to consult; however, proponents are encouraged to consult within an engagement process with Indigenous peoples to build relationships and share information that could support consultation processes. As a result of numerous models and definitions existing in various sectors, in this paper the term consultation will be defined within the legal context of the grey literature (Government of BC, n.d.; Government of BC, 2014; Natcher, 2000) and engagement will be defined by the larger academic discussion on best practices for seeking input from communities or stakeholders. In the context of this study, engagement could be an aspect of consultation, but one that must be built into the consultation process by design. An example of improving engagement practices is the trend of corporate social responsibility (CSR) (Delannon, Raufflet, & Baba, 2016; Devin, & Lane, 2014; Dobele, Westberg, Steel, & Flowers, 2014; O’Riordan, & Fairbrass, 2014; Sloan, 2009), which has added strategies for more meaningful and productive community engagement practices that can be used in consultation processes. These strategies address the awareness of negative consultation outcomes that may occur due to practices that lack an engagement process for collaborative, consensus-building decision-making that is then notably reflected in all aspects of day-to-day operations (Sloan, 2009). Therefore, the design of an engagement process with the best practices
outlined above that parallels an “ethical space” enhances the potential for intercultural understanding if it is integrated onto consultation practices.

To recap, in light of the extant research, this study will define consultation as the legal obligation of the “duty to consult” (Government of BC, n.d.). The term engagement will represent a best practices model for a consultation process that uses collaborative, consensus decision-making practices that include structural inward-looking processes for positive change that are reflected in operational decisions and actions based in on-going relationships built on trust (Delannon, et al., 2016; Kovach, 2009; Sloan, 2009). The general best practices in community engagement for consultation will be explored further in the next section as important aspects of respectful and meaningful modes of inclusive communication for all stakeholders.

Community consultation and engagement. So far, I have sought to synthesize the extensive research regarding legal consultation practices, and to highlight the scholarly discussion on the need for further research for positive and productive (expressly designed for intercultural and ethical) consultation outcomes, so that this study can build on that discussion. As just noted, there is academic research regarding best practices for community consultation (Delannon, et al., 2016; Ermine, 2007; Fraser & Viswanathan, 2013; Pun, 2016; Sloan, 2009; Tobin, French, & Hanlon, 2010; Williams, Penrose, & Hawkes, 1998) that can be used to build on best practices in engagement for positive outcomes. For example, Halseth and Booth (2003) in a case study involving six BC communities involved in a recent land use consultation around forestry practice, explored the public’s perception of what is working and what is not working in mandatory public consultation for land and resource use planning. Their findings indicate that there is room for improvement in public engagement that can be accomplished through a
strengths-based approach to the research, concluding that there are three important factors to consider for engaging public consultations: the need to address the low level of awareness regarding community consultation processes in their community; that information relevant to the process should be timely and readily available throughout the process; and, the need for clarity regarding the process itself, including the stakeholders involved, all mandates, and the powers of decision-making (2003). Halseth and Booth’s (2003) study demonstrates the need for change in consultation practices by noting the importance of sharing knowledge and information. However, it does not mention relationship building and trust explicitly, and none of the six communities involved in the study were designated as a First Nation, Band, or Indigenous community, so it is unclear if intercultural considerations or best practices were included in the research. However, my study builds on the findings of this research in community consultation by including intercultural considerations with Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants and is applicable to all consultation models.

Before I explore intercultural engagement practices, there are academic studies on best practices in working with Indigenous peoples that add an important discussion and context which I discuss next.

**Academic research with Indigenous peoples.** Fortunately, there is a growing acknowledgement in academe that research relationships with Indigenous peoples require change. For example, in their study with Indigenous co-researchers, Blodgett, Schinke, Smith, Peltier, and Pheasant (2011) discuss the recent awareness of the incompatibility of traditional academic research with Indigenous cultures, calling for different research designs and methods to be used when working with Indigenous peoples in research. There are three key aspects to
appropriate engagement according to Tobin, French, and Hanlon (2010): cultural competency, Indigenous traditional ways of knowing, and “recognizing strengths as a way of knowing” (pp. 50-51). In recognition of academic debate regarding the term cultural competency, this study uses the definition that refers to the importance of building relationships and trust with a community for “successful working relationships” that include the colonial historical context of the community, cultural diversity of populations, and recognition of existing power relations (Tobin et al., 2010, p. 50). By seeking participants in communities with whom this researcher has built professional relationships and the use of the TRC report as part of this research, the first key aspect is recognized (Tobin et al, 2010). The use of participants representing Indigenous and non-Indigenous stakeholders in equal numbers for creation of data serves the need to incorporate Indigenous traditional knowledge and thus recognizes the strengths and knowledge within both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities (Tobin et al., 2010) and reflects intercultural communication best practice of a balanced number of similar cultural perspectives (Oetzel, 2005). The strengths-based approach is addressed by looking for what is working well in engagement practices, rather than focusing on barriers to consultation (Tobin et al., 2010).

These three elements—cultural competency, Indigenous ways of knowing, and a strength-based focus—are considered important for ethical, respectful, and positive engagement (Kovach, 2009) and are also noted in Shawn Wilson’s (2007) articulation of what he calls an Indigenist (i.e. for use by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers) research paradigm, which, coupled with Ermine’s (2007) “ethical space” based on Wilson’s (2007) work, is the overall framework that has inspired the design of this study’s research questions and methodology. In order to incorporate these three elements into the research methodology, an
Appreciative Inquiry (AI) approach will be used to provide the best examples for appropriate engagement. This strength-based approach will be discussed in the next section. First though, I look at two studies to identify the current state of the academic discussion in engagement practices with Indigenous communities to identify how my research can inform those scholarly conversations.

**Intercultural engagement and consultation with Indigenous communities.** There is strong academic evidence that choosing engagement practices that acknowledge and honour Indigenous knowledge and traditional ways of knowing as distinct from Eurocentric ways of knowing can enable better consultation outcomes (Sossin, 2010), positive engagement relationships (Ermine, 2007; Fraser & Viswanathan, 2013; McLeod, et al., 2015; Sloan, 2009); and therefore, take into consideration of the intent of the findings of the Tsilhqot’in court case, the TRC *Calls to Action* report, the *UNDRIP*, and the purpose of this study. As previously noted, traditionally local government consultation with Indigenous peoples and the provincial government is comprised of colonial protocols and structures, such as the colonial construct of land as a commodity (Casas, 2014), where in the forestry sector the provincial government controls and manages 94% of the forestland and until the creation of the *Forestry Revitalization Act* in 2003, Indigenous peoples were historically excluded from participation in the forestry sector (Pun, 2016). Awareness of the cultural, discursive space in which negotiations are occurring is important in a land use consultation or engagement context insofar as the colonial worldview and Indigenous worldview have significantly different meanings regarding land and land use (Casas, 2014; Kovach, 2009; Pun, 2016). For example, and importantly for this research, the colonial worldview of land is one that views land as a commodity (Casas, 2014),
whereas an Indigenous worldview of land is merely one aspect of a holistic perspective of the cosmos as a living being that is interconnected with everything; of which the cosmos and all its parts has a consciousness (Ermine, 2007; Kapyrka, & Dockstator, 2012; Lavallée, 2009; Miller, 2008). Historically, the process for consultation with local government and Indigenous peoples conducted within colonial cultural structures (Casas, 2014; Ermine, 2007; Kovach, 2009; Pun, 2016) has set a clear barrier to interculturality and ethical, heterarchical consultation and stakeholder engagement.

The extent and quality of BC’s local governments’ intercultural engagement with Indigenous peoples is an underdeveloped area of study with few academic sources, but there are studies that have shown the need for a more enlightened, respectful approach that takes into consideration differing worldviews and traditional knowledge. For example, Fraser and Viswanathan (2013) interviewed 17 participants engaged in local government engagement initiatives in Ontario and found many participants interviewed felt Indigenous peoples and municipal relations could be improved. They also found that engagement solely on a project-by-project basis was not sufficient to support a stable relationship for progressive collaboration in land use (Fraser & Viswanathan, 2013). Another example is a study by Lewis & Sheppard (2006) that explores a new three-dimensional visualization engagement practice to share technical forestry information with the Cheam Band of the Fraser Valley as a more culturally appropriate communication tool than the two-dimensional map typically used by resource managers. Their study shows that effective public consultation that employs best practices in engagement with Indigenous peoples was well received by the Indigenous community as the Cheam Band members commented that they found the new visualization tool to be more
meaningful and helpful (Lewis & Sheppard, 2006), demonstrating the visualization approach helped to meet the goal of intercultural understanding by using a communication tool that took into consideration differing cultural language, knowledge, and understanding of the land.

The studies I have noted reflect the need for an intercultural communication framework that takes into consideration what needs to be in place for positive and effective dialogues between Indigenous peoples and local governments in land use consultation; that framework is the three pillars of “ethical space” for engagement (Ermine, 2007). My study recognizes the need for better relationships with local government and Indigenous peoples through engagement best practices and aims to provide practical engagement tools, building on the findings of these academic studies. The key to achieve that goal and address the gaps previously mentioned is to utilize intercultural communication best practices to build on consultation and engagement best practices. In order to conduct that research, a strength-based, community-based approach to research will be used, and that approach is discussed next.

**Appreciative Inquiry in the Context of Indigenous Community-Based Research**

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) has historically been an organizational development process stemming from *social constructionism* theory (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008) that is a community-based research approach situated in strengths-based practice (Lind & Smith, 2008) that has grown in research applications beyond organizational development (Lind & Smith, 2008; Trajkovski, Schmied, Vickers, & Jackson, 2013), making AI and its guiding principles an appropriate approach to intercultural research with Indigenous peoples and local government (Lind & Smith, 2008). Tobin et al.’s (2010) three principles for effective, ethical engagement and aspects of Wilson’s (2007) Indigenist (relational) research paradigm align well with certain
foundational AI principles that, together, enable a strengths-based inquiry context for interculturally appropriate methods aimed at effecting positive change (rather than focusing on problem-based research) (Ermine, 2007; Reed, 2007).

Of the five guiding principles of AI—constructivist, simultaneity, poetic, anticipatory, and positive (Reed, 2007)—this research is based on principles of constructivism, simultaneity, and positive and utilizes the 4-D approach of Discovery, Dream, Design, and Destiny (Cooperrider et al., 2008). As Reed (2007) has outlined, the constructivist principle is based on the theoretical premise of social constructionism, wherein meaning is seen not to be in things themselves, but rather is developed through individuals’ co-construction and interpretation of the world creating differing stories that co-exist together. Supporting the use of an AI approach for gathering positive experiences for the co-construction of what elements of communication surface as positive in past land use consultations from the culturally diverse individual stories of the six participants through a thematic analysis of the phenomenological experiences for culturally competent findings. This constructivist principle allows for a research design that recognizes the co-existence of past, present, and future worldview differences of Indigenous and non-Indigenous stories regarding land and land use and the power of stories (Tobin et al., 2010; Wilson, 2007), addressing the requirement that land use consultations be grounded in Indigenous ways of knowing (Ermine, 2007; Wilson, 2007). The principle of simultaneity situates inquiry and change as being mutually implicated (Reed, 2007), supporting my contention that positive changes in land consultation and engagement practices with Indigenous peoples (Tobin, et al., 2010; TRC, 2015) can be enacted in the process of gathering stories of what that change would look like at its best (Reed, 2007). The positive principle, with its emphasis on strengths-finding is
incorporated in this research “in the way it asks questions” about what is working well in the context of the topic being explored (Tobin et al., 2010, p. 27). This last principle is important as it parallels the Indigenist paradigm’s requirement that research focus on bringing benefits to the community (Wilson, 2007). This study’s strength-based, action-research, co-constructivist approach parallels Tobin et al.’s (2010) three qualities of culturally appropriate research design when working with Indigenous communities and individuals to allow for transformational outcomes.

There is recent scholarship that has used an AI approach in community-based research that demonstrates AI’s utility as a strengths-based approach to transformational research and as a research approach that is commensurable with the cultural attenuation of many Indigenous communities. For example, Bushe and Kassam (2005) examined twenty cases using AI to change social systems. The authors conclude that there are two differing and therefore important aspects of AI that allow for presence of transformational outcomes: “(a) a focus on changing how people think instead of what people do and (b) a focus on supporting self-organizing change processes that flow from new ideas” (p. 61). These two aspects reflect the importance of relationships and the transformative possibilities of engagement in the “ethical space” between cultures (Ermine, 2007). It is important to use research frameworks and methodology when conducting research with Indigenous peoples as a non-Indigenous researcher that parallel Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing whenever possible (Nicholls, 2008; Wallace, 2011). Trajkovski et al.’s (2013) research for organizational change in the health sector demonstrates AI’s ability to bridge the gap between community-based research that promotes social change, and the policies that govern those communities and their leaders. As Lind & Smith (2008)
demonstrate, AI’s ability to create transformational changes between health services and Indigenous communities in their analysis of an exemplar with the Nuu-Chah-Nulth Tribal Council. The authors conclude AI takes into consideration social equity, empowerment, and community participants—and has created sound policy and service delivery model changes (Lind & Smith, 2008). In light of this emerging body of research, AI offers an effective and appropriate way to transcend the problems with intercultural engagement practices for consultation with local government and Indigenous peoples. The use of a social constructionist theoretical framework of individual perceptions used in AI for gathering strength-based stories from the participant’s own experience allows for the individual voices of Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants, and the cultural views that inform them, to be equally recognized through their own story for the purpose of positive change (Cunliffe, 2008; Reed, 2007; Schwandt, 2007).

These best practices from the aforementioned AI-based studies demonstrate that AI is an effective approach for transformational academic study with Indigenous peoples. This research builds on engagement best practices using strengths-based and culturally competent research, by utilizing a AI approach to improve the way local governments engage with Indigenous communities, and specifically in this case around land use consultation. The research from other sectors demonstrates a need for creative, strengths-based practices to be used in further academic study regarding local government engagement with Indigenous peoples regarding land use. With a limited number of studies based in the BC context, and even fewer studies with a rural perspective, this study will build on previous academic consultation and engagement research, and add a unique and innovative perspective to intercultural consultation.
Summary

The grey literature outlines the legislative duties and complexities in local government engagement with Indigenous peoples for land use and the timely need for this research. The academic studies demonstrate the need for research that incorporates Indigenous knowledge that works to building meaningful relationships based on trust and equality, thereby utilizing decolonizing research frameworks that reflect intercultural communication best practices. By building on academic studies involving intercultural consultation and Indigenous engagement, and the current government literature, this study contributes innovative research findings to the growing body of literature on intercultural engagement practice, seeking to contribute to the gap that exists on best practices in local government-Indigenous stakeholder engagement and consultation around the issue of land use. Despite this gap, several studies reviewed have guided the methodological choices for this proposal, including the AI principles of strengths-based research to provide an ethical framework designed for intercultural engagement with Indigenous peoples. I will discuss these principles in the context of my research design and methods, presented next.

Methods

Research Design

As noted above, there has been a developing awareness in academe of the incompatibilities of traditional Western Euro-centric research with Indigenous peoples, and in particular, the injustices to Indigenous cultures through colonial practices (Blodgett, Schinke, Smith, Peltier, & Pheasant, 2011); however, there are theoretical practices and academic literature to support the facilitation of a research design that intentionally elicits intercultural
communication and cross-cultural understanding (Barker, 2015). The importance of recognizing the differing worldviews of Indigenous peoples and colonialism is due to a “history of mainstream research being imposed on indigenous peoples in ways that have subverted the knowledge and voices coming from within their communities” (Blodgett, et al., 2011, p. 522). Therefore, since social reality is influenced by a historical context (Cunliffe, 2008), ethical considerations must be made to counteract the historical dominant colonial culture of research and utilize methodology that allows for respectful research that recognizes Indigenous peoples’ cultural differences in the past, present, and future from that of colonialism.

It is important, therefore, to note that this culturally aware and appreciative research design recognizes the importance of this researcher having a professional relationship or connection with all the participants to reduce the Western or colonial bias of conducting the research as primarily a task oriented construct that privileges the colonial individualistic cultural values (Oetzel, 2005). The past relationship with the participants demonstrates the research design as considering cultural competency as an intercultural best practice (Tobin, et al., 2010) by balancing relational with outcome-based (Oetzel, 2005) research requirements. As the discussion on intercultural communications concluded, an intercultural communication framework is needed for working in the space in between two or more cultures to address the unique challenges in disparate worldviews such as those between Indigenous and non-Indigenous cultures, just as in local government and Indigenous peoples land consultation, and this research; Ermine’s (2007) “ethical space of engagement” can be that framework.

The concept of an “ethical space” of engagement underwrites all the research design choices presented below, a design that strives to create a research process that disperses
hierarchies, invites diversity of worldviews, and values subjective reflection (Ermine, 2007). In acknowledgement that the assumptions and cultural knowledge of the research and researcher are within the colonial perspective both conscious and subconscious, it is ethically imperative that large excerpts of raw data of the participants’ own voice be presented in the findings “to work with, rather than on” the participants (Ermine, 2007; Lind & Smith, 2008; Tobin et al., 2010, p. 50). This mitigates the historical colonial power differential of the research and researcher, and presents the diverse perspectives and knowledge of differing worldviews presented for the reader to form their own phenomenological understanding of the research within their own subjective reflection of their cultural understanding and ways of knowing (Blodgett, et al., 2011; Ermine, 2007; Tobin, et al., 2010; Wilson, 2007).

To that end, this research takes into consideration the complexities of diverse intercultural perspectives through a study aimed at exploring the meaning of appropriate engagement with Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities through a collaborative approach with participants and the researcher. By working within the interpretive paradigm, this study allows for recognition of Indigenous voice and ways of knowing as unique and equal to the colonial voice and ways of knowing (Ermine, 2007; Tobin, et al., 2010; Wilson, 2007). This research is located within the interpretive paradigm as the research is grounded in an epistemology that regards each person as having individualized experiences based on their perceptions, resulting in the possibility of many interpretations of the same shared experience (Lapadat, 2012; Reed, 2007; Scotland, 2012), paralleling the AI positivist, social constructionist approach (Reed, 2007; Schwandt, 2007) to qualitative research, discussed above, thus creating a hybrid of the two (Guest, et al., 2012).
In accordance with social constructionism’s precept that reality is co-constructed through social relations, this study design intentionally used an AI approach with the explicit intention of creating beneficial outcomes that are supported by participants (Ermine, 2007; Tobin et al., 2010) and recognized the importance of an individual’s experience (Reed, 2007) providing time and space for diverse worldviews for intercultural research (Ermine, 2007). This approach is also appropriate as it recognizes a collaborative approach to the research with the researcher as part of the research seeking positive change through its findings (Ermine, 2007; Reed, 2007; Tobin et al., 2010; Wilson, 2007; Wilson, 2001) and because it “focuses on supporting people […] to tell stories of positive development in their work that they can build on,” (Reed, 2007, pp. 44-46).

The reflexivity inherent to AI (Reed, 2007) is important in research with Indigenous peoples (Nicholls, 2008) and parallels an Indigenist paradigm that recognizes the interconnectedness (Wilson, 2007) of all involved in the study (including the researcher) while seeking to benefit the communities involved in the study (Kovach, 2009; Tobin et al., 2011; Wilson, 2007).

Furthermore, as noted above, the AI approach is theoretically grounded in principles of positivist psychology, which is aligned with an Indigenist paradigm of focusing on community strengths with research results that encourage community capacity building for the participants and the larger population the sub-group represents in community consultations (Tobin et al., 2010; Wilson, 2007).

As such, the study intentional draws on cross-cultural participant sampling that represents all local stakeholder positions in a typical land use process. With the understanding that the individual socially constructs their own reality by drawing on cultural assumptions (Cunliffe, 2008) related to their worldview, it was imperative to first determine principles for designing an
effective communication process for decision-making groups in order to subsequently create (Oetzel, 2005) an ethical and equitable intercultural consultation process. Evoking different cultural interpretations of a shared experience (land use consultation) allows for participants from both cultures to have differing stories of successful engagement in land use decisions and is conducive to a main theme within AI of inclusive collaboration (Reed, 2007). As such, the data was collected in the form of semi-structured interviews with six former participants in local rural land use consultations, serving as a deliberate, small sampling, representative of a larger population (Rapley, 2014) that used thematic analysis for a systematic approach to analyze the data.

An appropriate method for analysis of the kind of narrative data that arises from an AI semi-structure interview is thematic analysis, which I have used to “to yield insightful interpretations that are contextually grounded” (Lapadat, 2012, p. 927; Schwandt, 2007), and to provide innovative ways to “change the social circumstances” of land use consultation “through the technical application of social scientific knowledge” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 308). Thematic analysis can be used for identifying patterns both within and across data for experiential research and, similar to AI, is within the principles of positive psychology (Clarke & Braun, 2017). Thematic analysis is a common analytical technique for analyzing qualitative data. It does not involve specialized procedures nor other analytic tools such as grounded theory or discourse analysis; instead it is an exploratory approach that categorizes text to emergent themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Clarke & Braun, 2017; Schwandt, 2007).

One of the criticisms of thematic analysis is the loss of contextuality and coherence in using small excerpts of the narrative for creating and presenting the themes (Lapadat, 2012). To
mitigate this loss of contextuality of meaning in individual narratives (Lapadat, 2012) and within 
the ethical stance of the research design (Ermine, 2007; Tobin, et al., 2010; Wilson, 2007), large 
excerpts of raw data, rather than short, small excerpts of a few words or a sentence or two than 
normally associated with thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) are presented in the Findings 
below. This decision was in aid of providing a stronger contextual understanding of each 
participants’ individual cultural voice and my responsibility as the role of researcher to the 
participants, the reader, the communities involved, and society, to reflect an Indigenist 
methodological approach (to allow people to speak for themselves and in the first person) within 
the research and its design (Wilson, 2001).

This overall research design allowed for themes to arise from stories reflecting the lived 
experience of participants from diverse cultures, rather than from a colonial construct of what 
information should be extracted from the data for creating change in consultation practices. The 
collection of stories as the primary text for the data and the use of thematic analysis is 
by respecting Indigenous oral and story traditions and ways of knowing in the research design 
and methodology (Kovach, 2009). A rigorous thematic analysis of the individual interview 
narratives of the participants was undertaken as a method to look for themes that represent what 
needs to be present for positive intercultural land use consultations.

Data and Data Collection

The data sampling was purposive and quota-based due to an existing working 
relationship or professional network connection with participants who were involved within a 
single land use consultation process, based in one specific region, the Kootenays, with the
participants involved directly or indirectly in a treaty process still being finalized (Rapley, 2014). Based on my professional networks and past experience working with Indigenous communities and local governments, the data sampling included three Indigenous and three non-Indigenous representatives with direct experience in the land consultation processes being studied and direct experience with consultations located in the same region. Participants were offered anonymity throughout the research, approved their transcripts, and were presented the final draft for comments or concerns; however, all participants were comfortable and willing to have their name published. Declining to have their identities protected in confidence allows the researcher to fully recognize and attribute the contributions to this research by disclosing and using the real names of the participants. The six participants were: Chris Luke, the past Chief of Yaqan Nukiy [Lower Kootenay Band] [literally translated “where the rock stands”, which refers to an important place in the Creston Valley,” (Yaqan Nukiy, 2016)] of the Ktunaxa Nation; Chad Luke of the of Yaqan Nukiy [Lower Kootenay Band], a current participant in water, land, and wildlife consultation partnerships; Garry Merkel, of the Tahltan Nation that works with the Ktunaxa Nation, a participant in Treaty processes and currently works in the Ktunaxa Government building in Cranbrook, and has worked within many Indigenous and non-Indigenous land use consultation processes; Wayne Stetski, present Member of Parliament for Kootenay-Columbia and past Mayor of Cranbrook; Ron Toyota, the present Mayor of Creston; and John Kettle, the past Regional District of Central Kootenay Electoral Area B Director. This sampling is representative of the local representation in a rural BC land consultation process and encompasses representatives for all local stakeholders involved, while also providing a culturally balanced and viable number of participants for the limited time and capacity of this study. These
community leaders have directly impacted the land consultation process and represent the past, present, and future for land consultations, which is reflective of an Indigenous framework (Ermine, 2007; Tobin, et al., 2010) and an AI process (Cooperrider, et al., 2008).

The data was collected through individual, semi-structured, conversational (Kovach, 2010) appreciative interviews focusing on the participants’ experiences regarding successful land use consultations they wished to speak about. The interview questions were designed as an adaptation of an AI 4D approach of the iterative phases of discovery, dream, design, and destiny with affirmative research questions at the core of the AI cycle (Bushe & Kassam, 2005; Cooperrider, et al., 2008). The Discovery phase explores and appreciates the best within an area of study to create a positive core (Cooperrider, et al., 2008) for the inquiry process. However, in recognition of the colonial injustices in the past to Indigenous peoples and the long history of monological consultation processes that are deaf to Indigenous voices and worldview, at the start of the interviews, participants were made aware of the ability to tell a negative story with the understanding that within a negative there is positive human potential (Boje, 2016). This option to begin from a deficit perspective allows data collection to remain within the positive theme of AI through interview questions and research outcomes (Reed, 2007), while taking into consideration the Indigenous peoples histories and personal stories that may be disparate with a colonial perspective (Ermine, 2007; Wilson, 2007).

The positive core in the Discovery phase is built upon in the Dream phase, which explores what could be by imagining and envisioning a future (Cooperrider, et al., 2008). The Dream phase sets a strategic focus for the Design phase that starts to create the visions of the Dream phase into a process of creating change (2008). The Destiny (or Delivery) phase’s
primary goal is to ensure the dream is realized (2008). The interviews were semi-structured with open-ended questions to allow participants to answer freely (Gavin, 2013) based on an AI approach of focusing on what works well in engagement practices for consultation in land use. The interview questions were adapted from the work of Cooperrider et al. (2008), experts on AI; below is an example of interview questions:

1. Tell me the story about how the two successful land consultation processes happened.
2. What do you think allowed these two land consultations to become successful?
3. How do you hope future consultation and engagement will be conducted? In general, how would you like consultation and engagement to be in Canada?
4. What do you think are some of the best ways to engage with different communities; with your own?
5. How do you think those ideas for future engagement can be realized? What needs to be in place for consultation to be the engagement process you described?

The questions were deliberately open-ended, positively focused about the research question of how to create best practices for land use consultation, and sought to gather data representative of the full cycle of *Discovery* (questions 1-2), *Dream* (question 3) *Design* (questions 4), and *Destiny* (question 5). Although these questions were used to elicit the story from the participants, the importance of the individual voice of the participant took precedent over asking each question specifically, as they were a guiding tool to elicit the participants story and these were semi-structured interviews. Four of the six participants heard the questions in the introduction to the interview process (a sample is provided in Appendix A), with three of the participants specifically being asked each question in the order shown above during the process of the
interview. Each participant received a *Letter of Invitation* that stated the purpose of the overall study (see Appendix B). However, there was an ethical responsibility to balance the needs of each participant and the needs of the researcher; the participant set the tone and the questions were used according to the individual needs of the participant and the needs of the researcher. It was my priority to demonstrate respect for the time and space for each individual participant to tell their story (Ermine, 2007) in a manner that they were comfortable with and felt respected and heard (Tobin et al., 2010); this was also in acknowledgement that I am a non-Indigenous researcher working with Indigenous participants conducting intercultural research.

The participants were each contacted according to my professional relationship with them. Chris Luke, I had not met before, but was suggested by John Kettle due to Chris’ role as Chief for the Lower Kootenay Band and his participation in the treaty process. I had worked with his son, Chad Luke, so the initial contact and subsequent information sent before the interviews (mentioned below) and interview coordination was conducted through Chad Luke, according to the participants’ request. The participants in the Creston area were offered to meet at the Ramada Inn in Creston, B.C. or a meeting space of their choice. Chris and Chad Luke were both interviewed in Chad’s office in the Lower Kootenay Band Administration Complex building in their traditional Yaqan Nukiy territory. Both the Mayor of Creston, Ron Toyota and former Regional District Central Kootenay (RDCK) Area B Director, John Kettle, chose to conduct the interview in the executive suite in the Ramada Hotel. I meet with Garry Merkel and Wayne Stetski at their respective offices in Cranbrook, B.C. Each participant was emailed a *Letter of Invitation*, with slight variations according to the participant (Appendix B) outlining the research
and purpose for contacting them, and a Consent Form (Appendix C) for the interview and research participation before the conducting the interviews.

Over the course of two days, all the interviews were conducted in English; requiring no Indigenous language translation, with the exception of a few words that were transcribed verbatim and verified with the participant. At the beginning of each interview, the Consent Form (Appendix C) provided before the interviews was discussed and signed before beginning the interview and an introductory script (Appendix A) was read (with only slight variations according to the participant and the verbal and nonverbal feedback I received while reading the script) describing the process of the interview, the intercultural considerations for the research, the AI design of the interview questions and the five questions with sub-questions that were to be asked—participants did not receive the interview questions beforehand. With the exception of Wayne Stetski, as I started reading the script—reiterating the information he had previously received, such as, his ethical right not to participate and the Consent Form, although, consent had been obtained through the coordination and the acceptance of the interview—for approximately one minute and paused the recorder to go over the Consent Form and answer any questions, accordingly, I did not record the initial meeting and conversation regarding the consent form with participants, as I had not obtained permission to record and conduct the interview until that process was complete (with the expectation of Wayne Stetski, as previously stated; he approved the interview transcript that was conducted before signing the Consent Form, which was primarily the researcher speaking and the interviewee verbally agreeing to the ethical information provided for the second time). This may not be usual, however, discussions regarding the research, the freedom to not participate, the option for anonymity and factors of
consent had been carried out through email correspondence, telephone conversations, and agreement to meet to conduct the interview with the participants prior to conducting the interviews. The Consent Form was used as formal recognition and proof of consent, rather than verbal consent or implied consent through coordination of meeting and conducting the interviews. I did not complete the reading of the introductory transcript with Chris Luke regarding the AI questions and design, nor for the remaining part of the interview. It was my decision to listen to Chris Luke tell his story without the prompts, and did receive the interview data of past, present, and future regarding land consultation for the research. Chad Luke was in the office with us, at the request of the participants in coordinating the time and place of the interviews, and his interview was conducted after Chris Luke’s, and subsequently, did not hear the full transcript, either. However, both Chris and Chad Luke were sent the Letter of Invitation that outlined the research and Chad Luke and I had discussions before the interview as to the nature of the research and the data I hoped to collect. The interviews contained valuable phenomenological data regarding land use and consultation from Indigenous participants. Chris Luke stated he liked the type of interview that was conducted, and Chad Luke also stated why he felt comfortable sharing his story with me. Therefore, I believe that all the interviews were conducted appropriately and were academically sound within the context of my intercultural, semi-structured interview questions, and research design.

The participants were informed that they were in no way required to participate in the research project from the first point of contact to inquire about their interest in participating in the research. They were free to withdraw until the data had been analyzed. After the data had been analyzed, participants had the opportunity to review and comment; however, full
withdrawal would not be practical for the purpose of completing the research. Instead, they had the option to request anonymity in the research project. Similarly, if they chose not to participate earlier in the research, the information would be maintained in confidence. The Consent Form (Appendix C) was also enclosed discussing that participants would possibly know and speak to each other; however, they were requested to kept this knowledge in confidence until the final paper was completed to allow participants to request anonymity. The participants were also requested to consider public acknowledgement—which all participants agreed to—for their contribution at the completion of the project; which was addressed in the Consent Form (Appendix C).

The interviews were to be recorded using my Blackberry or iPad; however, an unforeseen technological change during an update with my Blackberry phone prohibited me from using it to record data for more than a few minutes. The iPad requires iCloud for storing data, that is not definitively secure data storage to ensure anonymity for the participants should they make the request at any time until the research paper is finalized. Alternatively, an electronic personal device that recorded data internally, not remotely, was used. This recorder was always securely stored for the duration of data collection (two days in the East Kootenay). After the data was collected, it was downloaded onto my password protected personal laptop. After the data was downloaded from the recorder, the recorder was securely stored and will remain there for a year after the submission of this research paper, when I will erase the data on the recorder and my laptop. All data and resulting information for the study will be stored on my personal computer, the recorder, and a memory stick and will be kept secure at all times by use of a password-protected hard drive and securely stored memory stick locked in my office. The transcribed data
was approved by each respective participant for accuracy, as part of the Indigenous framework and community-based approach inherent to respectful and sound intercultural inquiry (Firmin et al., 2008; Ermine, 2007; Tobin, et al., 2010). The transcribed data was then analyzed through a thematic analysis to look for themes that represent what needs to be present for successful land use consultations outcomes.

**Data Analysis**

To make the thematic elements of experiences explicit, the process is inductive, recursive, and reflexive (Clarke & Braun, 2017; Gavin, 2013). Although the themes are expressions of phenomenological (subjective) experience and therefore “cannot be wholly explicit” (p. 279), this use of phenomenology parallels the social constructionism theoretical ontology of AI and of the phenomenological precepts underwriting “ethical space” design. This makes thematic analysis appropriate for intercultural research as it can be used for heterogeneous datum sets and to capture meaning that is explicit or latent (Clarke & Braun, 2017). A second researcher may be used during thematic analysis for accuracy (Gavin, 2013); this research design does not, as the AI approach recognizes the researcher as part of the research, influencing it from start to completion (Reed, 2007).

This research was designed (e.g., story telling, cross-cultural sampling, inductive analysis) to mitigate the researchers’ subjective influence over the participants and the research outcomes. I made a conscious decision to not document initial field notes and first impressions after the interviews; as I was aware that I would have cultural biases and assumptions based in a colonial perspective regarding the research, its design, and analysis and wanted to focus on the content of the textual interviews that I would also be influencing through analysis of interpreting,
coding, and creating the findings of the research. Instead, I re-listened to audio interviews, or
asked the interviewees to clarify questions or to fill in information I was unsure of in the
transcribing process at the time I requested the participants’ approval of their transcribed data.
As well as, participants were invited to comment on the research outcomes, which were
considered by the researcher before the final submission of the thesis, in order to help ensure the
findings were not an inaccurate representation or harmful to the participants and their
communities.

The semi-structured interviews collected from the six participants were analyzed through
an inductive thematic analysis where themes are grounded and emerged from the interview data
(Lapadat, 2012) focusing on the content, deriving themes and sub-themes from the research
questions for successful engagement processes (Clarke & Braun, 2017; Guest, MacQueen, &
Namey, 2012). First, I transcribed the interviews conversationally verbatim; as the first phase of
the six-phased thematic analysis, transcribing was suggested as part of the process to familiarize
myself with the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Although I present the six-phased steps in a
sequential order, this is a recursive rather than a linear process (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Clarke &
Braun, 2013). Once the first step of familiarizing myself with the data through transcribing, re-
listening, and re-reading the textual data derived from the recorded interviews, the textual data
was also subjected to the remaining five phases—generation initial codes, searching for themes,
reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, producing the report (Braun & Clarke, 2006)—
through an inductive thematic analysis process. I used an adapted reflexivity exercise by
reflecting on and subsequently writing about any assumptions I thought I had about the research
question and any biases through my life experience I believed I held regarding intercultural
consultation and engagement (Clarke & Braun, 2013). I highlighted, bolded, underlined, and
colour-coded text and noted themes for each interview, that were “regularly occurring and/or
atypical” to generate a thematic overview of each interview by using different colour coding to
indicate and differentiate emergent themes (Gavin, 2013, p. 277).

Overall, I also used Guest et al.’s (2012) work on applied thematic analysis as a guide for
implicit coding and segmentation of data using “‘key-word-in-context’” (KWIC) to “locate
meaning in the data” and “easily return to the full context of any feature described on the data
‘map’,” to ascertain “where meaning begins and ends” (p. 51). By incorporating Guest et al.’s
(2012) and Clarke and Braun’s (2013) various techniques, I developed a rigorous analysis that
focused first on each individual interview datum to then develop over-arching themes cross the
data set without deductively influencing the outcomes for “preserving the larger context of the
dialog” (Guest et al., 2012, p. 51) and thus, the voice of the participant and their
phenomenological perspective. The analysis was conducted recursively and utilized all the
previously stated techniques for coding and analysis. The thematic findings were then used to
form definitions and a model for best practices in engagement for consultation as discussed
below.

Ethical Considerations

Shawn Wilson (2007) states that the Indigenist research paradigm is not exclusively for
Indigenous researchers and this research design mirrors this paradigm as previously mentioned,
but also in the following other principles: all actions will be in a spirit of kindness, honesty, and
compassion; the integrity of Indigenous peoples will not be undermined. The research design is
purposeful in the use of thematic analysis and AI; although these are founded on ontological
principles that differ from Indigenous ontologies, there are several commensurabilities in how AI and Indigenous methods both value the rich data of stories, see meaning as constructed by human beings, take a community approach, and embrace the notion that the solutions to problems must come from the community itself. While this study is not situated in the critical paradigm, given its focus on creating intercultural understanding, it recognizes the power relations that currently favour colonialist interpretations of land, property, and other concepts central to the process and seeks to create a research design that allows for equitability. Wallace (2011) states that, as a non-Indigenous scholar, there is a need to be aware of biases and assumptions “that reproduce a privileged status of dominance in our relationships with Indigenous peoples in Canada” (p. 156). As the researcher, I recognize the need to record and examine my own views and practice (as previously stated) as steps to mitigate colonialist ontologies and epistemologies I bring to the research and design. One effect of the care I took in this regard is the presentation of the data in large excerpts from the interview transcripts, which lengthened the thesis considerably. I did so intentionally, to make the subjective reflections of participants highly visible, and to avoid speaking on behalf of the research participants.

Other ethical considerations were to consider traditional protocols and respectful conduct for the interviews and each participant’s individual cultural needs for participating in the research. An Indigenist framework (Wilson, 2001; Wilson, 2007) was used as much as possible, which included seeking approval of transcribed interviews from the participants as a method to reduce risk of harm to participants and to show respect according to community cultural traditions. Permission from each participant was obtained during data gathering and was discussed initially when permission was requested for participation in the study. This included
transparency of all aspects regarding the studies’ methods, methodology, and the creation of principles and a model of best practices. These principles and best practices are discussed next.

**Stories Surfacing Ethical Consultations for Successful Outcomes**

Below, I present the findings from the thematic analysis of the participants’ interview data to answer the research question of how rural local government in British Columbia can build on current legislative land consultation processes and engagement practices with Indigenous communities to create positive consultation outcomes. In the Discussion section, I use those findings to illustrate how the stories of successful consultation between non-Indigenous and Indigenous community leaders are transferable for use in future consultation and engagement, and how they constitute a well-designed, ethical consultation process.

The themes generated from the analysis were synthesized into a model for consultation that is designed for ethical engagement in the service of interculturality. Often the themes are closely related and linked to each other, as the model is cyclic and each theme is interconnected with its relationship to the other—paralleling the relational aspects of an Indigenist paradigm and worldview (Ermine, 2007; Kapyrka & Dockstator, 2012; Wilson 2007; Wilson, 2001). Due to the research design’s focus on surfacing the phenomenological experiences of the participants, its intentionally intercultural approach of the larger context of the dialog, and the AI approach to focus on eliciting “(vivid) data extracts” (Clarke and Braun, 2013, p. 121), specific raw data is presented at length to allow the reader’s own phenomenological understanding in the findings while recognizing the importance of the individual experience of the participants and researcher to be transparent and open. This approach is also aligned with the principles of Indigenous
research methods (Cunliffe, 2008; Lind & Smith, 2008) and “ethical space” qualities’ of diversity of perspective, dispersal of hierarchies, and subjective reflection (Ermine, 2007).

The consultation process is divided into three main stages of a journey (see Figure 1): packing the essentials, creating a safe and productive journey, and preparation for destination. These stages contain themes that reflect a desirable, ethical consultation process that is cyclical in nature and requires flexibility, cultural inclusivity, and regular reassessment to understand what is required at various stages in the process to continually move forward for a successful outcome. My findings are presented in the form of a “journey” metaphor to weave “a coherent and persuasive story” of data extracts and analytic narrative of the thematic analysis within an AI approach (Clarke & Braun, 2013, p. 121). Next, I will describe process in the order presented by Figure 1, elaborating on the three main stages— *Packing the Essentials, Creating a Safe and Productive Journey, Preparation for Destination*— (and the over-arching themes/principles within them) for land use consultation using a “journey” metaphor to demonstrate the need for collaborative, inclusive, and meaningful engagement for successful outcomes. I elaborate on those themes and the sub-themes to answer the research question and sub-questions.
Figure 1. The journey of consultation model. This figure illustrates the stages and thematic findings for best practices in intercultural consultation and engagement practices.
Decision for a Journey

Before a journey can begin, the decision to make a journey and the nature of the journey must be decided, as it greatly impacts the decisions for the rest of journey to the final destination. Is it a vacation, work-related, or is there someone you are trying to visit? If you do not know where you are going, it is difficult to invite anyone to join you, or to plan for a successful journey, when you don’t have a destination in mind. The details of what you will do can only be decided when you have a general understanding of the purpose of the journey.

The participants spoke to the importance of a purpose for the journey. For example, Chad Luke spoke of purpose from a cultural perspective of the traditional values and beliefs of the Yaqan Nukiy:

... it’s an important waterway for our people because at one point in time there was salmon all up through here. The “Lion King” talks about the “Circle of Life...” And a lot of people don’t understand that, but yet, it’s being taught right before our eyes... The sooner you understand, the better off you will be, because in order for me to live I have to gather the things from land, earth, right? People like to think that we look after the land. Well, first and foremost the land looks after us, otherwise we won’t be here. And when it comes to land... the reason I don’t have a problem with you sharing any of this is because I want it to actually hit ears that are going to do something about it. You know, it’s not a big secret. The more people understand, where, say, myself is coming from.

The purpose of engagement most strongly expressed by Chad Luke was to take timely action on consultation for land use within a “big picture” perspective that reflects an Indigenous worldview of interconnectedness of all living things while also focusing on a strong need to have this...
worldview heard, understood, and incorporated into how land use decisions are made. Chris Luke’s insights in this regard were similar to Chad Luke, as he spoke to cultural and traditional values:

*Creston Reclamation Company Limited... had approximately 1,923 acres under their control... they had until 1934 to 1984, a 50-year lease agreement... I know it was peanuts [the lease payments to the Yaqan Nukiy]. Peanuts that you usually give to the elephants at the circus... right up until 1982 when we finally broke the lease. I can realistically say that this Band is where it is at, not because of the government, it’s because of utilizing the dollars that did filter into this community through the department of Indian Affairs to run the situations... my Council, before I stepped away, set the tone, of where this community is going to go. We drafted up plans as far as development is concerned and whatnot. They are carrying on the story. In fact, let me talk about this, in... I believe it was ’90-’91. I would say that the hunting and guiding territory became a part of our, I guess, responsibility to keep the place going. So, that’s a good thing... mind you, again, we really didn’t get that much help from the government.*

It was clear to me that Chris Luke believed that the past and future sustainability of the Yaqan Nukiy were independent of the provincial and federal government. His purpose was to regain the autonomous ability to have lands that are the responsibility of their community—as part of the Ktunaxa Nation—for traditional use based on the past, present, and future of the Yaqan Nukiy. Garry Merkel’s reflections on the question of a land consultation’s purpose also spoke to sustainability of the land from an interconnected Indigenous worldview and emphasized the need for action to be purposively part of consultation; however, he also stressed the importance of the
purpose as a way of focusing inclusive dialogue for ensuring operational effectiveness, which requires cooperation and a balance between technical and relational work:

... [W]e created what we called the Goat River Forestry Forum which expanded to the Kootenay Lake Forestry Forum. What it was... a mechanism for the forest industry... to have... an affective dialogue because there were... multiple licensees, with multiple overlapping operations and the community was active on all areas of land down there and the Ktunaxa Council as a whole, had a lot of interest... Land and Resource Management Plan process... it was really always a struggle because we would create these planning tables and they would just go on and on and on and they just never focus on anything... people need deadlines, and they need focus, and you need to bring that kind of business... you’ve got a certain time... let’s integrate, but... we’re moving and doing something... that was a process that didn’t really work that well... when we’re looking after land it’s... important to understand that we’re not really looking after the land... we’re translating public expectations onto the land... land is complex and you have to translate those expectations onto land in a way that hopefully doesn’t cause irreparable damage and allows the land to continue to function and be healthy and sustain us... in the long term... it’s a bit of a failing... as they treated it much more of a technical, almost like an engineering job as opposed to a people job... we... are changing public policy to understand that and to reflect that, and to trust people more and to bring in more wisdom... And you need to be clear upfront that this is the expectation.

The purpose creates a collective focus that must include communications balancing technical
(work) and relational goals for best practice in intercultural communications that need to be accepted as expectations at the beginning of the process with all stakeholders for an inclusively diverse and effective dialogue to reach collaborative goals and innovative results.

The consequences of failing to engage in the dialogue that leads to clear and appropriate purpose can be dire, as John Kettle spoke to at length. Similar to Chris Luke, John Kettle spoke of the purpose involving the need to correct a past trespass onto Yaqan Nukiy land due to the lack of the proper legal structure recognized by the Federal government. It was a land use issue that was an absolute necessity to be resolved by the local government, yet he also spoke to an inclusive purpose that needed to be resolved for all communities involved:

O.K., let me preface this, if I can, my name is John Kettle, today is the 27th of February 2017. I’m doing this interview with Miss Hillary Elliott and, I want to preface this by saying that to the best of my knowledge, everything I’m about to say today, does not, contravene any issues, that I have dealt with in the past as an elected official or compromise any of the in-camera proceedings. It will all be public information, to the best that I can remember it... It happened out of necessity, for both parties... We did this because we were neighbours and we did it because we all live in the same community. We’re familiar with each other, our kids all go to the same schools, they play in the same hockey rinks... out of necessity we had to get along because it’s the only land fill in this area servicing all communities in our valley including the Lower Kootenay Band... the idea of having thousands of tons of waste sitting and smelling each day was the driver for our process on both sides... We [Regional District Central Kootenay] applied for lands around the land fill to protect it for the Regional District and also, to allow for compensation to the Band by purchasing
lands that they had below the land fill, which were being impacted by the Regional District…. we both knew the problems and we both knew the solutions.

The recognition of correcting a historical problem of trespassing and rectifying any adverse impacts to the Lower Kootenay Band’s land, structures an intercultural relationship balanced with a purpose that is respectful and inclusive, which recognizes all parties as equal, is essential for a successful intercultural consultation process. Ron Toyota also expressed the main purpose was the need for local government to resolve its own land use issue and come to an agreement with the Yaqan Nukiy to rectify negative impacts to their communities and the need to start a conversation to resolve those issues to also prevent issues arising in the future:

[R]eally, it’s about... the negotiations we were doing with the Creston Land Fill area...

One, how do we start a conversation to say we are interested in purchasing it, are they interested in selling it. Two, why? So, I think it’s really about why we started that conversation, is because... the fact that the, Lower Kootenay Band and their properties are adjacent... It would help, in the long term, making sure that the... land fill site, as it became full and once it had to be closed, and at the same time... are there issues with contamination or leaching or settling, or whatever that may be.

The recognition of mutual land issue concerns from a neighbour-to-neighbor perspective demonstrates a lack of hierarchies within the process and a strong inclusive purpose with the possibility of mutually beneficially outcomes for successful consultation.

Purpose-setting is also key to determining the type of considerations for the process needed for consultation. For example, in the numerous examples of land use consultation Wayne Stetski presented the purpose greatly affected the success of consultation:
The first large initiative was called Parks Plan ’90... to move the parks system forward and see at least 12% of British Columbia protected as provincial parks... Where we invited the public to come and present their perspective, either for or against, adding new parks... Second one I was involved in was the 1995 Land Use Plan... where, sectors were all invited to come and sit around at the table and some of us that worked with government were assigned to support them.... So, the role there was to provide them with good information that they could then use to argue for their particular sector around the table... I became Regional Manager for, they called it, the Environmental Stewardship Division. So, we started to look at how... to better incorporate First Nations into what we were doing... just based on what was happening legally, you could see that, both from sort of a moral and an ethical perspective, but also from a legal perspective that we needed to be working much more closely with First Nations. In the end, all those court decisions stated that very clearly. So, then when I became Mayor... I had the opportunity through the Regional District of East Kootenay, and Central Kootenay... to represent municipal government at the Treaty table with the Ktunaxa, and so I volunteered to do that... when you’re doing a Treaty, you try and set up a new government.

The best practices and considerations in consultation and engagement for effective dialogue are demonstrated by past mistakes of positioning the purpose as “yes or no” versus other more successful purposes that allowed for diverse dialogue and opinions. The 1995 Land Use Plan purpose was based on best practices of inclusivity of all diverse stakeholders with the opportunity to voice their perspective. Lastly, the purpose of forming a “new government” through the purpose of creating a Treaty demonstrated a respectful relationship, nation-to-nation.


**Interpretation.** Each participant defined a purpose. However, they differed considerably, from very clearly defined purpose “to set aside at least 12% of British Columbia” for parks (Wayne Stetski), to having values, beliefs, and culture acknowledged, accepted, and realized in the outcomes (Chad Luke), which impacted the process and desired outcomes. The purpose in consultation to embrace diverse perspectives that are incorporated into the whole engagement process was explicitly and implicitly discussed by all participants as a reoccurring best practice. In short, before you embark on the journey, a clear understanding of why (the work process) and how you are traveling together (the relational process) must be collaboratively decided for inclusivity of diversity before packing the essentials to inclusively decide where to go and how to get there.

**Packing the Essentials**

Once the purpose for the journey has been identified, packing the essentials for your trip can begin: time, dedication, and knowledge. As a cyclical, reflexive, and flexible process, the purpose, and the essentials may change, be added to, or need to be re-evaluated along the way, however, understanding the need for these essentials allows for the ability to create a safe and effective journey that enables the arrival at the final destination to be realized.

**Time.** A journey takes time due to the various complex elements and unforeseen curves and pitstops that may occur. The importance of time was a strong re-occurring theme in relation to the process holistically for successful outcomes and in the context of other themes presented. The research participants spoke of the importance of time in the transcript excerpts that follow.

The expressions of time by Chad Luke spanned over decades and centuries of knowledge and experience that were influential on past, present, and future relationships:
I can say I have seen a lot of change, probably in the last, 10 years... I’ll go back to our creation story. How often did we talk about our creation story, fifty, sixty years ago? It was only once in awhile during special events, that we would get to hear the creation story of how we came about, how everything came about, and where were things started, and how everything started. And then, it’s because back then our People were getting more comfortable with sharing our culture, our traditions, and culture. The reason they had to get comfortable was because during the Indian Agent days... our traditional People, Elders, Storytellers, whatever you have, fluent speakers... would get arrested... and be put in jail... I don’t want to be talking about this topic or this issue in 20 years time when I’m 65. You know, 20 years, that’s not very far from now... Even though, back in the day, when my Dad was talking there about land rental and stuff like that, land leases, and everything else, the way that non-Native farmers would try and screw us over. You know, it’s sad. But, why did it get exposed? It got exposed for a reason. The government’s way of thinking was, you’ve seen it, and you’ve read it in books, about wanting to get rid of the Natives, get rid of the Indians, let’s get rid of them. You know, they wanted to make us extinct, as a group, tribe, whatever you want to call it. But, if you really look at it, we have been through hell and back for the last 80 years, like you won’t believe. In 80 years, all of this has happened, 80-100 years... But we have always said we are survivors and for a reason. And then it comes back to empowering, say, the young ones/weaker ones, I guess, with the Creation Story because if they see our Creation Story, it’s... three or four days long or something like that. From beginning to end.
Chris Luke also spoke to land issues spanning over almost a century that impacted relationships with government and like Chad Luke, also reflected that more recently the relationship had slightly improved:

And I was the leader then, the Chief, and today I am still not happy about that whole situation [a past land claim negotiation with the government]... I spent 36 years as the Chief of this community... they had until 1934 to 1984, a 50-year lease agreement...
when I got in it was 1970, the fall of 1970 I got in as the Chief and then January 1st I took the Oath of Office and at the same time I became the Administrator and I had to sign a contract. A five-year contract saying that once I started working, and I can’t leave the job until five years later, and if you’re happy and you know it [clapped his hands], carry on. And so, I was the Administrator and Manager for 22 years... we have gone from back then to now, the bottom line is that the government, not until about 15... give or take 20 years, let’s give the government that little bit of credit. For the last 20 years, they’ve been trying to do the reconciliation, not so much the accommodation, but more the reconciliation... in fact in all this there’s 2,365 acres that was cut off, that’s a lot of land. Which takes in the golf course, the airport, Fox Tree Hill, right down to the border [U.S.A. border]. So, [chuckling] when we come across the border, we say, eh, make sure you stoke the fire, keep the fire going, you’re on Ktunaxa land, Lower Kootenay Band land, [both interviewer and interviewee chuckling] take care of our fires for us [both chuckling].
The references to time by Garry Merkel go back centuries in relation to Indigenous traditional knowledge. However, he also spoke to the importance of taking the time needed to build a relationship within a group:

... he [an Indigenous colleague] was there, and I talked all the way through and he kind of insisted at the start that we do... a modification of a Round Dance... it’s the circle where you run into everybody at least once when you go around... And we went around twice, 120 people, and we only had... 15-20 minutes for introductions and purpose and... this thing took an hour and a half... [it involved] two questions... the first one required us to get to know each other a little bit and... why we were there. And the second one required exchange, and so by the time you got to the person the second time, you actually kind felt like you knew them a little bit... and it was hard to keep the line moving... It took a long time to get through that, and I am thinking... How are we going to get through this? Well, we adjusted the agenda all the way through and... the conversations were just incredible... and the depth of the conversation the second day – it was a two-day thing – I just couldn’t believe what we produced out of that. And it was really because of the way we started... And so yes you can build culture by modifying and enhancing and focusing the way people think and the way they interact over time and creating opportunities for that and creating structures that reflect that, but it doesn’t happen overnight. So, that’s what building relationships is all about, building structure, building understanding, spending time... So, the way I look at it, personally, is I like to work with people who... put the time in... And so, the engineer’s well, he just ran his Cat [construction machinery] over there and it disappeared. It turns out where he was running his Cat used to be an
old bog for a few hundred years, or a few thousand years, and you couldn’t tell until you drove over there and it disappeared... The important thing about that is, whether it’s First Nations or others who live on the land in an area, they know a lot of things if they’ve been there for a while that you will never be able to learn as a scientist or a casual observer about that land, about where the animals go, what they do, what’s there and all that history... The good thing about Indigenous people who still live on the land and know it, is that they have many, many generations of history that have come to the knowledge that, that individual standing in front of you, knows now. But I know way more about my territory [Tahltan] and I don’t even live on it, than a lot of people know, like outside. And I know people in our territory... I’m just an absolute infant compared to what they know and the detail that they know. Absolute infant, because they’ve lived on it their whole lives and they’ve heard all the stories from everybody else that’s lived on it their whole lives.

The knowledge gained through centuries allowed for wisdom differing from technology and science. The importance of traditional knowledge from Indigenous communities is an invaluable resource within land use consultation as it allows for greater creative problem-solving through diversity. Garry also noted that the amount of time spent on building relationships was important to incorporate as it saved time later in the process by encouraging inclusivity of all diverse voices early in the process and thus, created innovative solutions.

John Kettle referenced two decades with his relationship with the Yaqan Nukiy, the old landfill agreement, and local government land negotiations regarding the landfill site:
For the past 18 years, I have been involved with, in one way or another, the Lower Kootenay Band. And to some extent, the Ktunaxa-Kinbasket. I served as Chair of the Ktunaxa-Kinbasket Treaty Council for I believe around 8 years... I want to be perfectly clear here, I do not think that you can, in today’s society, solve problems that were created over a hundred years ago. The dynamics are outside the norm and the only way in my opinion they’re ever going to be resolved because of the changes in ownership, the changes in peoples’ lands and people that have accessed those lands and hold title to those lands through provincial and federal governments, is a compensation package that’s tied directly to the Treaty. It will be a compensation package that’s passed on to the Native Bands; and probably will not come from any local government negotiation...

As far as anything we did locally, and worked on locally, for 10 – 15 years it worked fine, but when we needed to make it official, for both parties, we had to go through the feds and that’s when it became much more complicated... It was doable. It took a long time and a lot of machinations.

Of interest here, is the length of time referenced by John Kettle, which was considerably shorter than the Indigenous participants, except for a general reference to historical colonial-Indigenous relations. Similarly, to John Kettle, Ron Toyota spoke in shorter spans of time and the added complexities of jurisdictional boundaries that made the journey longer. However, he also reflected on the time required for building relationships and creating collaborative land use plans:

It would help, in the long term, making sure that... the land fill site, as it became full and once it had to be closed, and at the same time... are there issues... And then you throw all
of those issues on the wall and 4 or 5 years later you come to an agreement... And... we’re still not done... So, it’s just not a, let’s shake hands and walk away type of thing. And it has taken many years... And of course, we didn’t have the property either [land that both parties decided on as a solution for the landfill issue], it was the BC government and we were dealing with the federal government. So, all of that results in many years, many years, and it just doesn’t go along nice tickity-boo. Trying to convene the players can take months... it’s a lot of back and forth, right, it’s taken a long time and we have come to an Agreement, more or less... we’re still working through some of the legal, survey, title, etc... I mean, all that took time... it just didn’t happen overnight... it was worked on before I became Mayor, and then I started in... January ’09 and we’re at ’17 now and we’re still not 100% done... it is a long, long process... there’s no such thing as a playbook that written and says check here and tick off and if you get there, go to the next step, it’s about building a relationship. And that took several years... we built a relationship and... several meetings from 2009 up until 2016... So, and it’s about building a relationship takes time, it just takes time. And you can’t rush things... I’d like to think that it is something that both parties worked at, it wasn’t just one-sided... And it’s the fact that... in theory, all of the land was theirs at one time... it comes right back to that, you just giving back to us what we had in the beginning or should have... but you have to work with that whole philosophy that... history is different than what the present is. The present is, we are dealing with the individuals, or the different groups that exist here, today... So, we have... a... plan... it would involve Lower Kootenay Band because we want them to do some planning and some of their heritage and things of that nature...
It’s a long term, it’s probably 3-5 year down the road… but it’s not off the ground and it’s like anything... it takes some time... it’s in the strategic plan down the road.

Ron Toyota also differentiated between historical impacts and present decision-making, and the longer time frames needed to arrive at consensus on a final destination, especially when involving other levels of government. However, similarly to Garry Merkel, Ron Toyota also emphasized the need to take time to build a relationship and that, like the process, can take years.

The expressions of time by Wayne Stetski spanned approximately two decades, and involved much smaller chunks of time ranging from about one to three years:

I had the opportunity through the Regional District of East Kootenay, and Central Kootenay... to represent municipal government at the Treaty table with the Ktunaxa... and so spent 3 years, 3 days a month, when I could make it, at the Treaty table... at UBCM, and the City of Vancouver had just signed onto a year of reconciliation with First Nations. So, I came back here and... I put forward a motion at City Council [Cranbrook], which was approved, that we would engage in a year of reconciliation with the Ktunaxa... and then I was no longer Mayor, so we didn’t ever conclude that discussion... Second one [land use consultation] I was involved in was the... 1995 Kootenay-Boundary Land Use Plan... later on, I became the Chair of the Interagency Management Committee over-seeing the implementation of the 1995 land use plan... I think it was ’97, I don’t quite remember... I became Chair for two years of the Interagency Management Committee overseeing the implementation of the plan.

Through his experiences in local, provincial, and presently the federal government the reference to time is notably shorter than the Indigenous participants.
**Interpretation.** Participants spoke of time in stark differences in the examples above: the expansion of time, the value of time, how length (a long time) is defined, and the meaning and value of history in relation to the present, especially in relation to decision-making, allowing for rich insights from the diverse perspectives.

The negative impacts of colonialism are starkly present in Chad Luke’s interview and demonstrate an explicit impact it had and still has on relationships for the Yaqan Nukiy. Having traditional knowledge and ways of knowing acknowledged and having the ability to share that knowledge and ways of knowing was perceived as a positive change. Chad Luke’s references to time reflect the necessity to acknowledge traditional knowledge and ways of knowing, and historical relationships for successful consultation processes now and into the future. The negative impacts of colonialism span over a century revolving around different land use issues that impact the Indigenous relationship with Canadian government. However, by acknowledging the past impacts of colonialism and land negations that recognize traditional land use of the Yaqan Nukiy, reflect the importance of historical acknowledgement of colonial impacts and acceptance of traditional knowledge and ways of knowing as an important element for successful consultation.

The sub-themes of time were: the importance of recognizing cultural diversity regarding knowledge and understanding of time, the need for time to be understood in terms of years for the development of relationships and the completion of the entire consultation process, and dedication to the time required for completion of the process. A meaningful journey takes time and needs dedicated participants that embrace cultural diversity.
Dedication. The need for commitment by all participants to the overall journey, from the purpose, to final outcomes was an important aspect of the participants’ discussion for a successful consultation process. Due to the length of time of the process, time needed for the development of relationships, and the complexity of the process, the stakeholders need to be dedicated to completing the full consultation process to realize successful outcomes. To provide the rich diversity of the underlying meanings and explicit expressions in the interview data, the following excerpts from the participants are provided to capture the context and intercultural expressions of this theme.

Chad Luke spoke of how including Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing in decisions that affected his community required stakeholders to acknowledge the need for cultural awareness, and dedicate the time and resources to complete the journey:

*We have the Columbia River Treaty that’s non-existent right now and it’s an important waterway for our People because at one point in time there was salmon all up through here... the Columbia River Treaty is a huge topic... we were involved right away because we were one... of roughly 32 tribes/communities that are involved or affected one way or another by the Columbia River... We’ve been dealing with that caribou issue, the Selkirk caribou’s... it’s such a touchy subject because they are blaming one animal, which is the wolves. Wolves are getting the majority of the blame, but you know, those caribou have to share a territory with moose, elk, deer, bears, cougars, all the other animals that feed off of that same territory. But who gets the blame? So, it’s a touchy subject... I will be 45 this year, and when I was like, 16-18 my Dad was talking about issues like this, and I*
It requires dedication to the process from the start to finish: a clear purpose for consultation that allows for culturally diverse perspectives and respectful inclusive dialogue, the time needed to accomplish the goals, and commitment to follow through with collaborative solutions, for the goals of the journey to be realized successfully.

The dedication that Chris Luke spoke of was also in regard to his commitment to the Yaqan Nukiy traditions and having a voice and autonomy for sustainability into the future:

Now is that considered successful. I guess it would be, by the general public, right? They would say, “Oh ya, they were successful, you got paid, and land claims,” and stuff like that. I would have to challenge something like that because even though... we... took the footsteps... from point A to point B... I didn’t feel that it was positive, as far as the word positive goes because I kept on throwing the idea of land in exchange... It’s something we have been talking about for a long time. If we can own a big part of the mountain, whatever, and we’ve got all these animals so that we can get our game, why not?... that’s all part of sustenance. And I have always seen it that way and I’m old-school because that’s how I was brought up. You know, old-school, you go and get your game and that’s what feeds you.

Dedication to cultural values and traditions influenced the definition of success; in light of the various subjective commitments of each of the consultation stakeholder participants and the governments they represent, it requires dedication from all participants to create collaborative
solutions that work for all stakeholders in a respectful and meaningful way for a positive journey together.

Garry Merkel states the importance of dedication in facing the challenging and complex nature of a successful consultation:

_Haida, the Reconciliation Agreement, they still really haven’t implemented that effectively because there turns out to be a lot of warts and pimples in making that work on all sides. It’s not just a simple thing… they settled on paper, Haida are very pragmatic people and they’re working to build the infrastructure, the province is committed to making it work and their working to figure it out... and it’s gotten better... But it wasn’t easy [his emphasis]... So, the way I look at it, personally, is I like to work with people who are committed to the job... and [put] the effort in to learn everybody else and learn the job and be effective and meaningful participants and contributors. And uh, if you are willing to do that, then maybe we can have a relationship and we need to create some space for that to happen, too. ... You have to have a certain mental, thinking involved here, where people are committed to doing that job..._

For a successful journey, all stakeholders must be committed to building relationships, learning the knowledge required, and dedicating the time and space needed to complete the intercultural journey.

John Kettle’s commitment to consultation was motivated by local government needing to find solutions to an issue, but also included the dedication to building an inclusive community:

_It happened out of necessity, for both parties... We did this because we were neighbours and we did it because we all live in the same community. We’re familiar with each other,
our kids all go to the same schools, they play in the same hockey rinks, and so, out of necessity we had to get along because it’s the only land fill in this area servicing all communities in our valley including the LKB… we both knew the problems and we both knew the solutions. We worked towards those as best we could… We were able to work locally through our differences... we did the best we could with what we had to work with... Best thing to do in my opinion is if there’s a problem, deal [emphasis his] with it...

If it’s mutually beneficial why wouldn’t you do it? And why wouldn’t they do it? They will. And so will you.

The importance of resolving land issues and concerns for the people, in a way that was inclusive of Indigenous and non-Indigenous community members, was as important as the local governments’ corporate goals to mitigate current and potential legal land use issues. For Ron Toyota, the complexity of the process and the time it took was challenging and required dedication to build relationships and to complete the process collaboratively:

And then, of course, is it a negotiation whether it’s money, or a land swaps, or things of that nature, and then you just go down the whole path... the criteria is very strict and then it’s involving a lot of different bodies, at different levels of government: federal, provincial, the Indian Nation... And it has taken many years and it is a very big process. I think the process is big because it involves a lot of things. It’s not just the land, and it’s not just money, and we’ve got to look at the whole thing about preservation of community and one of the things, I think as we got into it and started to really understand each other; one of the properties that we felt would be pleasing to them was on Kootenay Lake and that’s where their heritage is, initially, way, way, back... I’d like to think that it is
something that both parties worked at, it wasn’t just one-sided and uh, it’s taken a while... it’s a two-way street... it had to have involvement by all parties and I think there was a desire to work with it. There wasn’t any players that said, no, forget it... it’s about the relationship and having them in the room and working and it takes time...

A commitment to working collaboratively for mutually beneficial outcomes required dedication to building a genuine relationship based on trust and respect for a successful journey that everyone can appreciate. The dedication to intercultural communication best practices and the outcomes was also a predominant factor for success in Wayne Stetski’s narrative:

What made that process successful in the end was that government, provincial government, at the time was committed to making it happen... Otherwise it wouldn’t have happened, quite frankly... I became Regional Manager for... the Environmental Stewardship Division. So, we started to look at how... to better incorporate First Nations into what we were doing... we ended up with basically establishing Memorandums of Understanding on a shared approach to provincial parks and to the management of fish and wildlife in the region. Which was relatively new for governments, at the time. Also, we agreed... to add the Ktunaxa word for white swan onto our big sign on the highway. I won’t ever forget the discussion I had with our Director in Victoria, who said, “Who gave you the authority to do that.” And I said, “It’s the right thing to do, and we’re going to do it.” And it was really important to the Ktunaxa because it was the first time that sort of their naming had been celebrated in a very public way... Canada signed on... to the AICHI targets, which is an international agreement. That international agreement says that by 2020, all the countries that signed the agreement would set aside a minimum
of 17% of their land, and 10% of their marine waters for protection, by 2020. Which is not too far away... So, and we are currently at about 10% of land and 1% of marine. So, there’s a far bit of work to do over the next 3 years... But, this Committee is working together, just incredibly well. I use it as a model for how Committees should work because the people that are on this Committee are committed to the objective.

In this and other participant’s interviews, a consistent theme is dedication to cooperatively following through on a mutual purpose and embracing diverse perspectives that are reflected in the final outcomes as requirements for a safe and productive journey.

**Interpretation.** Through the dedication of relationships and finding a meaningful, mutually beneficial solution to an issue, the journey can be a success through balancing relational with work goals. The more culturally diverse the working group, the more challenging it is to achieve effective communications; however, the group is more likely to achieve relational and work effectiveness the more the group utilizes effective communication processes (Oetzel, 2005), such as cultural competency (Tobin, et al., 2010), and an ethical space (Ermine, 2007) for intercultural engagement. Consultation requires a commitment by all participants to dedicate the required amount of time on a monthly or yearly basis, and more importantly the years it may take to come to the final destination. It takes dedication to engage in intercultural communications for negotiating diverse perspectives into collaborative outcomes (Ermine, 2007; Oetzel, 2005) that all parties can embrace. Everyone must be dedicated to each aspect of the long journey to create meaningful relationships to overcome the inevitable bumps and curves of the journey’s work.

**Knowledge.** This theme encompasses the process holistically, as well as the themes individually, touching on all aspects of the journey model: time, dedication, relationship,
collaboration, mutual benefits, and the final destination. Most importantly, the intercultural consideration of the ontology and epistemology of knowledge is also discussed.

Chad Luke spoke of the Yaqan Nukiy, their traditional knowledge, the willingness to share that knowledge, and Canadian government starting to recognize their knowledge:

... are acknowledging the fact that we utilized the territories... our People were getting more comfortable with sharing our culture, our traditions, and culture... and believe it or not, it raises eyebrows of that government representative or federal representative, thinking, I know that area you are talking about, and it’s being talked about in a story...
And how structures, how the terrain is visually talked about and described through our story, the Creation Story. So, with the Creation Story being told more and more and people are understanding of more and more and knowing... I look at everything holistically whenever I talk about land and how one thing affects one thing and it’s not just about water, it’s not just about the land, it’s not just about animals, it’s about all the living things within it and that’s one of the biggest things we talk about today. It’s all living things... Who looks after who? That’s the big question. People like to think that we look after the land. Well, first and foremost the land looks after us, otherwise we won’t be here.

However, this recognition of knowledge and ways of knowing is recent as Chad Luke’s father, Chris Luke had an understanding and knowledge of the Canadian government, structures, and language that was not always reciprocated in the following passages:

... And if you are going to ask me about reconciliation, I would say no there really
wasn’t. Accommodation? No. It was, we got paid off in cash, and that was the end of the
day… So, when you want to talk about reconciliation, accommodation, no, it’s not
successful… I got in it was 1970, the fall of 1970 I got in as the Chief and then January
1st I took the Oath of Office and at the same time I became the Administrator and I had to
sign a contract. A five-year contract… And so, I was the Administrator and Manager for
22 years. In the meantime, my shirt was being the Chief… So, can you imagine just for a
second, Chris the Administrator talking to Chris the Chief, talking myself into things… I
have had to do that a few times, like sit at the table. Have a piece of paper here, and
another piece of paper here. Here’s the question, and here’s the answer. Right? Chief.
Administrator. The Administrator asks a question, and the Chief would answer over on
this side. Ya, so, I spent a lot of time doing that, 22 years of it… And if I were to ask the
government about anything in regards to land and whatnot I think I would be asking for
properties where it is pristine, wood pristine, and I would lock that in. Right? And lock
that in and that it be made park, parks, I would like to see that… I would sooner see this,
the reconciliation/accommodation, taking back what was once Ktunaxa, O.K., within the
territory, as a part from the Treaty because you have to give up rights, ya know what I
am saying… Would you give up your hunting right, land right, you would even be taxed
for crown land… No, of course not.

For the journey to be a success, understanding process is important but, reciprocal understanding
and knowledge based on a meaningful relationship allows for solutions to be created for
everyone to consider the journey successful.
Knowledge about the actors involved in a consultation also came to the fore. Garry Merkel spoke of the importance of knowing all the appropriate stakeholders to be involved at the beginning of the process, and knowing when new participants need to be invited as the process evolves. Understanding the process and various jurisdictional options creates a better understanding of how to accomplish possible solutions. Knowledge of the other participants from a cultural, jurisdictional, and even a personal perspective is beneficial for success:

... I’ll call it stakeholder engagement land use planning... the forest industry... local Ktunaxa community, Yaqan Nukiy... the Ktunaxa/Kinbasket Tribal Council... multiple licensees, with multiple overlapping operations... the community was active on all areas of land down there... We did bring in the odd mining interest, once in a while, just to kind of make sure that there was... no conflicts... And so, ideally, we try to find all the groups... It needs to be an informed and effective dialogue... you need informed participants, you need people who know everybody else at the table and what they’re interested in, you need to know they’re world, you need to know the regulatory world that you are working in, you especially need to know the constraints that you are working with, and who can over-ride what you are doing, and where you have to take direction, and where you can’t give direction... and you need to know it in reasonably good detail. You need to know the working environment in very good detail, every person at that table needs to know that but, you also need to know the broader regulatory environment to a certain amount, and about the land that you are actually working on, there’s a huge education process in any planning process... We have much more capacity than the province in this area, we have way more information, way more people, way more
understanding of the land, way more understanding of the cultural resources in the area, etc. So, we’re looking at that.

The journey may start with a particular purpose that involves certain participants on an on-going basis, but as the journey progresses, a friend might request a ride part of the way that is of particular interest to them. It is not necessary for them to travel the full journey, but their knowledge and participation could avoid uncomfortable bumps on the road or assist in avoiding unforeseen road-blocks. Understanding arrived at by creating a relationship with all stakeholders is vital knowledge for a safe and adventurous journey. All participants must be afforded the same information and be informed for effective and meaningful collaborative results.

The importance of knowing the unique structures for local government’s and Indigenous peoples’ communities by seeking knowledge through developing relationships with all participants is articulated in John Kettle’s next interview excerpts:

... hold title to those lands through provincial and federal governments... tied directly to the Treaty ... The province doesn’t really have any say-so, unless it partner’s up with the federal government... to make things official, we had to go through the Treaty process... locally, for 10 – 15 years it worked fine... when you don’t talk and you take actions whether intended or innocent that could be construed as adversarial, that problems may arise... Make sure in your zoning or land use guidelines that no historical sites exist on the property before development. Local government is in a kind of a catch-22 and needs to work through their regional districts and the province... It became a lot more convoluted, frankly, from [LKB] side; than it did from our side because they had other Bands they had to consult in the Treaty process... It depends on your sphere of
influence... I want to say part of the reason we succeeded was the help we got from the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs and from the province. They were on board from day one and they helped guide this process with the federal government, and assisted us on the process heavily. Without their help, we’d probably be still in some sort of negotiation...

Minister John Rustad... I have to tell you that none of this would have happened without the guidance and leadership of Garry Merkel and Kathryn Teneese of the Treaty Council.

General knowledge of the process and jurisdictional authorities allows for the appropriate representation to be present at the right time. Being open to inviting or reaching out to different travellers along the journey helps in acquiring the road advisories and all the appropriate knowledge for a safe and successful route. It is also important to know fellow travellers, as some invited on the journey may have obligations with those not directly present on the journey, but could impact the route to the final destination. As a local government participant for the municipality, Ron Toyota was not always directly involved with every aspect of the process and noted that participation changes. However, similarly to John Kettle, his general knowledge of Canadian government structures and his knowledge of other participants gained through relationships is demonstrated in the following quotes:

... the player’s will change from time to time, as individuals move on... it had to have [emphasis his] involvement by all parties... I’m not sure about Health Authority and I’m not sure about ALR. Well, ALR would have been because of the other land that we were acquiring, so... And health, definitely, health is in involved because they’re involved with land fill sites and...licencing and permitting, they would have been involved at a different stage, definitely... there were a lot of different bodies... inviting them in and... you set off
five years ago and then you sort of had a very different picture by the end... it expanded, it evolved... They don’t have a lot, Lower Kootenay Band, the Nation, didn’t have a lot of lake property. This was an opportunity to work with that... I think the other one is about heritage as well, and history and heritage... It’s about recreation, it’s about trails, it’s about how can we help each other, so we are having discussions in several different capacities as to what is out there. And is it possible to do.

The knowledge that the process takes time and participants can change allows for opportunities to create strategies for over-coming changes, such as building new relationships based on the strength of those that remain.

The knowledge gained by Wayne Stetski from participating in different consultation models allowed for valuable lessons on best practices for consultation:

... was the end of that process, a number of the pro-park people came to me and said, “Wayne I can’t do this. I’ll send it to you, but I can’t stand up in front of this crowd, living in this community and tell them how much I want to see more parks set aside.”... we had set it up so that anybody could present a talk... without any accountability, at all. It was absolutely the poorest public process, I think, from a structural perspective, that I was ever involved in. When the Environment and the round table... came through the riding, they set it up so that there were panelists... and the panelists challenged any information that a speaker gave that they thought was nonsense and challenged them quite vigorously, at times... That is a much better way to run a public process than... no accountability for it. So, from that I learned, one of the principles of good public involvement and consultation is a process of accountability, should be there as part of the
process in some way... we invited the public to come and present their perspective...

sectors were all invited to come and sit around at the table... involve Aboriginal people and First Nations in managing... Provincial Parks... When I was regional manager there were times when I would almost count on the Ktunaxa to do the right thing around the environment... if government was heading in a questionable direction.

The valuable lessons learnt from past journeys allows for the creation of best practices. The structure of the consultation process greatly influenced the effectiveness of the consultation and the outcomes. Knowledge of different routes with an understanding of the various tools that exist for various mechanical problems along the journey allows for choosing the desired route with the best tools to solve any problems that may arise.

**Interpretation.** Knowledge of the process, jurisdictional representation, and of the participants themselves is important for effective, collaborative decision-making. Stakeholders need to be equipped with appropriate tools and the knowledge of how to use them to make the best decisions travelling along the journey together, as that is pivotal in creating a meaningful relationship, and being able to be productive as a group in finding mutually beneficial solutions. The relationships built allowed for an understanding of each other that was gained through knowledge by sharing information, which opened the door for innovative solutions outside the participants’ jurisdictional authority, and enabled the participants to seek the proper tools to ensure arrival at the collaboratively decided final destination.

Thus far, the emerging model offers the following consultation principles: it is essential for stakeholders to understand the time needed for the journey, to be dedicated to travelling the whole distance required, to have the proper work and relational knowledge, and be equipped
with intercultural communication tools for creation a safe and productive journey. Having “packed the essentials” it is important to know How to Create a Safe and Productive Journey, which includes: relationship, collaboration, jurisdiction, and mutual benefits.

Creating a Safe and Productive Journey

Once the essentials of time, dedication, and knowledge have been packed, the creation of a safe and productive journey requires meaningful relationships, collaborative dialogue, appropriate jurisdictional representation, and mutually beneficial outcomes.

**Relationship.** Participants expressed latent and explicit examples of the importance of understanding each other that included on-going efforts to build or maintain, trust, respect, develop personal and/or business relations, and even at times a deep connection with participants as neighbours, that enabled the process to continue through conflicts, differences, and challenges of varying nature.

The elements of relationship that Chad Luke spoke of were that of respect, trust, and hierarchies:

... But, I think, when it all does come down to talks, they [provincial, federal government] are hearing what we have to say, a lot more. But, saying and doing are two different things, still, though... And when it comes to land stuff I don’t like it when you have bureaucrats or higher-powered individuals that get influenced by contractors or whatever.

Similar to his son, Chris Luke spoke to the need for trust to be demonstrated through meaningful actions:
... I’m not happy and things could have looked a hell of a lot better had the government been a little bit more open and honest about the situation... I could be good friends with Justin Trudeau. In fact, I wrote to him, and he called me up... That was a good thing. He responded... And I was trying to get him to shake up the...this is before he got in...to shake up the [pause for reflection]... Justice Minister, and give him a good shake. And he did. So, personally I would say that, I would say that I got a response and I love that.

By feeling heard and respected through meaningful interactions, there was an opportunity to create a relationship. Indeed, over the course of Garry Merkel’s narrative, the importance of relationship was highlighted as one of the strongest best practices in all consultation processes:

...the most important thing is to foster some kind of relationship, an understanding and a knowing of each other. You don’t have to agree, but you have to be on terms where you can speak bluntly and directly about what’s going on in a way that doesn’t create instant defensiveness because of lack of understanding on the other participant’s part… So, it turned it from a, kind of a conflict to more of an human exercise, and it was clear as we got closer to the end of that, which I talked to people about and I talked to them about the fact that we are building a relationship here. This is the important part of all the work we do from this point forward. You know, a lot of the industry guys were, they weren’t a hundred percent sure of it when we first started, but they quickly converted once they saw the value of it because they started to understand other people a lot better and they understood the community a lot better and the next thing you know they could actually start to use, kind of, human tools instead of legal tools to solve problems and we could have real conversation, which was really valuable.
Relationships can help to avoid conflicts, misunderstandings, and even possible legal actions, while also creating mutually acceptable solutions. Similarly, John Kettle spoke passionately about the importance of relationship throughout the consultation process:

*I’ve known four Chiefs, now at the Lower Kootenay Band and dealt with them all personally and know them all personally, and their families... I involved the Lower Kootenay Band as not only employees, but people I sent to school and paid for, myself, so they could understand what we were trying to do with respect to the land fill... Know your neighbours... If it’s your neighbour, if they’re in the same community in the same area that you are in, it’s very easy for us to deal with our neighbours.... They want the same things for their kids and their families, as we do. There’s not an adversarial approach to this. So, to be inclusive, I think you have to talk to your neighbours. When you’re having open house meetings and you’re having discussions, invite the local Band leader or Council or go down and meet with them. Discuss what the community is doing and get their input. Nothing ever, nobody ever got hurt by talking. So, it’s when you don’t talk and you take actions whether intended or innocent that could be construed as adversarial, that problems may arise... So, I think the biggest thing to people that are trying to deal with their neighbours that are First Nations, is deal with them on the basis that they’re not different, that they are unique and approach everything from the standpoint of mutual respect. If you do that with bands, you will earn their respect... You can’t earn it by just talking, you have to actually show and do what you believe. You can’t just have an Aboriginal Day and dress up and pow wow dance and a week later, forget about it. They will understand that. That’s offensive. So, if they’re going to be a
part of your community, they’re part of your community. If they want to be separate, and they might want to be separate, then you deal with them on that basis of best practices. It’s their choice, not yours.

Local relationships were genuine and respectful, as Indigenous and non-Indigenous community members were valued equally within the context of an inclusive, greater community.

The significance of building a relationship was also important to Ron Toyota, who added a meaningful relationship went beyond the formalities of a business relationship:

... it's about building a relationship... we built a relationship and we did the formality part... they started a youth canoe trek... It wasn’t just the Natives themselves, it was the youth community of varying people ... they launched at Kuskanook at the south end of Kootenay Lake and then they came to our [the Mayor and his family’s] beach, our private home... and overnighted and set up camp and we then we provided them with a meal... the fact that we did sign an official MOU [Memorandum of Understanding] of Friendship, that’s sort of the formal or legal document that we did, and it had never been done before, so. It is... indirectly this is good stuff, new stuff, it hasn’t been happening, we like the relationship and we worked at it. Over the years Chief Louie has come to different functions whether it’s AKLBG, or local events or whatever, and he’s given Greetings, he’s given a prayer and he’s also given talks and he’s very good at it.

The importance of building a meaningful relationship went beyond business formalities to genuine personal interest and connections beyond the formal work goals. Similarly, for Wayne Stetski the idea of building relationships was not merely business obligations, but rather a moral sense that inclusivity will take you in the right direction:
I used to invite Sophie Pierre who was the Chief at the time, to come and talk to my Rangers staff about the history of the Ktunaxa in the area, the importance of some of the resources... we started to look at how to better incorporate First Nations into what we were doing... a shared approach to provincial parks and to the management of fish and wildlife in the region. Which was relatively new for governments, at the time... you could see that, both from sort of a moral and an ethical perspective... that we needed to be working much more closely with First Nations... so I volunteered to do that, with my personal interest... when I could make it, at the Treaty table... I always had a lot of respect for their environmental values, their ethics... from my perspective, I have a lot of faith in their land use ethics, their land use practices from an environmental perspective... You know, just like any kind of relationship, right? Trust is really, really, important and so, before you can move a lot of these models forward, people have to trust you... And ultimately you have to know that I will do what I say... that is key in any kind of relationship, whether it’s land use, or life, in the end... I became Mayor, and the former Mayor had a really good working relationship with the Chief of ʔaq’am... It’s everything from meaningful involvement, I always tried to make sure that every City event that I was involved in had an opening prayer from the Ktunaxa, would always start by recognizing the fact that we’re sharing the land here with the traditional territory of the Ktunaxa... So, there’s kind of a personal support element to it, as well, and people are getting better at that, municipalities are getting better at that... to me it’s a two-part process, but part of it is definitely personal. You have to build those personal relationships of trust and then, often, you can start talking about other more formal ways
to build on that relationship... You need to start with mutual trust and that has been missing for many, many years, in many parts of Canada. Building that trust, but once that's in place, it can lead to great things.

Trust is required for building and maintaining a relationship, whether is it a prescript or morally the right thing to do.

**Interpretation.** Building and maintaining a relationship can be achieved in numerous ways, but it must be built on trust and respect that accepts diversity, as it is the strongest catalyst for creating collaboratively innovative and successful outcomes that are mutually beneficial for a successful journey. The time it takes build a meaningful relationship built on respect and trust allows for the creation of collaborative solutions. It is important to take the time for relationships of equality to grow in order to learn how to work across cultural differences, because innovative solutions are not possible to achieve by working in isolation from each other. In fact, balancing a focus of land use agreement outcomes with relational goals allowed for a successful journey. Ultimately, creating a meaningful relationship based on inclusive diversity for collaborative solutions is the catalyst for innovative solutions specific to the needs of the journey.

**Collaboration.** The efforts of developing and maintaining a meaningful relationship allows for collaborative decision-making and successful mutually beneficial outcomes. Working together is necessary for participants to be engaged and feel their perspectives are not only heard, but have an impact on the solutions, which in turn reinforces and solidifies meaningful relationships, and creates the possibility for innovative outcomes. Collaboration is essential for a positive journey that everyone wants to embark on and remain in to the end.
In the next excerpts, Chad Luke discussed the importance of inclusive dialogue of diverse perspectives in working cooperatively:

... I go to tables now that I am involved with, and I will sit and the table and say... Some of our Storytellers can talk so, articulately about a certain area, and believe it or not, it raises eyebrows of that government representative or federal representative, thinking, I know that area you are talking about, and it’s being talked about in a story... Are we really going to act upon what is genuinely being talked about?

Alternatively, Chris Luke spoke to past experiences that were not inclusive providing an opportunity for learning from past mistakes:

... And when a Native Band comes knocking at their door, what do they usually do? They usually send you to other doors, right? Just as a distraction... And the next thing you know, you come back around, you’ve done full circle, so you go back and you knock on the same door, again. Oh, you haven’t tried that, and haven’t tried this, and, da da da, you know? You are going to have to go try again because we just don’t have it... But, that would be something. And I would say, “Thank you.” It’s something we have been talking about for a long time... Because in my time I really haven’t seen the positive side of the government. We have always had to sign on the dotted line, like, we’ll screw you on the dotted line. Sign here. And that’s basically how’s it’s been on two of the occasions.

The importance of respectful, inclusive intercultural communications for cooperative work is emphasized by this passage of a past journey. Although Garry Merkel’s story also spoke of inclusiveness, he elaborated further on the idea:
... looking after land is definitely a collective wisdom process ... but a lot of people treat it more like a conflict avoidance process, and if you’re in the business of land use and land use planning, conflict is inevitable, that’s just the way it is... O.K., I get what you’re talking about, I don’t agree with it necessarily, but I get what you’re talking about and hopefully moving more towards being able to talk about interests as opposed to positions ... being able to be respectful in conversations, and empathetic, I think would be exactly the right word. Like, O.K., I understand, I appreciate what you’re saying, it doesn’t mean I agree with it, but at least now we can have a kind of a respectful work getting somewhere, dialogue... “Like, are we ready to have positive dialogue and move on here?” It doesn’t mean we have to get along, or agree, but, we do have to work together. And you know, they spend enough time that they kind of learn to have professional disagreements, but they need to get something done for all of us.

Garry Merkel referred to the collective wisdom of diverse perspectives coming together to find innovative solutions and the importance of relationships to overcome differences that are inevitable while traveling together.

Just as John Kettle’s earlier passages presented a strong relationship, these next interview excerpts from his and other participants demonstrate the success in working collaboratively together was based on mutual purpose, goals, and a meaningful relationship:

*We successfully worked with the Lower Kootenay Band to arrive at a way that we could compensate them, for the access to our land fill, which was a Regional District land fill... we both knew the problems and we both knew the solutions. We worked towards those as best we could...*
Relationships allow for creating an understanding of how to work cooperatively on the journey. From Ron Toyota’s passages below the success by a willingness to work cooperatively for mutually beneficial outcomes is demonstrated:

... it had to have involvement by all parties and I think there was a desire to work with it. There wasn’t any players that said, no, forget it. It was about once we started going down a road that this could be a, this could be the way we could package it, I think that the various parties, they’re going to be very protective of what they have and make sure that the process is there and they have to be careful with precedents and anything else that may go along. But I think all the parties were willing to explore it, try and open the door more or at least “a heads up” on what the issue might be and then try and find solutions.

The sharing knowledge and information of each participant’s jurisdictional boundaries, and the meaningful relationship created space and time for collaboration. Once again, the successes of diverse perspectives working together shared by Wayne Stetski emphasized the power of collaboration for successful consultation processes:

I thought that was a good process, people were absolutely given the opportunity to present their views, there was always a chair left empty around the table, the table probably had about 20 different sectors represented, with support people... and one chair was always left vacant for the voiceless... somebody... could move into that vacant chair and speak on behalf of whatever the value was that they didn’t think was being appropriately represented... the 1995 land use... the process was really good, it really did pull together all the different sectors, they all had a say, they all had an opportunity to give input... there was a great deal of support there to move these AICHI targets
forward by creating a network... Any land use planning in the future needs to, first and foremost, deeply involve First Nations in the area, and communities in the area, and it has to be meaningful consultation. Not just, we will hold a meeting and do whatever we want, which some might argue has been a bit of a tradition for governments in the past...

Land could potentially be a part of it, but there potentially might be other ways, employment, priority of employment, different kinds of economic relationships, potentially, could be developed.

Working with diverse perspectives that balance relational and task goals based on cooperation, allows for successful intercultural communications.

**Interpretation.** Being able to function as an inclusive group is paramount for making collaborative decisions when traveling together. There needs to be time and space created for effective working relationships to develop to allow for a collaborative process to be realized in intercultural communications. Creating a journey in which everyone feels their interests and values are acted upon is essential to the cooperative consultation process. Collaboration requires the elimination of hierarchies, allowing for everyone’s voice to be heard and respected as equal participants in the process, which can then lead to innovative solutions otherwise unrealized. However, for the outcomes of the journey to be realized, the appropriate jurisdictional authority needs to be along for the ride.

**Jurisdiction.** Only the driver is in control of the direction of the vehicle for the journey. Knowing who is in the driver’s seat is the only way to request changes in the direction of the route. Making decisions about where to go that cannot be act upon by the participants need to be addressed by the proper authority. As the process evolves and solutions are created, the
participants may change over the course of the whole process due to the jurisdictional authority required for arrival at the final destination, emphasizing the cyclic nature of this model. The knowledge gained by informed participants regarding culture, parameters, rules, and regulations that the process is working within, along with the relationships developed, allows for inclusion of the appropriate authority to make the various decisions that may arise during land use consultation.

Chris Luke spoke of the nuances of jurisdictional decisions and the importance of knowing the parameters that individual representatives work within:

*And, I myself, was not the only one making the decision, you know, to either reject or accept... 80 – 85% of people [in the community] said yes. So, my hand was forced to sign on the dotted line. End of story... but I kept on getting the same old scenario from the government that no, we can’t do that, and we can’t because we can’t make it adjacent to the reservation. Well, that shouldn’t have mattered.*

Cultural knowledge regarding decision-making is an important aspect of jurisdictional authority. As Chief, Chris Luke was the representative for the process, but had cultural obligations for making the final decision. Alternatively, the government stated boundaries that they worked in.

*Alternatively, Chad Luke spoke to the changes or lack there of, in recognition of Indigenous jurisdictions in land use consultations and decision-making. He also expressed a concern regarding jurisdictional solutions to land use issues:*

*Government’s starting to acknowledge that O.K., you guys, you First Nations, regardless of what First Nations they are dealing with, are acknowledging the fact that we utilized*
the territories. Not just vicinities, or township’s area, or whatever, it’s the territory in
genral... I don’t like it when they try to play God and that’s a big thing is when you’ve
got people trying to play God and trying to dictate how things are going live and how
things are going to survive or die. We’ve been dealing with that caribou issue, the Selkirk
caribou’s, you know, it’s such a touchy subject because they are blaming one animal,
which is the wolves.

Although there are indications that intercultural communication is improving, the tensions of
intercultural communication depicted in the raw data regarding jurisdictional authority reflect an
opportunity to learn more from this field and its best practices.

In the following passages, Garry Merkel spoke to the complex jurisdictional roles that
Indigenous peoples may have in a shared decision-making process with Canadian governments:

...delegated authority... we might have as an Aboriginal group, and others can have the
same ones, but it’s probably more afforded to Aboriginal groups than it is to other
groups because we have a, I’ll say loosely, a shared decision-making role with the
province and federal government. Although, they have jurisdiction still, we still kind of
work together closely, and local government, too. ... a delegated relationship where we
might build an infrastructure, and actually assume a responsibility for land management
... under a specific umbrella, under provincial legislation or federal legislation... there
are a few tribes who have... delegated authority to administer the Fisheries Act and
particularly for their own People, for Canada, but they can do it for others, too...

essentially an extension of the enforcement arm for the DFO... we are looking at taking
over cultural heritage resource and archeology management in this territory, we are still
at a design level... but it is definitely one of our priorities... In the Yukon, First Nations took over fire control as a delegated authority... In here [referring to the Ktunaxa Government building in Cranbrook], where the delegated authority for Child and Family Services, we administer all Child and Family Services for all Aboriginal people in the whole community and region out of our Child and Family Services office. So, that’s a delegated authority model. And then the last kind of model would be a statutory model, where you have some entity, actually replaces the statutory decision-maker and the province holds firm on... the fact that it cannot create a third order of government and it can’t give away its jurisdiction because their jurisdiction of the province is laid out in the Natural Resource Transfer Acts and in the Constitution and the division of powers and it doesn’t allow for creating brand new levels of government and giving them their jurisdiction. They can create any kind of sub-set of themselves... the statutory model, the case of... the Haida Reconciliation Agreement, I think it’s called, they’ve created a panel with two Haida, two province, and one independent mutually agreed on Chair, all members get a vote, and they replace the statutory decision-maker for land use planning... So, they replace the Chief Forrester and the Minister of Environment.

Jurisdictional roles vary within Indigenous communities and across the levels of Canadian government. The importance of understanding the opportunities of what is possible and who those options apply to are important to finding innovative solutions that can be acted upon.

John Kettle discussed the jurisdictional limitations of local government:

An informal lease is one between the band and a party and is not signed off on by the federal Indian Affairs or sanctioned by them... Informal leases are only worth the paper
they are printed on because the only real authority, when it comes to Indian lands, is the federal government... the only real authority, when it comes to Indian lands, is the federal government which holds all lands in trust for bands under the Federal Indian Act.
The genesis for everything that we’re trying to do with local bands goes back to the Indian Act... In order to affect a change in title or in order to affect a transfer of properties we had to involve federal and provincial Indian Affairs in the negotiation.
Frankly, once we did, I believe they saw the fact that we had this successful agreement going on for a long time. I think it helped work it through the process.

The need for knowledge regarding jurisdictional authorities and applicable boundaries are vital to the arrival at the final destination successfully. However, local relationships were important for forging success with other jurisdictions. Similarly, to John Kettle, Ron Toyota spoke of the limitations of local government jurisdictional authority in the decision-making process:

And we are only, we were only a partial player in this. I mean it is the, primarily the RDCK and it was to do with land fill land, etc. and the Town of Creston is a participant in the Regional District of Central Kootenay, but we’re not the major player, majority player or anything else. We’re one of the players and that’s another part of the process that you have to appreciate. It’s not like when I ran my own business, if I could make a decision, it was on my head.

The need for local governments to understand their jurisdictional relationship with provincial and federal government is important in finding the proper authority to achieve the goals that may arise along the journey. Wayne Stetski commented on the limited jurisdictional opportunities and guidance for local governments working with Indigenous communities and land use consultation,
he spoke to the connection between authority and meaningful relationships, and the need for Indigenous peoples to be more involved with different jurisdictional authorities:

... I put forward a motion at City Council, which was approved, that we would engage in a year of reconciliation with the Ktunaxa... the Truth and Reconciliation Report which has a fair number, it’s 97 really good recommendations... on a federal level. But what does reconciliation look like for communities, locally... Municipalities still don’t have a clear approach to consultation with First Nations... Municipalities hold some land, but not a lot, generally... If it involved provincial land, the expectation was that the province would do the consultation... not the municipality... when I became Mayor, there were some agreements already in place between the City of Cranbrook and Ktunaxa, which we continued to value... So, those agreements [MOU’s created as Regional Manager for Parks in East Kootenay] actually worked fairly well, they were sort of pre-treaty sort of agreements, but that got swallowed up into a larger agreement a couple of years later [an Aboriginal Affairs process]... as a Member of Parliament, I am sitting on the Environment Committee for our study on parks and protected areas [for the AICHI targets] a great deal of interest, and they see it as both reconciliation and as conservation to set up a network of Aboriginal protected areas, Aboriginal parks... there was a great deal of support there to move these AICHI targets forward by creating a network of Aboriginal parks and protected areas. Now, they would obviously have traditional rights within those protected areas... just based on what was happening legally, you could see that... from a legal perspective that we needed to be working much more closely with First Nations... when you think of all the regulations and policies in place between
municipal governments, provincial governments, and federal governments, and you are trying to put together a Treaty so that you become your own government... I wasn’t a major player [in the Treaty process]... I was there as sort of a sub-set of the province, as municipalities are... as I say, became a real fan of Treaties because land certainty is so important moving forward. And we heard a number of times... one federal government organization that participates in a lot of these things and that is always their final answer, they don’t have the authority to agree to that... they just lose all trust... so, it’s another important principle around land use decisions. You know, don’t send somebody there that does not have the full authority to make decisions.

Stetski and others made clear Jurisdictional opportunities for local governments to engage in land use consultation is limited in comparison to other stakeholders. Through building relationships and working with other jurisdictions collaboratively, these jurisdictional challenges can be overcome. Jurisdiction can affect relationships, especially if they are used to create or reinforce hierarchies. It is the knowledge about jurisdictional authorities and working cooperatively according to your route that leads to a bump-free journey.

**Interpretation.** Along the way of the local land use consultation journey, making commitments in the process must be within your jurisdiction, or representation that has the authority must be invited on the journey at the appropriate pit-stop to avoid negatively impacting relationships or the final destination. The diversity of the participants’ experiences demonstrates how varied are the considerations that need to be brought to the question of how intercultural consultation is at the local government level. Since jurisdictional land decisions for the Lower Kootenay Band are only through those legislative bodies with legal authority to do so, combined
with the purpose of who is approaching whom in the consultation process, both Chad Luke and Chris Luke did not directly speak to stakeholders other than provincial and federal governments.

**Mutual benefit.** The process of creating a meaningful relationship by attending to mutual respect and trust through genuine demonstrative actions, consequentially allows for collaborative dialogue for mutually beneficial solutions. The journey can only be successfully completed, if everyone is agreeable to the definition of the final destination.

Chad Luke spoke about the creation of mutually beneficial outcomes being more than listening to different points of view, but to collaboratively create solutions that everyone can accept:

> But, saying and doing are two different things, still, though. What they do with the information they get, when it comes to dealing with land issues, is another thing.

Listening to everyone’s ideas is not enough, the final journey must be a decision that is acceptable by the diverse perspectives of all the stakeholders (Ermine, 2007).

The importance that Chris Luke spoke to for reaching a mutually beneficial outcome was to understand what success means for everyone:

> I believe if we would have been successful in an exchange over cash, or it could have been an exchange and then cash, I would have said, “Ya.” Now that is a successful story.

> But as it came down to, I didn’t see us as receiving the cash as a win-win situation.

To create mutually beneficial solutions, knowledge of what is important to all participants, their reasons for participating in the journey, and their desired goals must be taken into consideration for the final decision of where the destination ends.
By building a meaningful relationship, Garry Merkel spoke to the natural progression of the creation of solutions that were beneficial to all stakeholders:

And the more of that stuff you fix early the more engagement and ownership and goodwill that your building. And so, it becomes after a while, it becomes a mutual exercise and especially when you create it so that they have a vested interest in the end of this particular thing happening... what’s your stake in this? ... and it’s better if you have a vested interest, and that we have a mutual vested interest to making this work.

The importance of meaningful relationships allows for cooperation and collaboration, with mutually invested interests to the final destination for solutions to be created that are mutually beneficial. To wit, from John Kettle’s perspective, it was the mutually beneficial outcomes created through meaningful relationships that created a successful process, as well:

Mutual benefit. Before it became official through Indian Affairs we both had the benefit of a working understanding. When both parties benefit it’s a good deal... Originally, we believed that having a Buckshee agreement allowed us to continue for the benefit of all parties. We tried to deal and fix the problems at the local level and we were successful on that for many years... If it’s mutually beneficial why wouldn’t you do it? And why wouldn’t they do it? They will. And so will you.

A meaningful relationship sets the journey on a mutually beneficial route. Ron Toyota also emphasized the importance of relationship and knowing the participants for collaboratively finding mutually beneficial solutions:

Well, it’s a two-way street, I mean it can’t be just a one-sided Agreement. We all like to think that we are getting what we want... but in this case... we RDCK had to do and
acquire the land we wanted to acquire, their side was to say, ya, we’re willing to work on that. I think the other one is about heritage as well, and history and heritage.

Local government did not have the jurisdiction to authorize the mutually beneficial final destination, but it was a combination of local relationships, collaborative dialogue, and mutual support that enabled the knowledge of representation needed to complete the journey, to be invited into the process for a successful journey. Wayne Stetski echoed this focus on relationships, inclusivity, and collaboration for outcomes that were agreeable to everyone as necessary for success: “The future is meaningful consultation, partnerships wherever we can, with both First Nations and communities, to move land use planning forward. It won’t happen unless it is done that way...”. Through respectful and inclusive consultation, collaborative solutions that benefit all stakeholders can be the final destination.

**Interpretation.** The findings presented in this section of mutual benefit provide another important piece of the engagement model that is vital for successful consultations. Keeping the outcomes of mutual benefits at the forefront during consultation design, process, and the final destination is a key factor in ensuring a lasting effect and all-participant buy-in for the success of the final destination.

**Preparation for Destination**

So far on the journey, the purpose of engagement has been clearly defined and incorporates collaborative and inclusive decision-making processes void of hierarchies with all appropriate stakeholders, a commitment to the time and dedication required for the process has been accepted and participants are knowledgeable in all aspects of the consultation. A safe and productive journey has been established through relationships built respectfully on trust with
intercultural best practices, and solutions have been collaboratively created for mutually beneficial outcomes with all necessary jurisdictions part of the process. As the journey comes to an end, preparation of the final details before everyone goes their separate ways allows for the creation of lasting, positive memories that everyone can enjoy.

**Final destination.** There is a need to ensure the proper tools within the appropriate jurisdiction are put in place for the outcomes to be fully realized, understood, and followed by all stakeholders. If you get a sudden flat tire along the home stretch to your final destination, it is important to have a spare tire and the proper tools, or to call for help, if required. In this vein, Garry Merkel spoke specifically to the importance of the last steps in the journey:

> ... as long as you know the rules, and you are clear and certain about the rules you can often find a way to make it work. You’ve just got to figure it out, you just have to be innovative and creative... and that’s the nature of the beast.

Collaboratively creating the mutually beneficial solutions allows for innovative outcomes. Ensuring that all the proper jurisdictional tools and the appropriate representatives are in place for the final destination is essential for success.

Using the right tool for the right job is imperative. Wayne Stetski’s story spoke of lessons learnt by using tools for the collaborative outcomes that merely suggested actions, rather than creating solutions that legally required actions:

> ... government sectors were charged with the responsibility of implementing plans...

> Within a couple of years, it became very evident that companies, particularly if they are always focused on their bottom-line, even though the plan suggested that they follow certain practices, would start to say, “Uh no, that’s just policy.” So, a number of the
elements, particularly related to forestry, had to be elevated through a higher use plan and made legal... Rather than policy, prescriptive; make it legal... the importance of legislation to help deliver... to make sure that industry was following what the intention was in that plan... I very much value, still, regulatory results from land use planning exercises... from my experience, I truly believe that you really need to put some of what’s going to happen into regulation if you want to make sure it’s going to happen, in the end... probably the largest lesson I learned out of the 1995 land use plan was the importance of legislation to help deliver... establishing Memorandums of Understanding on a shared approach to provincial parks and to the management of fish and wildlife in the region...

It is important to assess the desired outcomes of journey to understand if the final destination will reflect the intent and goals all participants agreed to, and deliver everyone safely to same destination.

Interpretation. Everyone needs to be held accountable for the decisions made on the journey, having the proper tools, and using them for lasting effects instead of a quick fix to get you back on your way is a way to ensure the successes created are lasting ones. The need to ensure all the proper tools are used for the final outcome (such as a treaty, legislation, or a Memorandum of Understanding [MOU]) was latently expressed, but sometimes over-looked explicitly in the participants’ stories on the long and complex journeys some of them traveled. If the outcomes must be followed, legally binding and legislative tools are required or conversely, if the solutions are non-prescriptive guidelines, then less formalized outcomes such as MOU’s,
and partnerships could serve as the appropriate tools. It is this framework that sets the appropriate grade and route for the road you will continue to collaboratively pave into the future.

Summary

The “Journey of Consultation” model (Figure 1) depicted above has arisen from the appreciative interviews conducting with leaders who have intimate knowledge and experience of local land use consultations. The model presents a framework for land use consultation between Indigenous peoples and local government participants that has applications beyond this jurisdictional level to industry and other levels of government. The diverse range of historical roles and experiences of the research participants in land use consultation created data that discussed a wide range of phenomenological experiences, demonstrating explicitly—such as the need for Indigenous peoples’ cultural values be included in the final outcomes—and latently—such as the cultural disparate view of time—how consultation and engagement in any situation is paradoxically unique on a case-by-case basis, yet offers transferability of best practices as a starting hypothesis of considerations for success in each unique situation (Rapley, 2014).

Discussion of Findings

Out of the theoretical principles from the research design, the participants’ narratives, and my interpretation of it, a “journey” narrative for guiding ethical, intercultural consultation emerged. In what follows, I discuss the Journey of Consultation model in the context of the extant research presented above in the literature review in aid of laying out the broad implications for government and industry of the research findings.

Building on current consultation processes for positive outcomes. It should be noted at the outset that the research process that allowed for the emergence of the “Journey of
Consultation Model” confirms the value that other researchers like Lind & Smith (2008) have found in taking strengths-based, communitarian approach to research; it also underscores Wilson’s (2007) articulation of the importance of relational knowledge-making as the basis of Indigenist research. The findings of this research reflect Oetzels’ (2005) emphasis on the importance of relationships in consultation and engagement processes and therefore, also reflects the intent of the TRC report and UNDRIP, but also adds applicable and practical applications for consultation with local government and Indigenous peoples. The conversations I had with Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants collectively produced design factors for consultations that are equitable, cooperative, and operate in a “positive way” aligning with Ermine’s (2007) “ethical space” for engagement, and the positive psychology theoretical principles of AI (Cooperrider, et al., 2008). Together, they form a model for successful intercultural consultations with Indigenous peoples and local governments, one with transferability (Rapley, 2014) to other consultation and engagement processes. The “Journey to Consultation” model presented above offers the over-arching themes in a series of three phases that set out the tools and best routes to be taken on a consultation journey based on the participants’ experiences.

Once the decision to make the journey has been accepted, everyone’s diverse perspectives need to be meaningfully integrated equally into the journey from the very start to the final destination (Ermine, 2007; Lind & Smith, 2008). Knowing the purpose of the consultation for engagement impacts considerations for decisions regarding process and the desired outcomes (Bowen, et al., 2010; Delannon, et al., 2016). Expectations for relational and work outcomes should be explicit and collaboratively created for planning the route in the up-
coming journey, reflecting Oetzel’s (2005) insight that work and relational goals should be equally valued for effective decision-making with intercultural workgroups. Once the decision to travel the journey together has been decided, it is time to pack the essentials. The findings of this research strongly reflect Ermine’s (2007) insights regarding the importance of building ethical relationships as a solution to overcome the challenges Oetzel (2005) raises of culturally diverse workgroups, such as a disparate worldview of time by the participants. The essential tools to bring along on the journey are: time, dedication, and knowledge.

The challenges of time should not be taken lightly, as they can impact the consultation. For example, the Indigenous participants explicitly and latently reference a much larger span of time and reference historical knowledge and/or context distinctly more than the non-Indigenous participants, inferring a possible intercultural communication difference that could be important in creating solutions for successful land consultation. Another demonstration of this worldview differentiation regarding time was a distinction between what had happened in the past, with decisions made in the present and future by local government participants, which differed from Indigenous participants. According to local government participants, the colonial decisions impacting Indigenous peoples in the past could not be rectified in the present or future by local governments due to lack of jurisdictional authority. The solution required involvement of the federal government, which creates greater complexity of process and therefore a greater amount of time to arrive at the final destination. Another consideration of the challenges of time is that some participants may move on to different positions, or may not be able to participate in the process. If participants change, the relational work is disrupted by a new participant and in order to create an “ethical space” within in the new workgroup, the new participant will need to
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develop a relationship with the remaining participants to continue with an ethical and inclusive process. This can be disruptive to the consultation workgroup in terms of seeming to stall the process; however, it is important to remember the cyclic nature of the model and return to a theme, as required, such as, when new participants are invited into the process for jurisdictional or other reasons.

To succeed in completing a successful journey, consultation participants must be committed to the process of the engagement to the final destination, but to also be committed to carrying out the amount of work and time needed for understanding the knowledge required for the process and to the time needed for building relationships. Garry Merkel and Ron Toyota strongly noted the importance of dedication to the consultation process due to the amount of time and work required for conducting the business, but also the time and work required for relational goals. This is reflective of Oeztel’s (2005) insight that work and relational goals take time and should be balanced equally, and Ermine (2007) does recognize the need for space and time to develop ethical relationships; however, the dedication of all participants required for the success of the consultation process is either not mentioned or not emphasized in the literature as an important communication factor for success (Oetzel, 2005).

Knowledge is a cultural construct and, historically, Canada’s governments have not recognized knowledge and ways of knowing from Indigenous cultures. Indigenous participants spoke of the need to not only recognize traditional knowledge in the process, but as part of the solutions. As Tobin et al., (2010) noted, dialogue that allows for diverse perspectives to be heard is paramount in the process that allows for inclusive and innovative results. To actually demonstrate the removal of hierarchies Ermine (2007) has stated from the consultation process,
the solutions it produces must also reflect the knowledge and traditional ways of knowing of the Indigenous participants. By collaboratively working with the diverse perspectives and subjective reflections of everyone riding along allows for innovative routes along the journey that otherwise would have been missed. Clearly then, knowledge equity is key to the success of a land use consultation.

Ensuring the new participants understand the collective purpose, are knowledgeable in the information and roles of all other participants, commit to the process holistically and to the importance of all stages/themes, in other words, these new participants must “catch up” with the group in the business and relational knowledge. The most important aspect of the relational work that was emphasized in the raw data, but not in the literature, is the time it takes to lay the groundwork for the shared meanings that constitute intercultural communication; in this case, what is required is time to identify and find some commensurabilities between two disparate worldviews to cooperatively produce new and innovative solutions to land use issues. This is precisely the goal of ethical engagement and it is in the work of making space and time for subjective reflection (Ermine, 2007) that can surface the differential cultural meanings (Oetzel, 2005) about time that consultation participants bring to their work. Therefore, what was apparent from this analysis was the necessity of understanding what success, land, and other key terms means for each participant in consideration of disparate worldviews, to come to a shared understanding for a meaningful and respectful consultation process involving all the appropriate stakeholders to create interculturally collaborative solutions.

The next phase focuses on setting up a safe and productive journey to realize the final destination successfully: relationship, collaboration, jurisdiction, and mutual benefit.
Consultation processes involving divergent worldviews need to build on recognition of the historical relationship, as also articulated by Ermine (2007) and Oetzel (2005), if a positive and ethical working relationship is to emerge. Developing a space for the subjective reflection to be brought to the surface depends on decentring the perspective of the dominant colonial culture and intentionally dispersing hierarchies toward the greater purpose of achieving mutually satisfying relationships (Ermine, 2007), and that it is easier to achieve when the consultation partners share a relationship to the local region. This space that is created, which Ermine (2007) calls “ethical space,” is where collaborative engagement takes place for the creation of mutually beneficial outcomes that would not have otherwise been realized in isolation from the diverse perspectives.

In terms of jurisdictional considerations, it became starkly apparent that local government has a significant role in working with Indigenous communities regarding land use consultation—an unexpected finding. Local participants are most likely to have the strongest meaningful relationship with one another due to proximity and shared interests, which each participant noted are essential to collaborative and innovative solutions that are mutual beneficial and necessary for a successful journey together. However, as noted in the literature (Government of BC, 2016a; Government of BC, 2016b; Government of BC, 2014) local governments’ jurisdictional boundaries and lack of authority greatly differ from those of First Nation communities, provincial, and federal government agencies. Due to the challenge of local governments lacking the jurisdictional authority to negotiate land transfers of Crown land to First Nation communities, and the possibility of lacking knowledge regarding treaty or land claim negotiations that a First Nation community may be having with the federal government, the appropriate tools to resolve
the challenge must be decided and acted upon to reach the end of the journey. Therefore, if the mutually beneficial solution for resolving the land issue for consultation involves lands not held by the local government, the process will need to invite other government agencies to legally realize the outcomes. All stakeholders required to make decisions should be invited into the process as soon as possible to work towards collaborative solutions that reflect the jurisdictional and cultural considerations of all participants needed to complete the journey successfully. This strongly supports Oetzel’s (2005) requirement to recognize the interconnectedness and need to balance both work and relational outcomes, and addresses the need to eliminate the hierarchies that may exist due to jurisdictional and historical relationships in paralleling Ermine’s (2007) pillar of removing hierarchies in creating an “ethical space” for engagement. Intercultural considerations are a useful tool to have on the journey in the creation of successful consultation processes with diverse perspectives within the context of jurisdictional authorities and their respective cultural worldviews for collaborative, innovative outcomes.

The local communities’ collaborative and mutually beneficial solutions provide the roadmap for other participants as they are invited on the journey. In the example presented by participants in the study, when the local mutually agreed upon solution required Crown land to be transferred to a First Nation community, there was a need to include provincial and federal participants, and as John Kettle states here,

… at the local level and we were successful on that for a long, long time … in order to affect a change … a transfer of properties we had to involve… Indian Affairs in the negotiation… they saw the fact that we had this going on for a long time, I think it helped work it through the process.
He felt it was the strong relationship between the Lower Kootenay Band and the local
governments that helped to elicit support of their proposed solution from the provincial and
federal stakeholders that were involved after this mutually beneficial decision was decided
between the local stakeholders. Although this reflects the need for some flexibility in the process
and possibly the outcomes to accommodate new participants’ perspectives and jurisdictional
boundaries, having a strong collaborative purpose and solution sets the tone and focus for new
participants to follow by presenting a clear direction of how and where the journey should end.
This is important for continuity within the cyclic model presented to ensure an ethical
intercultural journey is created from the start of the journey and is carried through to the final
destination, despite changes or additions in participants needed for the process.

All the research participants had a strong sense of purpose regarding the reason for
consultation. It is this strong sense of purpose for embarking on the journey, coupled with a
meaningful relationship built on trust and respect, that allowed for collective dedication to the
direction of the route to be taken, the knowledge to invite participants as needed for realizing the
mutually beneficial outcomes created together, for everyone to successfully arrive safely at the
final destination with lasting positive memories for years to come.

**Addressing the gaps: Necessary elements for ethical consultation design.** By utilizing
the collective wisdom of all the participants representative of the local stakeholders in a land use
consultation process with Indigenous peoples and local government, a model was created based
on a framework of best practices with the elements needed for ethical consultation, which will be
discussed next. However, first, during this research, the importance of a definitive and
interdisciplinary definition of *consultation* and *engagement* for a successful process became
abundantly clear due to the subjective expectations and interpretations of the terms presented in the raw data and literature presented (Bowen, Newenham-Kahindi, & Herremans, 2010; Fraser & Viswanathan, 2013; Government of BC, n.d.; Lewis & Sheppard, 2006; O’Riordan & Fairbrass, 2014; Pun, 2016; Schreyer, 2008; Sloan, 2009; TRC, 2015). Based on the research findings, as well as the grey and scholarly literature, the following definitions are recommended to be interdisciplinary, cross-sectoral, and for all levels of government for clarity on both engagement and consultation practices (and how they differ and relate). Consultation—the legal and legislative requirement by provincial or federal governments, or for the process resulting from a delegated authority, defined as it pertains to legal and legislative law, such as, the “duty to consult” (Gardner, Kirchhoff, & Tsuji, 2015)—requires incorporation of meaningful practices for dialogue and the creation of mutually beneficial solutions to any arising issues from any of the parties. Engagement—the best practices involving the collaborative participation (Bowen, et al., 2010) all of stakeholders and/or participants in a communication process that involves an inclusive decision-making process based on meaningful discussions—made possible through meaningful relationships—that must be based in a transformational, dialogical communication to allow for actions based on mutual learning and understanding for the creation of solutions (Bowen, et al., 2010) in recognition that this is the most advanced communication strategy (Delannon, et al., 2016). This clarity on the distinction and relationship between consultation and engagement is necessary for building the capacity to create relationships between local governments and Indigenous communities and assumes these processes are guided on best practices for intercultural engagement previously discussed.
“The Journey of Consultation” model presented offers a practical consultation design and framework to fill the gap for resources and addresses interculturality regarding consultation with local government and Indigenous peoples. Ermine’s (2007) concept of ethical space requires a degree of subjective reflection in the form of feelings, memories, and opinions to rise to the surface of the dialogue. In this vein, Oetzel (2005) states that a group is less likely to succeed in creating successful collaborative outcomes if a history of unresolved cultural conflict exists in the society at large, as well as, differences in status. In light of the need for reconciliation and accommodation by Canadian government these two factors must be recognized as influencing the ability to manage intercultural diversity in land use consultation processes, which Oetzel’s also recognized as a necessary element in creating effective communications. My findings parallel Oetzel’s effective intercultural communications best practices by presenting a framework built on collaborative decision-making, respectful communication, equal participation, and cooperative conflict management that demonstrates in despite of the challenges of effective communications noted by both Ermine (2007) and Oetzel (2005) within heterogenous groups of differing worldviews and diverse perspectives, and the challenge of each consultation case being unique, over-arching best practices can be created for intercultural consultation and engagement processes.

**How participants’ stories can positively influence future consultation.** The grey and academic literature refers to consultation and engagement best practices, as previously discussed; however, participants generated insights building on that discussion with several additions. First, it is important to start the process as early as possible to allow for the best practices presented by Lind & Smith (2008), and Ermine (2007) of cultural competency in building an ethical
relationship with Indigenous stakeholders, in creating collaborative and cooperative processes, and for innovative and transformative results, to be used to their fullest potential for successful outcomes. Second, the consultation workgroup must understand and dedicate the time necessary for building meaningful relationships and for the process, itself.

Also, the appropriate jurisdictional representation for successful and lasting outcomes must be taken into account. The lack of authority of local government to make land use decisions demonstrated in this study is reflective of the TRC report recommendations regarding nation-to-nation relationships, which, omits the local government from the process and gives insight into the challenges of intercultural communications reflected in the TRC report for local government involvement. As presented at length in the grey literature regarding jurisdictional authority, yet, not emphasized in the academic literature, the importance of understanding and working within those jurisdictional boundaries with the appropriate representatives is paramount for success. The important factor within the context of jurisdiction for intercultural communication considerations is the balance of understanding and respecting jurisdictional authority within the process is heterarchical, and engages in inclusive dialogue that allows for subjective reflection for the creation of mutually beneficial outcomes.

Although local government lacks the jurisdictional authority for land consultation from a legal perspective, it was the ability to form ethical, intercultural relationships at the local level that was so integral to the successful consultation journeys described by the research participants. The engagement process took into consideration the future sustainability of the Indigenous community and found mutually beneficial solutions based on the collective local knowledge through a reciprocal relationship that incorporated everyone’s vision for the future and included
the necessary jurisdictional participants. By creating a success narrative built from insights from the participant’s own stories, this study has built on academic discussions by intertwining the best practices of consultation and the best practices of intercultural and ethical engagement practices as a foundation for successful future consultation processes.

**Conclusion**

The goal of this research was to develop an epistemological model of best practices grounded in the personal experiences from a wide range of perspectives using local representation typically present in a land use process for consultation with Indigenous peoples and local government. The model is presented as a symbolic journey that provides themes for necessary tools and considerations for intercultural travellers willing to travel together. The research found that local governments can play an important role in determining best practices for ethical intercultural communication for consultation processes, and that they can do so by providing the experiential knowledge that leads to insights for creating innovative and mutually beneficial outcomes through collaboration.

Predominantly, land use consultation and engagement with Indigenous peoples and local government has previously lacked considerations for intercultural communication or for levelling the power relations that would allow for intercultural communication and true dialogue—it takes a commitment to shared understanding from all participants for intercultural meanings to arise. This reflects the necessity of acknowledging Indigenous traditional knowledge and ways of knowing (Tobin, et al., 2010), equality and inclusivity of diverse perspectives and making room for subjective reflection as advised by Ermine (2007), as well as the acknowledgement of historical relationships (Oetzel, 2005), as necessary elements that all need to be incorporated for
successful consultation processes. By implementing “ethical engagement” best practices that 
embrace diversity of perspectives, non-hierarchal structures, and subjective experiences (Ermine, 
2007) within a collaborative process that balances relational and work outcomes, the shared 
meaning and purpose needed for successful land use consultations can be accomplished (Oetzel, 
2005).

The findings profoundly pointed to the need for inclusion of intercultural communication 
skills through an “ethical space” in land use consultations with Indigenous peoples and local 
government—which is also reflected in the TRC Committee (2015) recommendations. The need 
for intercultural communication best practices as a mandatory tool on every consultation journey 
is a stark finding of this research. The historical context of past relationships with Indigenous 
peoples and the colonial government structures that still exist today, needs to be acknowledged 
and addressed for ethical, respectful engagement and successful consultation (Ermine, 2007).

Limitations, Exclusions, and Recommendations for Future Research

The scope of the research is limited to a specific geographical local stakeholder group of 
six participants; which excluded provincial representation and extremely limited federal 
representation. To create a manageable amount of data for analysis, this research design sought 
representation from all stakeholder groups involved in engagement from rural local communities 
with representation from one recently elected Member of Parliament, due to being a past 
municipal elected representative, local government, and Indigenous peoples in the land use 
process in the south-eastern region. It also recognizes the six participants are a small sampling of 
specific participants who are not culturally representative of other communities as they spoke 
exclusively from their personal perspective and experience. This research was limited to the
English language, which is the first language of the researcher and non-Indigenous participants, and so it necessarily reflects a Euro-Canadian worldview. More profound movements toward ethical interculturality could be enacted if participants who are fluent speakers of Indigenous languages were involved, allowing concepts unfamiliar to Euro-Canadian worldview to enter the dialogue.

AI is situated within a positive psychology theoretical perspective that collects information on what is working well for pursuing positive change in the future (Lind & Smith, 2008; Schwandt, 2007). However, all participants were informed at the beginning of the interview that negative stories could be shared (Boje, 2016), but the findings would be expressed from a positive perspective that is consistent with an AI method and Indigenous methodology and research paradigm (Ermine, 2007; Lind & Smith, 2008; Schwandt, 2007; Wilson, 2007; Wilson, 2001) through best practices and what can or should be done for successful consultation results based on lessons learnt, or about what did not work in the past.

Qualitative research has been criticized as unstructured research where “‘anything goes’” as it “cannot be subjected to the same criteria as ‘quantitative’ approaches” (Braun & Clarke, 2006). However, this type of research is appropriate for researchers new to academic research because its method is not complex and I used a rigorous method of analysis to the data and followed good practices in both analysis and data collection that was appropriate for intercultural research; resulting in sound and practical findings.

Future research could consider a larger scope in the number of communities and conduct interviews in more than one language, allowing for greater diversity in perspectives on successful intercultural engagement. Further study could be conducted with Indigenous and non-
Indigenous participants and researchers within an Indigenous paradigm and methodology, one designed to build on cross-cultural and intercultural academic study, and to further explore an ethical space between cultures. Implications of this research demonstrate future research from an interdisciplinary theoretical and best practice perspective will allow for further insight as to the best practices and various strategies for industry sectors, governments, and Indigenous peoples to mitigate court cases, financial impacts, and other challenges from arising.
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Appendix A: Sample Text Copy of Introductory Words and Interview Questions

Our time together today will consist of me asking you open-ended interview questions regarding past successful land use consultations you have participated in. The interview will last 1-2 hours, and I will also ask you to devote 1-3 hours to approving/editing your interview transcript, as well as to reviewing and commenting on the final outcomes of the research. The questions I use will ask for your story regarding experiences with successful land consultation processes; what you believe allowed them to be successful; and how you believe consultation and engagement should be conducted into the future.

As I mentioned in my invitation to you, you were chosen as a prospective participant because you are an important and key participant in land use consultation in your community and part of the stakeholder group making the decisions. Thank you very much for choosing to participate in this study. I greatly appreciate that you have taken the time to share your stories with me today and I am honoured that you have given me this opportunity to work with you.

The interview is being recorded on this electronic hand-held recorder. At no time, will any comment be attributed to you unless your specific agreement to attribute that comment has been obtained beforehand.

Please feel free to contact me at any time should you have additional questions regarding the project and its outcomes. You will be asked to approve the transcript I create from this interview, and I will share the final outcomes of the research with you before it is finalized. Once finalized, in addition to submitting my final report to Royal Roads University in partial fulfillment for a Master of Arts Professional Communication degree, I will also be sharing my research findings in academic journal articles, academic conferences, governments, and communities interested in the findings. I will also send the final report to you by your preferred method of communication: mail or email.

As a non-Indigenous researcher working with Indigenous participants, I have used best practices and respectful research methods from different Indigenous scholars and researchers to ensure the Yaqan Nukiy [Lower Kootenay Band] participants are respected and have equal voice in the research that respect Indigenous ways of knowing and traditional knowledge. I hope that my efforts to be respectful and open in this research are visible and you feel that your voice is heard and respected.

You are not compelled to participate in this research project. Similarly, if you choose not to participate in this research project, all information pertaining to you will also be maintained in confidence. If you do choose to participate, you are free to withdraw until the findings are completed. At that point, you may not withdraw, but you can request anonymity. I will give you a copy of the study findings and you are most welcome to comment; however, these comments that come after the findings have been discovered will not necessarily be considered or reflected in the findings.
I am going to be using an Appreciative Inquiry approach to my interview process. I chose to use Appreciative Inquiry because it has been used effectively for studies like this one, which is community based research. Appreciative Inquiry begins with collecting personal stories about what is already strong or working well from research participants, and therefore it allows for all voices to be hear equally in the research and focuses on good feelings, thoughts, and interactions, and allows for challenges and problems that are shared in the interviews to be presented in the study outcomes from a positive perspective. Do you have any questions or concerns before we proceed with the interview?

1. Tell me the story about how the two successful land consultation processes happened.
2. What do you think allowed these two land consultations to become successful?
3. How do you hope future consultation and engagement will be conducted? In general, how would you like consultation and engagement to be in Canada?
4. What do you think are some of the best ways to engage with different communities; with your own?
5. How do you think those ideas for future engagement can be realized? What needs to be in place for consultation to be the engagement process you described?

The questions are open-ended, positively focused about the research question of how to create best practices for land use consultation, and progress through the full Appreciative Inquiry cycle of Discovery (questions 1-3), Dream (question 4) Design (questions 5-6), and Destiny (question 6). These questions will be used to elicit your story. I will then look at all of the interviews, seeking patterns and themes that they share in terms of telling us what an ideal consultation process would look like. These themes will be used to inform the plan or best practices that will be the final outcome of this research we are doing together.
February 24, 2017

Dear Chad Luke,

I am currently a Masters student at Royal Roads University. Previously, I was in local government, working with John Kettle at the Regional District of Central Kootenay. I am conducting a research project regarding respectful and ethical land consultation involving First Nations and local government. The objective of my research project is to create and share ethical, respectful, and practical intercultural best practices for land use consultation with Indigenous peoples and local government based on successful examples in the region.

I am writing to invite you to be a participant in a research project that I am conducting. The objective of my research project is to create and share ethical, respectful, and practical intercultural best practices for land use consultation with Indigenous peoples and local government. Your name was chosen as a prospective participant because you are a community leader and a key participant in land use consultation in your community. It would be a great honour to work with you, Chad Luke, as I have great respect for your work as a community leader. I am open to discussions regarding any questions or concerns you may have regarding the research. It is my intent to collect stories involving your experiences in land consultations with local governments and First Nations to help benefit future discussions and partnerships at the local, provincial, and federal level. It would also allow you to provide leadership and knowledge to communities on respectful and ethical best practices for land and other consultation processes. This project will help me share with other community leaders and communities some practical information that they can use to respectfully and ethically work with the numerous and diverse Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities across the country. This research is intended to help communities across Canada in creating better ways of working with Indigenous communities that benefit everyone, focusing on respecting, and acknowledging the diverse traditional knowledge and ways of knowing with the numerous Indigenous communities across the country.

My project will consist of open-ended interview questions about past successful land use consultations in which you have participated. The interview is foreseen to last 1-2 hours, plus 1-3 hours for you to approve/edit your interview transcript, as well as, review and comment on the outcomes of the research. The questions will ask you for your story regarding experiences with successful land consultation processes; what you believe allowed them to be successful; and how you believe consultation and engagement should be conducted into the future. The interview will be recorded on my Blackberry phone. At no time, will any comment be attributed to you unless your specific agreement to attribute that comment has been obtained beforehand.

As a non-Indigenous researcher working with Indigenous participants, I have used best practices and respectful research methods from different Indigenous scholars and researchers to ensure
Indigenous participants are respected and have an equal voice in the research that respects Indigenous ways of knowing and traditional knowledge. To ensure that you approve of how this research is conducted, you will be asked to approve the transcript I create from your interview and I will share the final outcomes of the research with you for discussion, before the report is finalized. To know you approve the research is important to me because, in addition to submitting my final report to Royal Roads University in partial fulfillment for a Master of Arts Professional Communication degree, I will also be sharing my research findings in academic journal articles, academic conferences, and with governments, communities, and industries interested in the findings.

Please respond as soon as possible, so that if you wish to participate we can organize an interview in the next two weeks, or so.

This project is part of the requirement for a Master’s Degree in Professional Communication at Royal Roads University. My credentials with Royal Roads University can be established by calling my supervisor, Dr. Virginia McKendry, in the Professional Communication program in the School of Communication and Culture. I have received ethical approval from Royal Roads University to conduct this research. I have received approval to participate in this research project from my current place of work, the Village of Silverton.

You are in no way required to participate in this research project. If you choose to participate, you are free to withdraw until the data has been analyzed. After the data has been analyzed, you will have the opportunity to review and comment; however, full withdrawal would not be practical for the purpose of completing the research. Instead, you will have the option to request anonymity in the research project. Similarly, if you choose not to participate in this research project, this information will also be maintained in confidence. Please feel free to contact me at any time should you have additional questions regarding the project and its outcomes.

The consent form is also enclosed for your information. The form discusses that participants will possibly know and speak to each other; however, this will be kept in confidence until the final paper is completed to allow participants to request anonymity. This research was designed to create open dialogue that is respectful and honours the participants; it is my hope that with your permission, I will have the honour of publicly acknowledging your contribution after the completion of the project.

If you would like to participate in my research project, please contact me at:

Sincerely,

Hillary Elliott
Appendix C: Research Consent Form

My name is Hillary Elliott, and this research project is part of the requirement for a MA Professional Communication degree at Royal Roads University. My credentials with Royal Roads University can be established by telephoning Virginia McKendry, Associate Professor, MA in Professional Communication School of Communication and Culture.

This document constitutes an agreement to participate in my research project, the objective of which is to create intercultural best practices for land use consultation with Indigenous peoples and local governments.

My project will consist of open-ended interview questions regarding past successful land use consultations you have participated in. The interview is foreseen to last 1 – 2 hours. After I have transcribed the verbal interviews to written form, there will be about 1 - 2 hours to approve/edit your interview transcript; and then, about 1 – 2 hours after the data from the interviews has been analyzed for you to comment on the outcomes of the research. The interview questions will ask for your story regarding experiences with successful land consultation processes; what you believe allowed them to be successful; and how you believe consultation and engagement should be conducted into the future. There will be timeframes for interview scheduling and for your responses to enable me to fulfill my deadlines with the university.

In addition to submitting my final report to Royal Roads University in partial fulfillment for a Master of Arts Professional Communication degree, I will also be sharing my research findings in academic journal articles, academic conferences, and with governments, communities, and industries interested in the findings.

Interviews will be recorded on a Blackberry phone and transcribed onto my personal computer in conversational form. At no time, will any comment be attributed to you unless your specific agreement to attribute that comment has been obtained beforehand.

All interview transcripts will be kept strictly confidential.

As a non-Indigenous researcher working with Indigenous participants, I have used best practices and respectful research methods from different Indigenous scholars and researchers to ensure all participants are respected and have equal voice in the research and respects Indigenous ways of knowing and traditional knowledge.

You are not compelled to participate in this research project. Similarly, if you choose not to participate in this research project, this information will also be maintained in confidence. If you do choose to participate, you are free to withdraw until the findings are completed for your review. At which time participant’s may not withdraw, but can request anonymity. Each participant will be given a copy of the study findings and may comment; however, these comments will not necessarily be considered or reflected in the findings.
You may have knowledge of who the other participants are in this study; however, by signing this consent form you are agreeing to keep your participation and the other participants involved as strictly confidential information. Upon completion of the research and findings, if none of the participants request anonymity, confidentiality will no longer be required.

By signing this letter, you give free and informed consent to participate in this project.

Name: (Please Print): __________________________________________________

Signed: _____________________________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________________________

************************************************************************

It is not required, but you may also consider signing one (1) of the choices below:

By signing this letter, you give free and informed consent to participate in this project with **full anonymity of you and your community**.

Name: (Please Print): __________________________________________________

Signed: _____________________________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________________________

**OR**

By signing this letter, you give free and informed consent to participate in this project and have **you and your community named in the research and/or findings**. No direct quotes or interview information associated to your name will be used without a separate form to acquire your permission.

Name: (Please Print): __________________________________________________

Signed: _____________________________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________________________