GOVERNING URBAN PLANNING DIVERSITY. THE USE OF INTERNAL DIVERSITY IN METROPOLITAN AREA SPATIAL PLANNING

Wojciech Bonenberg

Professor D.Sc., PhD. Arch.

ul. Nieszawska 13 C, 61-021 Poznan, Poland

wojciech.bonenberg@put.poznan.pl

+48 603668155

Faculty of Architecture, Poznan University of Technology

Poznan University of Technology

pl. M. Sklodowskiej-Curie 5, 60-965 Poznan, Poland

officeiapp@put.poznan.pl

+48 616653260

+48 616653261 (F)

Key words: Metropolitan area, Diversity, Governance

Abstract

In this paper spatial, functional, social and cultural aspects of the problem of governing urban diversity are analysed. Economical use of diversity as an element driving urban economies is highlighted. It is indicated that the post-industrial reality imposes a need for a new attitude towards the role and place of diversity in the spatial and economic development of a city. The concept of rejuvenating urban structures based on diversity is presented and governance strategies are categorised. It is revealed that spatial diversity is a key resource of a metropolitan area, driving its growth as well as the performance of social and economic goals. Results of research on Poznan metropolitan area spatial diversity are presented: 6 types of relations are highlighted, which made it possible to assess the current level of diversity governance within the discussed areas. As a result three primary levels are identified at which diversity governance should be implemented as the basis for planning metropolitan areas' spatial development. It is determined that governing diversity is an effective development model for these areas.

Introduction

Transformation of the city environment, which takes root in the growth rate and dynamics of service, commercial and production activities, is the main cause of diversification and its impact on the quality of life and development strategies for metropolitan areas.

In the presented approach, diversification assumes a spatial dimension which takes into account social, cultural, technical, organisational and environmental factors[1]. A metropolitan area may be treated as a system, characterised by a certain technical development, dynamics

---

[1] Bonenberg, 2015, pp. 33-38

and rate of transformations, interactions and feedback amongst particular internal units (communes, districts, residential estates).

The research is based on an assumption, that the development strategies of metropolitan areas are closely related to urban environment diversity. Diversity governance and shaping should determine metropolitan areas development strategies.

Metropolitan areas are a significant element of a country's settlement network. Over the recent decades they have grown considerably, causing numerous problems. These are usually considered to include:

- depopulation of city centres,
- gradual degradation of inner city areas, depreciation of buildings, deterioration of technical infrastructure within inner cities,
- progressive increasing urban sprawl,
- suburban strategies for locating modern industry,
- transport problems,
- a disturbance to the environmental balance,
- social problems.

Central districts of metropolitan areas were affected by the decline of industry which provided jobs for many residents. This phenomenon carries serious consequences for sustainable urban development. It is difficult to talk about a correct spatial policy which encompasses elements such as: retention of cultural identity, social infrastructure reconstruction, more attractive city buildings - without an appropriate economic base which was lost.

The paper presents a concept for improving the economic situation of metropolitan areas by introducing "diversity governance" as an answer to contemporary challenges faced by spatial economy. In the general "spatial governance strategy", the primary factors which have to be taken into account to achieve a sustainable, creative growth on municipal districts and commune scale are discussed. Results of the research currently underway within the Poznan metropolitan area are presented. The way in which diversification of internal spatial units may contribute to improved competitiveness and cohesion of an entire metropolitan area is highlighted.

The problem

The definition of diversity is very broad. The Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines diversity as "the quality or state of having many different forms, types, ideas, etc". In statistics, "dispersion (also called variability, scatter, or spread) denotes how stretched or squeezed a distribution (theoretical or that underlying a statistical sample) is. Common examples of measures of statistical dispersion are the variance, standard deviation and interquartile range". In a broad sense, diversity can be found in nature, economics, technology and also pertains to social interactions.

The concept of a diversity in urban space is not new, it is connected to concepts coined by sociologists studying interactions between spatial systems and the social fabric. Representative

studies on urban sociology include works by Wirth[2], Simmel[3], Weber[4], Durkheim[5], Harvey[6] or Castells[7]. They take root in the Chicago School, where the social and cultural theory of city development was formulated[8]. This theory is based on the assumption, that human spatial behaviours, their ability to arrange surroundings, system of values and norms to a large extend are determined by social factors and largely do not depend on natural conditions. Understood in such way, every space shaped by man is an expression of social and cultural diversity.

For a long time, the discourse on diversity among urban planners and sociologists focused on the spatial and social structure of cities and was detached from the economy. Modern day economic transformations significantly altered this approach. Here, the key theoretic work is Ponsard's „*Analyse économique spatiale"*. The author emphasises that spatial development of cities relies heavily on the capacity to adapt to the changing economic reality[9].

Industrial cities owe their development to the functions provided for the benefit of their surroundings. In the past economic power of cities depended on the quantity of exported goods and access to the labour force. Contemporary development factors have lead to a decline in the significance of mass industrial production for the benefit of high technologies, specialised services and creative entrepreneurship. The concept of internal diversity appeared in economic analyses as a significant developmental factor. Investors are interested in diversity, it attracts customers and tourists. Internal diversification of urban structures is starting to be an advantage, which, if governed correctly, may be converted into economic development of the urban structure.

This pertains both to tangible diversity (e.g. diverse architecture) and well as intangible diversity (age, education, tradition, culture, collective memory of local societies, etc.). Diversity is of considerable practical significance. Its economic potential is grossly undervalued, so far not categorised as municipal resources. These resources, resulting from local heritage stretching back centuries, may be converted into development capital. Diversity and economy are becoming ever more intertwined and interdependent.

The traditional view of metropolitan area internal diversity as an element which generates costs and requires financial outlays to eliminate differences and disproportions has been overshadowed by an approach which sees advantages fuelling the urban economy in internal diversity. Economical use of diversity is associated with new requirements within the scope of:

- lifestyle,
- visual consumption of the surroundings,
- seeking diverse experiences and emotions,
- innovation entailing the creative use of diversity.

Thus, the spatial diversity evolution stems from general civilisation transformations, which can be characterised using a system of opposites, pitting traditional 20th century model of the urban

---

[2] Wirth, 1938, pp. 1-24
[3] Simmel, 1955
[4] Weber, 1962
[5] Durkheim, 1964
[6] Harvey, 1973
[7] Castells, 1977
[8] Park, Burgess, McKenzie, 1925
[9] Ponsard, 1988, pp.128-186

economy and contemporary post-industrial development: Industrialisation – Deindustrialisation, Standardization – Individualisation, Hierarchical structure - Network structure, Large scale - Small and medium scale, Unification - Diversity and specialisation, Imitating others (the surroundings) - Being deferment from others (the surroundings).

It is worth pointing out, that the post-industrial reality imposes a need for a new way of looking at the role and place of diversity in the spatial and economic development of a city. Diversity in the functional sense becomes a product[10]. It is no longer a set of ideals shaping the relationship with space, but assumes an economic value. And thus it is associated with tangible values, which in the form of a unique sight attraction, an exceptional event, a one off opportunity, are designated for the consumer market.

The city landscape is a typical product. It constitutes the skyline of a city which grew over centuries in the backdrop of the landscape, establishing new interior landscapes with varying degrees of attractiveness to their recipients. The art of planning urban compositions, has the potential to bring to the fore such qualities as diversity, contrast, peculiarity, uniqueness, in return for which consumers (e.g. tourists) are willing to part with a defined sum of money.

It should also be highlighted that innovation combined with diversity is able to change entrenched habits. Municipal authorities, spatial planners and investors should use diversity to further economic development of metropolises.

Rejuvenation of urban structures based on diversity

A more thorough analysis of urban structure rejuvenation programmes focuses on strengthening functional links based on diversity. In this scope a particular role is assigned to architecture as the media for cultural diversity.

The "Our Creative Diversity" UNESCO report emphasises the fact that civilization development is connected with the increasing significance of choice, where culture plays an important part. Cultural diversity is a source of creativity, a factor which makes it possible to make use of all human experiences and wisdom[11].

Towards the end of the 20th century, the Partners for Livable Places Association was established, which is perhaps the oldest organisation aiming to maintain the diversity of local communities. The association, throughout more than 40 years of its practical experience, focused on providing information, advice and managing initiatives which creatively activate neighbour connections[12].

The „Division of Cultural Policies and Intercultural Dialogue" UNESCO report is an interesting example of implementing diversity[13]. Duxbury, Cullen and Pascual point out that investors and businessmen see diversity as a key factor for development which should be implemented in local and national development policies The authors state: „The traditional paradigm … does not recognize that cultural values ultimately shape what we mean by development and determine how people see the world. In contrast, a cultural diversity approach to development

---

[10] Throsby, Withers, 1993
[11] UNESCO. Our Creative Diversity, 1995
[12] Hunter, 1983
[13] UNESCO. Culture 21 - Agenda 21 for Culture Report, 2006

paradigms brings thoughtfulness and openness, and contributes to a world with complementary, pluralized visions of development"[14] .

Hoekstra compares problems associated with intercultural integration in Dutch cities. The problem of diversity is analysed in the context of the effectiveness of integration policy creation methods with reference to local communities[15].

Fabula, Horváth and Kovács present results of research on urban policies on diversity in Budapest. The authors analyse the political system and governance structure in Budapest, governmental and non-governmental views on diversity policy with reference to defined spatial units of the city and the communities inhabiting them. They point out, that in 2004 planning documents diversity is encouraged and regarded as a 'source of economic growth' pursuant to a systematised tiers of governance and actors of policy-making plan[16].

Interesting practical suggestions can be found in the works of Benet-Martinez and Hong. The authors perform a cross section analysis of the "Dynamic Multiculturalism" phenomenon in the social, cognitive, cultural and spatial context[17].

Fincher and Iveson point out that the contemporary spatial planning theory and practice should emphasise the need to satisfy diverse needs and preferences. They indicate the goals and tasks which constitute the basis for planning such diversity. They identify three principles of creative diversity: redistribution, recognition and encounter. Using various cities around the world as examples, they come to a conclusion that diversity sets out a new urban planning direction, which not only stimulates the development of cities, but also contributes to reduction in social inequalities[18].

Governing urban planning diversity

Governing Urban Diversity is a planning strategy which assumes that spatial diversity is a key resource of a city, driving its growth and the performance of social and economic goals. Governing urban diversity pertains to the manner of creating spatial policy which facilitates making efficient use of the available advantages of given city areas.

Effective urban diversity governance entails recognising and creative use of diversity and differences in the city's internal structure. The said governance can not constitute a collection of random actions, but a thought out strategy based on the assumption that development of a metropolitan areas and the performance of social and spatial goals will be more effective, will oil various needs, different advantages and conditions associated with internal divisions in the urban structure. The direct benefits of governing urban diversity include:

- consolidating the traditions and cultures of local communities,

- mitigating spatial and social conflicts,

- the synergy of effect of various factors (working together achieve greater results than the sum of their individual effects),

- strengthening the brand image of the given area,

---

[14] Duxbury, Cullen, Pascual, 2012, pp. 73-86
[15] Hoekstra, 2015, pp. 1798-1814
[16] Fabula, S., Horváth, D., Kovács, 2014
[17] Benet-Martinez, V., Hong, 2014
[18] Fincher, R., Iveson, 2008

- help in attracting and maintaining investors,
- increasing local motivation and identity.

The diversity phenomenon hides a very important aspect of urban planning reality. In appreciating and appropriately making use of the differences between various parts of a city, we are able to increase its developmental potential. Spatial planners around the world are becoming ever more interested in the subject of governing urban diversity. Investors, residents and local politicians are starting to notice the benefits stemming from implementing urban diversity governance policies, such as social stability (the feeling of local cohesion), better care for the area, attractiveness for tourists and investors, better resilience of a city to crisis situations.

Governing urban diversity is a relatively new concept, however it is gaining in prominence within spatial planning circles. In Poland, first urban diversity analyses appeared as part of geographic papers, analysing economic, spatial and social differences in the settlement network. They were performed on national and regional levels[19]. Whereas the concept of internal diversity within cities and metropolitan areas is still the subject of numerous discussions.

Using a synthetic approach, one may strive to make use the potential of differences in the internal structure of metropolitan areas as the basis for governing urban diversity, where particular districts become more attractive on account of being different from the others.

Here urban diversity appears on numerous plains: social, functional, cultural, landscape, emotional and marketing. The formal goal of urban diversity governance is the creation of a spatial policy by defining an appropriate strategy and laying it down in documents associated with the metropolitan areas spatial development directions. When establishing an urban diversity governance policy, the following methodological steps should be taken into account:

a) the diagnostic stage or identification of conditions, problems and potential associated with diversity (a diversity audit),

b) identification of conflict situations,

c) forecast phase - scenarios for the benefit of the preferred diversity standards,

d) selection of a development scenario on the basis of determined diversity standards,

e) drawing up of urban diversity governance drafts,

f) evaluation and monitoring of actions.

Governing urban diversity is more than just an urban development model. The key role in implementing diversity in a city is played by appropriate planning of tasks, defining goals, the order of performing tasks and the expected results. Performance of a diversity audit and testing which aspect of diversity would be most beneficial to activate for a city to draw benefits constitute the first step. Identification of conflict situations is significant at this stage.

Then an action plan is drawn up using the preferred diversity standards and the preferred development scenario is chosen. This constitutes the basis to begin implementing urban diversity governance projects. Evaluation and monitoring of actions is the final stage.

As a result urban diversity governance yields benefits for local governments, which gain tools for activating local communities. It is easy to see that implementing urban diversity policies in

---

[19] Bartkowski, 1974

spatial planning is associated with a change to project strategy. The significant changes entail involving the main interested parties in the project: investors, local leaders, urban marketing specialists, planners and politicians. Such a strategy is to improve the image of the entire metropolitan area, by consolidating the positions of various districts which invest in local diversity attributes.

The research conducted within the Poznan metropolitan area have lead to the identification of the following urban diversity attributes:

- landscape attributes,
- cognitive attributes,
- functional and use attributes,
- identification attributes,
- integration and adaptive attributes,
- religious attributes,
- emotional attributes,
- behavioural and educational attributes,
- ludic attributes,
- symbolic attributes.

From the broad range only some qualities become the leading attributes of urban diversity for given districts of the Poznan metropolitan area, establishing "diversity standards" of a kind. For example, the said standards include: for *Poznan Stare Miasto* - identification attributes, for *Środka and Ostrów Tumski* - religious attributes, for *Wilda, Jeżyce, Łazarz* districts - integration and adaptive attributes, for the *Fair District (MPT)* - cognitive attributes, for the *Saint Marcin Area* - symbolic attributes, for recognised suburban communes - ludic attributes, for the *Wielkopolski National Park Area* - landscape and educational attributes.

It is impossible to analyse individual attributes without taking into account the whole picture, as the Poznan metropolis is a functioning and integrated whole, made up of a unique configuration of diversity attributes ascribed to communities residing in given districts. Diversity standards play a significant role in shaping the collective memory of the social groups inhabiting the metropolitan area. In the eyes of the residents, particular regions of that area are assumed as their own, entailing idiosyncratic image and unique emotional expression. Being around them every day or sporadically creates a cultural identity of the place, grants access to various forms of creativity, shapes the multiplicity of attitudes, interpretations and opinions. Studies carried out in this scope have led to the creation of emotional diversity maps for the entire Poznan metropolitan area[20].

As follows from the presented discussion, diversity is a location's distinctive feature and its expression of identity. The way one perceives one's own district affects the perception of other districts in a metropolis. The interdependencies between "own" and "alien" urban surroundings are significant. For example local tradition is considered to be a point of reference for analysing similarities and differences between various districts. Research by Ely and Thomas confirms

---

[20] Bonenberg, 2012, pp. 258-260

this, showing that local identity plays an important part in identifying cultural differences[21]. That identity may be interpreted as the total knowledge of a given person on the forms associated with the nearest vicinity (estate, district). The emotional attitude towards spaces, to characteristic forms, colours, architectural details typical of a given tradition is shaped by the prism of diversity. The set of attributes associated with such a space builds unique diversity standards, which should be used in spatial planning.

Identification of difficulties associated with urban diversity governance

There is no homogenous assessment of the phenomenon of internal diversity of metropolitan areas in Polish planning tradition. There are egalitarian opinions, which dictate that spatial planning and local policy should lead to an elimination of differences between areas in a single agglomeration. This stems both from, priorities associated with a given development vision as well as spontaneous populist social tendencies. The unification of spatial behaviours and visual homogenisation of the surroundings are a noticeable effect of this phenomenon. This type of homogenisation is a trait of modern global mass culture.

On the other hand, one may come across opinions, to the effect that diversity is a significant developmental factor. In such case planning strategies are based on the conviction, that diversity is a quality which provides a competitive advantage, facilitates savings in terms of expenses on overcoming differences and diverts these to creative use of the local specifics. The ability to adapt to the changing external conditions and internal relations is a significant quality.

In the opinion of Egan and Bendick, achieving success is significantly simplified by such a governance model, as it shapes flexible reactions to changes occurring in the surroundings[22].

As such, managing diversity is a strategy which relies on the conscious use of the diverse potential of parts of a city. The actions undertaken shape the urban environment in such a way, as to ensure that all structural units have an option to seek new, not previously evident advantages associated with the local culture, tradition, location, landscape, etc. This is significant when it comes to planning practice. Cities employing this type of governance may except the following benefits:

- improved image in the eyes of investors seeking the best locations,
- less spatial conflicts,
- better integration between neighbours,
- improved decision making process on account of discovering different approaches to the problems and emergency situations which occur.

However, why is it, that despite such an abundance of benefits, urban diversity is still undervalued in planning practice? It seems that the main barriers to introducing urban diversity governance strategies are:

- stereotypes and entrenched standards,
- prejudices and lack of tolerance,
- spatial urban planners lacking professional backgrounds in terms of governing diversity,
- legal loopholes,

---

[21] Ely, Thomas, 2001, pp. 229-273
[22] Egan, Bendick, 2008, pp. 387

- bureaucracy combined with urban planning visions detached from local needs.

Working out diversity strategies and clear urban diversity governance procedures is not sufficient to overcome these stereotypes. One of the main conditions for these tools to be effective is awareness by local governments. The local governments should be made aware of what diversity is and how it affects attractiveness of an entire metropolitan area.

The truth, that urban space and communities residing therein are the primary, unique resource, which is decisive in winning competitive advantage is only slowly filtering through to local governments. Diverse social and spatial structures create a city's capacity to adapt to the surroundings, make use of opportunities which appear and avoid internal hazards.

In this context governing urban diversity should primarily serve to build awareness and further acceptance of differences (historic, economic, functional and landscape) which occur within a metropolitan area. It is very important for feasibility studies and spatial development strategies to take into account elements such as:

 - the feeling of belonging to social groups,
- economic and cultural status of residents,
 - residents lifestyles and attitudes.

A significant problem appears in this context, referred to as "inclusion". Whereas the concept of diversity refers to characteristics which cause areas of a metropolis to differ, "inclusion" refers to the degree to which these areas have access to important infrastructure resources of the metropolis. Studies conducted at the Poznan University of Technology's Institute of Architecture and Physical Planning demonstrated, that the "inclusion" problem in the Poznan metropolitan area pertains to issues such as:

- integrated transport and transport availability,
- access to health care,
- access to education.

What individual spatial units potentially stand to gain or lose as a result of mutual functional interactions should also be considered.

Studies within this scope were conducted in July 2015 by a group of 120 architecture students as part of summer fieldwork internships. The studies made use of urban planning research entailing an area of 2162 sq. km and 878 thousand residents. The GeoUrbanCentric expert method developed at Poznan University of Technology's Institute of Architecture and Physical Planning was used for partial assessments. The area was divided into 311 spatial units, the boundaries of which overlapped the boundaries of administration units and urban complexes as well as natural boundaries determined by water courses, streets, railway lines and other physiographic elements. The separated spatial units reflect precincts as defined in the National Official Register of the Territorial Division of the Country, maintained for the needs of public statistics.

The study aimed to identify relations stemming from diversity between Poznan metropolitan area spatial units. Using the minus sign to indicate a negative effect, the plus sign for a positive effect and 0 to signify no effect, six different categories were used to classify the diversification of impacts within the Poznan metropolis:

mutual negative impact between two units (-,-), mutual positive interactions (+,+), the (+,-) relation, the (+,0) relation, the (-,0) relation, the (0,0) relation. Based on an in-depth analysis of internal relations, it was determined that 11.02 per cent of the Poznan Metropolitan Area exhibits very good assessment of internal diversity. 18.33 per cent of the area have good relations, 9.02 per cent neutral relations, 42.41 per cent bad relations and 19.12 per cent very bad relations[23].

Based on the study results it is possible to ascertain that the level of urban diversity governance within the Poznan metropolitan area is low. The studies also identified conflict areas, where urban diversity governance plans have to be implemented as a priority.

Conclusions

In the context of changing external and internal circumstances, the issue of metropolitan areas' internal diversity becomes significantly important. Urban structure diversity introduces new points of view, makes it possible to identify loopholes and inconsistencies in the spatial planning system. Governing urban diversity refers to the identification and acceptance of heterogeneity in urban structure and skilful use of the potential of diversity. Within the scope of governing diversity, urban planners should increase efforts aiming to build awareness of benefits of diversity amongst residents and local authorities. Appropriately planned diversity should constitute a significant source of competitive advantage for metropolitan areas.

Based on the discussion presented herein, three primary levels can be identified at which diversity governance should be implemented:

- awareness level within the scope of diversity issues in formulating metropolitan area development targets,

- decision and urban planning procedures, which might contain errors leading to a marginalisation of particular structural units,

- behaviour level, pertaining to the actual attitudes of local communities and to the urban planners' targets within the scope of governing urban diversity. This level is shaped by investors', local authorities' and residents' degree of awareness.

Urban diversity governance formulated in such manner should be implemented as the basis for planning metropolitan areas' spatial development strategies.

References

Bonenberg, W. The Enigma of Metropolis: Its Spatial Diversity and Methods of Diagnosis. *Technical Transactions, Czasopismo Techniczne*, 2015, 8-A (14) pp. 33-38.

Wirth, L. *Urbanism as a Way of Life*. American Journal of Sociology, 1938, no. 44, pp. 1-24.

Simmel, G. *Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliations*. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955.

Weber, M. *The City*. New York: Colliers Books, 1962.

Durkheim, E. *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: Macmillan Free Press, 1964.

Harvey, D. *Social Justice and the City*. London: Edward Arnold, 1973.

Castells, M. *The Urban Question*. Cambridge, London: MIT Press, 1977.

---

[23] Bonenberg, 2016

Park, R., Burgess, E., McKenzie, R. *The City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.

Ponsard, C. *Analyse économique spatiale*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1988. pp. 128-186.

Throsby, D., Withers, G. *The Economics of the Performing Arts*. London: Edward Arnold, 1993.

UNESCO. *Our Creative Diversity*. Report from the Word Commission on Culture and Development, 1995.

Hunter, P. *Towards Livable Communities*. Washington: Partners for Livable Communities, 1983.

UNESCO. *Culture 21 - Agenda 21 for Culture Report*. Barcelona: UCLG and Barcelona City Council, 2006.

Duxbury, N., Cullen, C., Pascual, J. *Cities, Culture and Sustainable Development*. In: Anheier, H.K., Isar, Y.R., Hoelscher, M. (eds.) Cultural Policy and Governance in a New Metropolitan Age. The Cultures and Globalization Series, Vol. 5. London: Sage, 2012. pp. 73-86.

Hoekstra, M.S., Diverse cities and good citizenship: How local governments in the Netherlands recast national integration discourse. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 2015, 38(10), pp. 1798-1814.

Fabula, S., Horváth, D., Kovács, Z. *Governing Urban Diversity: Creating Social Cohesion, Social Mobility and Economic Performance in Today's Hyper-diversified Cities. Urban Policies on Diversity in Budapest, Hungary*. Budapest: DGUD, 2014.

Benet-Martinez, V., Hong, Y. *The Oxford Handbook of Multicultural Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Fincher, R., Iveson, K. *Planning and Diversity in the City: Redistribution, Recognition and Encounter*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Bartkowski, T. *Zastosowania geografii fizycznej*. Warszawa, Poznań: PWN, 1974.

Bonenberg, W. *Przestrzeń emocjonalna.* In: Kaczmarek ,T. (ed) Studium uwarunkowań rozwoju przestrzennego Aglomeracji Poznańskiej. Poznań: CBM, 2012. pp. 258-260.

Ely, R.J., Thomas, D.A. Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects of Diversity Perspectives on Work Group Processes and Outcome*s*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2001,Vol. 46, (2), Jun. 01, pp. 229-273.

Egan, M.L., Bendick, M., Combining multicultural management and diversity into one course on cultural competence, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2008, vol. 7, no. 3, p. 387.

Bonenberg, W. *Internal diversification – developing a research method of urban planning*. In: HCI International, Universal Access in Human-Computer Interaction. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2016.