

Increasing Awareness through an Ecological Approach to Planning Education

by

Bradley Squibb

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF CITY PLANNING**

**Department of City Planning
Faculty of Architecture
University of Manitoba**



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-56147-X

Canada

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE**

Increasing Awareness through an Ecological Approach to Planning Education

BY

Bradley Squibb

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University
of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree
of
Master of City Planning**

BRADLEY SQUIBB © 2000

Permission has been granted to the Library of The University of Manitoba to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis/practicum and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to Dissertations Abstracts International to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither this thesis/practicum nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Abstract

The contemporary planner has a tremendous impact on the sustainability of both the social and biophysical environments. The ramifications of planning action are extensive and it is essential that planners fully understand their magnitude. Planning education, as an integral component of planning, is vital in fostering a greater understanding of these complex interrelationships and is therefore the subject of investigation in this thesis.

This thesis discusses the paradigmatic development of planning in order to historically contextualize the role the discipline has played in the current ecological crisis. The ecological ignorance of traditionally 'rational' theories is identified and the development of contemporary 'radical' planning theories explored. Substantive ecological theories are then examined and placed within the context of radical planning thought in an attempt to offer new perspectives on how to operationalize an ecological approach to planning education.

The results of empirical research are presented and further address the current situation of planning education. In addition, these findings offer informative perspectives on the movement towards an ecological approach.

Finally, a distinct set of ecological principles is developed and recommended to guide the future restructuring of planning education. These program elements are intended to provide the foundation for an education in which future planners can attain greater ecological literacy and contribute to the long-term sustainability of all life.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Problem Statement.....	1
1.2 Objectives.....	3
1.3 Organization of the Thesis.....	6
1.4 Biases.....	7
1.5 Limitations.....	8
1.6 Chapter Summary.....	8
Chapter 2: The Situation of Contemporary Planning Thought.....	10
2.1 Introduction.....	10
2.2 The Historical Situation of Planning.....	11
2.3 Rethinking Radical Possibilities.....	12
2.4 The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory.....	18
2.5 The Contemporary Radical.....	23
2.6 Chapter Summary.....	26
Chapter 3: The Substance and Process of an Ecological Approach.....	28
3.1 Towards an Ecological Approach for Planning Education.....	28
3.2 Chapter Summary.....	38

Chapter 4: Research Tactics	39
4.1 Research Instruments.....	39
4.2 Limitations of the Research Instruments.....	45
4.3 Chapter Summary.....	47
Chapter 5: Responding to the Possibility of Change in Planning Education	48
5.1 Introduction.....	48
5.2 Focus Group—Professional Planning Practitioners.....	49
5.3 Focus Group—Graduate Planning Students.....	67
5.4 Interviews—Planning Academics.....	81
5.5 Highlights of the Empirical Research.....	97
5.6 Chapter Summary.....	99
Chapter 6: The Foundation of an Ecological Planning Education	101
6.1 Connecting the Pieces.....	102
6.2 Recommended Ecological Principles: A Guideline for Planning Education.....	109
6.3 Suggestions for Future Research.....	111
6.4 Closing Remarks.....	112
Appendix A: Empirical Research Questions	113
Appendix B: Canadian Institute of Planners <i>Statement of Values</i>	116
Bibliography	117

Acknowledgements

I thank Dr. Ian Skelton for his mentorship throughout the course of my planning education. He has not only played an essential part in the development of this thesis, but will continue to be someone whose thoughts and criticisms I value deeply.

I would also like to thank Dr. Ian Wight for his role in this project and the insights he has offered throughout the Masters program, as well as the other Faculty members and instructors, especially Dr. Sheri Blake, Dr. Rae Bridgman, Dr. David Van Vliet, and Dr. Iara Lessa. You have all contributed to my growth as both a student and a person.

I would like to thank Robert Nicol MCIP for acting as a Committee member and his input in numerous course projects over the past two years. In addition, I give thanks to Linda McFadyen MCIP for her insights in the early stages of this project.

A special thanks goes out to Dr. Kimberley Shoaf of the University of California, Los Angeles. I will always reflect on her course with joy and look forward to the next time we cross paths.

The thesis is dedicated to my mother Marjorie, and to my beautiful partner Kelly Orr. Much of this project has come at the expense of time with you and I will be forever grateful for the support, encouragement, and love you have shown throughout.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis was inspired by a personal need to contextualize the role of planning, and particularly planning education, in contemporary society. Current uncertainty with respect to what is the purpose and responsibility of graduate planning education makes it necessary to attempt to determine how can it be best situated to meet the needs of a rapidly changing world.

One issue that was examined in the thesis is the paradigmatic development of the discipline, as this will ultimately provide a greater understanding of the current situation of planning. This was done through a review of current planning literature, particularly that related to communicative action as discussed by Healey, and the emergent, insurgent planning covered by Sandercock. The way these two contemporary schools of thought have historically characterized planning within broader social trends will be addressed. Furthermore, the analysis of the relationship between planning and these broader social trends attempts to provide justification for the future planning educational principles proposed and discussed in this thesis.

The main purpose of the thesis, however, was to develop a set of program elements or principles that I argue are needed to foster an ecological ethic in graduate planning education. Recognizing that graduate education is inherently linked to the paradigmatic situation of planning, it plays an integral role in the ability of the discipline to shift its focus and lead the way in dealing with critical,

contemporary social issues and problems. Planning academia is where new paradigms are encoded through the observation, analysis and critiquing of planning practice. Placement of these analyses into current theoretical literature leads to the redefinition of planning and thus the creation of new paradigms. These new paradigms are then adopted by planning practitioners where they undergo thorough and rigorous practical testing.

This position is further reinforced by Harvey Perloff, arguably one of the most influential and important planning educators since the Second World War, when he notes that planning is not simply whatever professional planners do; effective planning results in social change (Feldman, 1994: 91). Planning scholars must therefore not blindly follow the lead of the profession, but must instead provide leadership by reflecting on planning and its societal role. Perloff points out that in doing this, the profession can only benefit since “there seems to be a direct relationship between the maturity and progress of a profession and the amount of educational leadership provided by the full-time university scholars who devote themselves to the advancement of the field” (Feldman, 1994: 92).

Based on this view, the thesis draws upon planning academic literature to provide a foundation for the suggested principles. The study used empirical research to explore possibilities and develop a set of program elements that could be used in the future to guide concrete educational amendments, which in turn influence the eventual adoption of an ecological ethic by planning practice.

1.1 Problem Statement

Planning is presently in a state of crisis. Important issues, such as multiculturalism, declining natural resources, hyper-consumptive societies, and increasing urbanization have not been sufficiently addressed by traditional, rational-comprehensive planning models. With this in mind, it is necessary to redefine the discipline in order to meet the pressing needs of contemporary society.

One important aspect of this redefinition comes in the form of planning education. As argued above, the role of planning education is integral in encoding new paradigms which can then be adapted and tested by planning practitioners. Therefore, the fundamental principles of graduate planning education are of paramount importance for the future realization of increased ecological sensitivity on the part of both planning academia and practice.

1.2 Objectives

The major objective of this study was to determine the role of graduate planning education in achieving a more 'socially responsible' planning. For the purpose of this project the term 'social responsibility' will encompass the pursuit of a strong environmental ethic, rooted largely in deep ecology literature. This is not to assume that past planning models (particularly rational-comprehensive ones) have

not striven for 'social responsibility,' but instead it calls for a rethinking of the major goals inherent to this 'social responsibility' in the different eras.

Achievement of this objective was done through the investigation of a number of important bodies of literature and through original empirical work with planning practitioners, professors, and students.

Firstly, the historical development of the planning discipline was analyzed in relation to the shifts in the broader social trends or 'metaparadigms,' as Garcia (1993: 20) refers to them. The nature of these relationships has recently been considered in the literature associated with communicative action and that connected with emergent, insurgent planning. This thesis drew on this literature to contextualize the current state of planning in contemporary society.

Secondly, the purpose of graduate planning education in terms of its position within the discipline is discussed. The issue of whether or not graduate planning education should be fundamentally based in value-development was analyzed through a review of contemporary literature. In terms of a value-based planning education particular attention was given to the fostering of an ecological ethic by planning schools. The necessity of planning education to operate from this framework was explored and determinations made on what principles current planning programs would have to adopt to meet the criteria of an education embracing this ecological ethic. Possibilities for these guiding principles or

program elements was explored through a review of the literature, the administration of two focus groups, and interviews with faculty from various planning programs throughout Canada.

The empirical research included input from current planning students, practitioners and academics. All the participants were targeted in an attempt to gain insights on the nature of present planning education, its influence on personal values and the possibility of reshaping planning education around a distinct set of ecological principles. Data obtained from the different types of respondents allowed for a comprehensive analysis of planning education from multiple perspectives and further informed the development of the recommendations.

One aspect of determining how to achieve the aforementioned ecological ethic required an examination of both skill and knowledge development in graduate planning education. The types of skills and knowledge that are currently deemed 'necessary' or 'favorable' shall be critiqued in terms of their usefulness in a value-driven program. Furthermore, ideas related to the development of 'literacies' (Sandercock, 1998; Sarkissian, 1996) were sought in the hope of providing some guidance on how they could become institutionalized.

1.3 Organization of the Thesis

This thesis has been organized into six chapters.

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the subject matter being discussed in the thesis. Additionally, the author explains the aims and objectives for the study, and how the study was conducted.

Chapter 2 features the results of the literature review that focused on both Communicative Action Theory and Radical Planning Theory. Both were explored in terms of historically situating the discipline of planning and providing frameworks for future action.

Chapter 3 furthers the literature review by examining the Deep Ecology theme as it relates particularly to graduate planning education. The work of three prominent authors is discussed in terms of the consideration of an ecological ethic and its influences in developing the ecological wisdom of planners. Furthermore, links are made to the theoretical foundation that was developed in Chapter 2 in so far as providing some direction for planners to realize this redefined educational framework.

Chapter 4 explains the research methods used to collect information and data for the empirical portion of this thesis. The reasons for choosing the general research

strategy, the design of the tactics, and the interview/focus group techniques are also discussed.

Chapter 5 presents the findings of the tactics used in this thesis. The data is categorized into dominant themes for each of the different respondent types and interpretive summaries are also offered at the end of each theme. These interpretive summaries are an attempt by the researcher to clarify why the participants may have given the types of responses they did. The summaries are largely a result of numerous observations the researcher made both during the respective sessions and also following the completion of the sessions when further analysis was being conducted.

Chapter 6 addresses how the findings of the empirical research relate to the literature. In addition, a recommended set of ecological program elements, from which to guide future planning educational restructuring, are offered.

1.4 Biases

In dealing with graduate planning education the author undoubtedly had numerous biases. Firstly, the study rests on an assumption that graduate planning education is in a state of crisis. Furthermore, there is an explicit advocacy for the pursuit of a value-driven planning education, based in an ecological ethic. A final bias that was brought to the study comes in the form of a belief in the need for radical action in the redefinition of planning education.

1.5 Limitations

The limitations of this study are numerous. Firstly, the scope of the analysis is limited geographically. While the study is making generalizations based on all Canadian planning education, the empirical research is predominantly being conducted in one area. The experiences of many of the research participants, while undoubtedly being quite varied, will certainly be influenced by their current situation within the Manitoba planning community.

Another limitation of the study is the inherent assumption of a critical need for radical action. For instance, the research method was premised on the hunch that an ecological ethic is necessary for planning, and thus may have influenced the ability of participants to deal with the subject matter. Some participants may not have felt the same way, and may have found it difficult to offer insight from a perspective they did not feel comfortable with. However, while the biases of the researcher obviously influenced the questions, participants were given every opportunity to offer viewpoints on their personal definition of the situation.

1.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter has outlined the major components of the study. It has set the stage in terms of defining the major goals of the thesis and addressed how these goals will be met. The chapter has also informed the reader of both the biases and limitations that were significant in shaping the project. Based on this framework, the next chapter moves into a discussion of some of the contemporary planning

theories that advance and inform the key ideas required to operationalize the principles recommended in this thesis.

Chapter 2: The Situation of Contemporary Planning Thought

2.1 Introduction

This literature review will begin by outlining the recent history of the planning discipline, particularly in the context of its metaparadigmatic development.

Following this historical overview, focus will be given to John Friedmann and his early work on radical planning. The work of Friedmann will then be built upon in an analysis of more contemporary radical streams, namely that of communicative action, outlined by Healey and Innes, and the emergent, insurgent forms of planning discussed by Leonie Sandercock.

It must be noted that the discussion of these contemporary theoretical frameworks is largely to situate the current state of planning. In doing this, a foundation is built, on which to address the second major section of the literature review—the creation of an ecological ethic informing the fundamental guiding principles of graduate planning programs.

In addressing the creation of an ecological ethic to drive graduate planning programs, the discussion will center on the work that Wendy Sarkissian undertook in her doctoral thesis. The ideas of David Orr and Timothy Beatley will also be dealt with as they pertain to the support and adoption of a value-driven curriculum in planning schools. The work of these two authors is arguably less directly related to planning education than that of Sarkissian, but it is no way less relevant.

Support is built for the necessity of increased social responsibility by planners, and others, in terms of addressing major ecological crises and concerns.

2.2 The Historical Situation of Planning

The Shaping of Contemporary Planning Thought

In an attempt to fully understand the current state of planning it is useful to look at the situation from the viewpoint of Thomas Kuhn and his development of cognitive constructs which he termed 'paradigms' (Garcia, 1993: 1). While initially Kuhn's analysis was done to explain the historical development of scientific disciplines, the usefulness in terms of describing the discipline of planning, which may not be 'scientific' in a traditional sense, should not be overlooked. With this in mind, Diana Crane may best have defined the application of the concept of a paradigm in planning when she noted,

Groups of innovators that produce nonscientific ideas must be guided by similar notions of what is and is not relevant to their interests...Concepts that have been utilized in the analysis of the social organization of science should also be useful in understanding other types of cultural phenomena.
(Garcia, 1993: 69)

It must be realized, however, in using Kuhn's paradigmatic analysis some debate does arise. Some theorists maintain that planning has never developed into a paradigm in the Kuhnian sense and is thus said to be in a 'pre-paradigmatic stage' (Garcia, 1993: 2). Others, such as Galloway and Mahayni, have argued that planning did develop a 'comprehensive land use' paradigm, but has progressed through various stages of paradigm development and now faces a 'paradigm

crisis' (1977: 65). Others still, agree that planning has traditionally evolved within the stages of the paradigmatic model, but define this paradigm more broadly as the 'rational comprehensive model,' arguing it is not unique to land use planning (Garcia, 1993: 2).

Regardless of which viewpoint one takes, there does seem to be general consensus that the discipline of planning is currently situated in a position of 'paradigmatic indeterminacy or confusion' (Garcia, 1993: 2).

To understand the current situation of planning it is important to recognize that the theoretical foundations by which it is guided are ultimately determined by overriding social trends or 'metaparadigms' (Garcia, 1993: 20). This is to say that planning operates within the parameters of broad social trends which constitute a fundamental consensus on the nature, organization and purpose of a particular society or humanity as a whole (Garcia, 1993: 20). Throughout history there have been numerous metaparadigms that can describe the major cognitive foundations of people who lived during those times. Some notable examples are the 'classical', the 'medieval', or the 'modern', all of which have provided a fundamental basis for one's perception of the world (Garcia, 1993: 21).

While it is possible to analyze these metaparadigms in retrospect, insofar as realizing the role they played in shaping the fundamental perceptions of society, it seems more difficult for those present within the period to be fully cognizant of the existence of these basic guiding theoretical principles. It would seem that not

unless individuals are outside the influence of the dominant system could they fully recognize the fundamental schemes mediating the perception of a society. On the other hand, understanding the development of metaparadigms becomes increasingly evident during periods of superficial breakdown, which in fact may lead to an eventual strengthening of the dominant perception (Garcia, 1993: 21). This is to say that marginal alternatives and elaborations of the fundamental scheme not only allow a more complete understanding of the basic principles guiding perception, but also work to justify its dominance due to their lack of providing a worthwhile, socially acceptable alternative.

Although periods of superficial breakdown can work to reinforce dominant metaparadigms, extreme critical analysis and rejection by increasing numbers and prominent members of the 'scientific community' garner a stage of paradigm anomaly which often leads to paradigm crisis (Galloway and Mahayni, 1977: 65). It is in this sense that we can begin to analyze planning, as it was shaped in the 'modernist project,' and evaluate its current situation in the paradigmatic crisis.

While elements of modernism can be traced back as far as ancient Greece, the fundamental attitudes and practices that have manifested themselves into modernism can be said to have emerged out of a number of intellectual movements in the eighteenth century (Garcia, 1993: 22). Largely under the influence of Jurgen Habermas and what he called the 'project of modernity,' the basic tenets of modernism have gradually come to underlie society's principles of perception (Garcia, 1993: 22). Furthermore, it was following the end of the

Second World War that this project of modernity essentially achieved a stage of 'metaparadigmatic hegemony' (Garcia, 1993: 22).

The Decline of Comprehensive Rationality

Within contemporary society it seems that there is a commitment to planning as a democratic enterprise, aimed to promote social justice and environmental sustainability (Healey, 1996: 234). However, the problem seems to be that the technical and administrative 'machineries' used by society to pursue these goals have in recent history (particularly since the Second World War) been based upon "a narrow scientific rationalism" (Healey, 1996: 234). Moreover, these 'machineries' have not only failed to achieve the aspired goals, but instead have compromised the very development of democratic attitudes.

Since the Second World War and throughout the 1970s the exponents of planning seemed to have a relatively soft commitment to social and environmental issues. Instead, planning seemed to be a site of struggle between class forces for control over the management of urban areas (Healey, 1996: 235). Growth, mainly economic, was sought after and 'trickle down' theories were used as swift justifications for not directly addressing what can in retrospect be seen as the major social and environmental problems of the time.

The 1980s, on the other hand, saw the discipline of planning attempting redefinition into a less one-dimensional view of conflict and cleavage in society,

towards a more nuanced appreciation of the diversity of the experience of urban life and environment (Healey, 1996: 235). While planning attempted this redefinition, however, problems arose. Neo-liberal political movements, particularly in Britain and the U.S. and to some degree in Canada, were growing in response to economic slow-down and the rising inflation of the late-1970s (Healey, 1997: 14-15). These movements ran counter to the mindset in planning at the time, as a major objective was to reduce the role of bureaucracy and politics in the management of the economy. State-sponsored planning was thus not only viewed as unnecessary, but as counterproductive to the project of recovering growth through market forces (Healey, 1997: 15). Furthermore, as noted by Healey, “the adverse social and environmental consequences of such a [neo-liberal] strategy were presented as necessary costs of transition to a more soundly-based economy, which would generate wealth to put them right in due course” (1997: 15).

Healey goes on to point out that the predominant neo-liberal movements rooted in the 1980s have come to a sudden halt (1996: 235). However, while the political ideology fostered in this time has dwindled, the institutional frameworks of operation it built still remain. Therefore, planning has now seen the adoption of vague political principles, such as citizen engagement and environmental sustainability, but lacks the ability to practically realize these goals. The discipline of planning finds itself trapped between ‘socially just’ aspirations and the materialistic, modernist, and rational ‘realities’ in which it still must operate.

2.3 Rethinking Radical Possibilities

The Search for Meaningful Action

When attempting to understand why the discipline of planning is in its current state of crisis it is important to comprehend the pace of change and magnitude of problems associated with historical and current events. Understanding this, and realizing the nature of traditional, rational, comprehensive planning models it becomes clearer why these models have failed the constituencies they aim to serve. As planners attempt to conceptualize problems, they are faced with ones of unprecedented enormity. Questions arise about how to cope when we lack the adequate knowledge to address the issues at hand.

In the search for solutions many put their faith in technology, but this has arguably caused many of the problems we now face. Others put their faith in the free market, a notion of abstract assumptions that devalues the magnitude of many problems. Others still revert to propaganda and repression, however, this is merely a means of political avoidance. Finally, there is the route of re-centering political power in civil society, mobilizing from below the countervailing actions of citizens, and recovering the energies for a political community that will transform both the state and corporate economy from within (Friedmann, 1987: 314). It is in this final route where the radical planner must work to retie the knot (i.e. be the link) between knowledge and action that has come undone (Friedmann, 1987: 314).

Who is the Radical Planner?

Radical planners are not neutral agents arbitrating between two disputing parties (Friedmann, 1987: 392). They are not experts on theory, whether it is the creation of theory or the ramifications of theory on practice. In terms of social space, the radical planner is “tangential” to radical practice at precisely the point where practice intersects theory (Friedmann, 1987: 392).

To understand who the radical planner is it is necessary to realize what sorts of knowledge they bring to their work. They must have substantive knowledge, in terms of data, information, and theoretical insight (Friedmann, 1987: 393). Their knowledge will be a combination of systematic learning, personal experience and observation. But all this knowledge will remain passive until the moment it is used in the process of thinking (Friedmann, 1987: 393). Moreover, in the mediations of radical planning this knowledge points to action, considers strategy, endeavors to reach a critical understanding of the present, and is informed by specific social values (Friedmann, 1987: 394). This is to say that the types of knowledge that radical planners bring to their assignments force them to confront formal knowledge with that drawn from struggle and experience. Realizing this then the roles in radical planning are not clearly defined (Friedmann, 1987: 395).

Within dialogue it becomes possible for participants to transcend the boundaries or constraints with respect to the free flow of ideas. With this in mind, the

possibility of expanding people's horizon or awareness becomes 'realistic.' It is arguable that this is a domain for the radical planner. Within a dialogic space the radical 'mediator' must ensure that perceived limitations are overcome and foster participants to "think without frontiers" (Friedmann, 1987: 398). They must allow the traditionally marginalized and dispossessed to be given voices, which will not only be heard, but also truly listened to. Perhaps most important of all, however, they must be social mobilizers who can surely transform the nature of the basic relation of knowledge to action (Friedmann, 1987: 417).

2.4 The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory

Conservative Radicalism?

Understanding the situation of planning within contemporary society can assist us in seeking new alternatives. Awareness of planning history within the broader social trends seemingly sets the stage for 'growth' in the sense that we learn from our mistakes and undergo a degree of 'societal maturation.' With this in mind, it now seems relevant to discuss some current theoretical discourse, particularly that termed communicative action.

Recognizing the problematic aspects of the comprehensive rational planning models of the past, it seems that it is increasingly important to focus new theory on the process of planning. This emphasis on process arguably leads to exploration of the communicative dimensions of collectively debating and deciding on matters of collective concern (Healey, 1997; 1996: 235). Focusing on

substantive issues is inherently bounded by *priori* assumptions of what is 'good/bad' or 'right/wrong,' whereas discourse based on process does not fall victim to this shortcoming of the rational mindset (Healey, 1996: 235-236). The imposition of reasoning of a dominant group or for that matter any group, upon other groups is not assumed and every position is treated merely as one opinion—which is as relevant as any other.

It seems obvious that the debate between process issues or substantive issues also has important ramifications for one's viewpoint on the 'project of modernity.' According to Healey, contemporary substantive theories almost whole-heartedly reject modernism yet fall victim to similar problems of idealism (1996: 235). Process-oriented theory on the other hand, such as communicative action, does not reject modernism in this manner, but merely questions the assumptions that are inherently made. A communicative conception of rationality, to replace that of the self-conscious autonomous subject using principles of logic and scientifically formulated empirical knowledge to guide actions, is sought. This ensures that reasoning includes an intersubjective effort at mutual understanding, and in doing so, refocuses the practices of planning to enable purposes to be communicatively discovered (Healey, 1997; 1996: 239).

The theoretical roots of communicative action derive from work by Jurgen Habermas on communicative rationality and therefore this theory has parallels with his conceptions of practical reasoning (Healey, 1996: 242). This implies an

expansion from the notion of reason as pure logic and scientific empiricism to encompass all the ways we come to understand and know things and use that knowledge in acting (Healey, 1996: 242). In doing this, communicative action takes the notion of reason as an intersubjective mutual understanding, arrived at by particular people in particular times and places (Healey, 1996: 243). This is to say that knowledge becomes historically situated within specific communities. What is seen as 'good' or 'bad' is something that has been mutually agreed upon in that community and thus there is no need for fundamental ideals or principles to guide societal action. Planning and its contents, in this conception, is a way of acting that we can *choose*, after *debate* (Healey, 1997; 1996: 243).

Addressing the Complexities of Definition

The work of Judith Innes falls into the communicative action framework as set out by Healey. However, while addressing the issues of interactive practice Innes seems to touch more specifically on the placement of this theory within planning's current paradigm crisis. Particularly when discussed in the context of John Friedmann's achievements on developing a definition of planning and the creation of a strong self-image for the discipline, the work of Innes seems to be seminal.

John Friedmann has argued that a stronger self-image within planning would enable us "...to clarify the just relation between theory and practice...and identify what is unique to our profession, distinguishing what we do from competing

professional fields and disciplines...” (1996: 94). Although developing a stronger self-image may appear difficult with such a broad range of theoretical discourse, it does appear possible to identify the types of practical tasks which planners undertake. This identification of practical undertakings alone does not seem to infringe on the development of theoretical frameworks, including those proposed by both ‘conservative’ postmodernists and ‘radical’ postmodernists. In fact, the development of this self-image will foster attitudes that better enable us to comprehend the importance of diversity and the encompassing nature of planning work, while forcing a realization that the discipline must develop some parameters for specialization. Planners, in both academia and practice, must realize that the nature of contemporary society makes it increasingly difficult for us to be generalists-with-a-specialty, and should perhaps instead focus on the mastery of a specialized area that rests on a solid foundation of knowledge about our domain (Friedmann, 1996: 102).

Friedmann’s arguments about the current state of planning situate Innes’ work on communicative action and interactive practice extremely well. Innes outlines the importance of developing strong definitions and notes that in doing so “...we recognize the complex possibilities that the definition would have to address” (1995: 187). She discusses issues of ethics and the need for planners to question the notions of professional knowledge. It does not seem, however, that Innes disregards the integrity or applicability of professional planners, but instead recognizes the problematic nature of assuming expertise.

Therefore, it may be argued that Innes purports a specialization in practical methods, particularly those of mediation, negotiation, and self-reflection. The very nature of communicative action and interactive practice call for planners to assume roles where they are guiding complex planning issues, enabling those with a vested interest in the decision to be heard, and reflecting on the outcome in an attempt to improve it in the future. It does not recognize the existence of truths that can be conceived from comprehensive rationality, but notes that benefits will be derived from the greater permission of individual and community experiences into the practical process of planning.

According to theories of communicative action and interactive practice, information is socially constructed in the community where it is used (Innes, 1995: 185). Knowledge is linked directly to action without the intervening step of decision, thus discrediting the linear, stepwise process assumed by instrumental rationality (Innes, 1995: 185). Furthermore, information always becomes politicized and therefore must be managed by the planner in a way that eliminates the inherent power relations within these politics. Planners must have a concrete understanding as to the uses of information and thus ensure that the importance of experiential knowledge, embedded within communities, is not overshadowed.

2.5 The Contemporary Radical

The Death of Modernism

While the communicative turn, outlined by both Healey and Innes above, contextualizes the history of the modernist project similarly to radical planning literature, the difference between the two lies in the undertaking of future planning action. Although communicative action theorists move away from the decision focus of applied rationality to a concern with interactive social processes, the primary actor and source of attention is still the formally educated planner working primarily through the modernist state (Sandercock, 1998: 97).

Radical streams of postmodernism, on the other hand, reject the maintenance of anything modern. They not only push for a redefinition of planning, but also a restructuring of the institutions that govern the most basic functioning of contemporary society. Perhaps Leonie Sandercock describes the contemporary radical position most effectively in her article “Voices from the Borderlands” (1995), when she first notes that it is currently:

...important to acknowledge that postmodernism is not a metaparadigm awaiting its historical moment to take over from the modernist metaparadigm. Rather, it is a multiplicity of critical, deconstructive, and oppositional voices hovering over the corpse of modernism...It has largely been a dismantling exercise directed against the failures and disastrous consequences of the project of modernity... (78)

However, she then goes on to recognize the spectrum within postmodernism and supports the necessity to build on the more radical approaches of this

dismantling exercise, in order to:

advance a progressive planning practice into the twenty-first century—a practice built on a politics of hope, a concern for economic and social justice and equality, a new moral vision or consciousness, and an “epistemology of multiplicity.” (Sandercock, 1995: 78)

Within this recognition of where planning practice has been and needs to go in the future, there appears to be the framework for severing the institutional constraints that haunt the more conservative planning theories. It is understood that we are being challenged by the diversity that is contemporary society. Therefore, we must listen to the voices of this diversity as they tell us, not only what is wrong with our cities, or for that matter planning, but more importantly, what is wrong with the way we look at the world (Sandercock, 1995: 79). Insofar as providing some guiding action for planning, proponents of this more radical stream (e.g. writers/theorists Gloria Anzaldua, Toni Morrison, and Leslie Marmon Silko), advocate the possibility of living with uncertainty. They recognize it is essential to acknowledge our multiple identities as active subjects and encourage us to take risks, explore, and give up the search or quest for homogeneity. For these theorists, we must embrace our differences and diversity by not adhering to the constraining mechanisms within contemporary institutions and allow our definitions of theory and disciplines to evolve in symbiotic harmony with the communities we aim to serve.

Realizing this, notable criticisms of the more radical streams of postmodern discourse seem to come apart. Arguments are put forth that these viewpoints for

looking at the world do not provide us with a framework by which to measure the quality of planning projects. They do not allow a clean and systematic assessment and therefore in essence, raise more questions than they answer. However, in these arguments the fundamental aspect of this viewpoint is lost. Their very nature of redefining assessment criteria is based on abandoning the notion that there have to be any criteria in the first place. This is part of entering into an uncertain future and allowing for a possibility of radically different outcomes in the undertaking of planning projects.

Radical Planning Practice

When focusing on what radical planners actually do, Sandercock notes:

...radical practices emerge from experience with and a critique of existing unequal relations and distributions of power, opportunity and resources. The goal of these practices is to work for structural transformation of systematic inequalities and, in the process, to empower those who have been systematically disempowered. (Sandercock, 1998: 97)

When operating from this mode of thinking radical planners seem to shed their 'professional skin' and subsequent loyalty to the planning profession and become 'activists' on behalf of the community they currently serve (Sandercock, 1998: 100-101). However, it becomes important here for radical planners not to get 'blinded,' in so far as perceiving the state and corporate economy as the enemies. They must realize that even when they are working with 'communities' (i.e. Christians, white, straight) against these 'enemies,' the communities which they serve will undoubtedly marginalize and exclude other communities (i.e. Jews,

blacks, gays). This is to say that radical planners must be aware of the repressive potential of mobilized communities (Sandercock, 1998: 101).

Furthermore, the radical planner must understand that in certain circumstances a more encompassing conception of 'right' than is possible at a local level, must be realized through the mobilization of state resources. Radical planners cannot simply accept the notion that the state, or the corporate economy for that matter, is the adversary, but instead must act as an antagonist between the state and the insurgent forms of the social (Sandercock, 1998: 101-102).

Understanding the difficult position that planners find themselves in, the issue becomes one of critical distance. This means the creation of a critical distance that can arguably only be achieved through the reconceptualization of both the discipline of planning and the notion of professional identity (Sandercock, 1998: 102). Theory, in a traditional sense, must be deconstructed and new possibilities reconstructed through the acceptance of alternative voices. In turn, planning practice will also undergo a transformation that will allow radical planners to realize the necessary critical distance and in doing so, a greater social responsibility.

2.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter outlined the recent history of planning, particularly in terms of its metaparadigmatic development. Understanding the context of this history, the

chapter then addressed some of John Friedmann's early work on radical planning. Contemporary theories, of communicative action and emergent, insurgent planning, were then discussed in the frameworks that Friedmann set out.

The ideas about radical planning, and particularly the role of the radical planner, will now be brought forward to contextualize the next set of literature. The concepts involved in an ecological approach to planning education will unquestionably require radical action, and thus the operationalization of the ideas developed around this approach are inherently connected to the theories already discussed.

Chapter 3: The Substance and Process of an Ecological Approach

3.1 Towards an Ecological Ethic for Planning Education

History through Rose-Colored Glasses

Understanding the mindset of rationality that has underpinned the tremendous ‘growth’ of humankind, especially in the last two hundred years, it is no surprise that we have understated the ecological crisis that we now face. Humans learn from experience, thus in effect—history. We commonly argue that we have overcome previously inconceivable obstacles and have gone on to flourish. Therefore, the ‘pessimists’ who point to ecological disaster should realize that humankind will ‘figure it out’ through technology and innovation. However, within these arguments are critical errors, in so far as how their understanding of history goes. Optimists of the ‘ultimate resource’ genre neglect the fact that history has always been a tale written by winners (Orr, 1992: 19). The losers, including those who have violated the commandments of carrying capacity, disappeared without ever writing much (Orr, 1992: 19). In fact, the way we come to find out about their demise is through archeological reconstruction that reveals telltale signs of overpopulation, desertification, deforestation, and social breakdown, all of which are prominent realities in today’s world (Orr, 1992: 19).

The Magnitude of Change

More importantly in the optimistic perception of history is the magnitude of the current crisis. The present ecological crisis is qualitatively different, without any historical precedent. It is arguably the first truly global crisis. As

pointed out by Orr (1992: 19-20),

Whether by economics, policy, passion, education, moral suasion, or some combination of the above, advocates of sustainability propose to remake the human role in nature, substantially altering much that we have come to take for granted from Galileo and Adam Smith to the present.

Realizing the inherent flaws within these historical justifications of ‘ecological ignorance,’ it seems necessary to discuss more thoroughly the magnitude of change that is currently necessary. As pointed out by both David Orr and Chet Bowers, “we must completely rework our master metaphorical templates” (Sarkissian, 1996: 298). We will be required to ask what is important for people to know—and therefore what ought to be taught—and frame both our questions and answers in less ‘technical’ terms (Sarkissian, 1996: 298). Our current ‘culture of progress’ will have to be redefined into one of sustainability, or perhaps more appropriately—one of survival (Sarkissian, 1996: 299).

The reworking of these ‘templates’ of society will force us to address our current language and conceptual definitions about the environment. Perhaps the most prominent concept that must be critiqued is that of ‘sustainable development,’ particularly as defined by the Brundtland Commission in 1987. The term often allows individuals, or society in general, some semblance of security as it implies an attainable state. The phrase presumes that “we know, or can discover, levels and thresholds of environmental carrying capacity, which is to say what is

sustainable and what is not” (Orr, 1992: 23). However, in deconstructing the notion of sustainable development, it becomes apparent that current society has ignored the deeper causes of the ecological crisis because these causes undoubtedly raise the possibility that we are in much more dire straits than most would care to believe (Orr, 1992: 24). The definition has been one of ‘polite appeasement’ for both sides of the debate, with the word ‘sustainable’ pacifying environmentalists, while ‘development’ has done the same for the corporate economy (Orr, 1992: 23).

Even more important than a critical view of our historical perspective is to accept our current situation and realize the overwhelming need to act. It is essential that we do not throw up our hands and conclude that “we cannot get there from here,” as this conclusion breeds fatalism and resignation—perhaps in the face of opportunity (Orr, 1992: 21). There must be the realization that society will require an unprecedented vigilance and ritualization of restraints through some “...combination of law, coercion, education, religion, social structure, myth, taboo, and market forces” (Orr, 1992: 22). We are treading into new territory and therefore must break the rationale we have used to solve problems in the past. The time for the radical reform and restructuring of both the rational social consciousness and institutional frameworks is upon us.

Why we need an Ethic of Caring for Nature in Planning Education

In her doctoral thesis (1996) on Australian planning education, Wendy Sarkissian explored the necessity for developing planning education around *an ethic of caring for Nature*, conceived as a deeply grounded, contextual ethic based on a sense of connection with the natural world. The study was underpinned by three major assumptions. Firstly, urban development in Australia (and elsewhere) contributes to both local and global ecological crises. Second, the activities of urban planners help to determine the form of urban development and, by implication, the ecological impacts. Finally, the education of urban planners influences their practices (Sarkissian, 1996: 2-3).

Understanding the foundation from which Sarkissian's study was built it is now possible to situate the argument in favor of an ecological ethic. Through the previous sections of this literature review the drawbacks of the rational, comprehensive model and in effect, past planning actions, have been discussed. Therefore, it can be argued that radically revising planning education would counter the entrenched anthropocentrism and utilitarianism which underpin both planning practice and education (Sarkissian, 1996: 4). If planning curricula were revised to be more value-driven, with the core being an ethic for caring for Nature, then planners would better realize, at a deep level, their connection with the natural world. Thus, they would be better equipped to propose and implement plans that are socially and ecologically sustainable (Sarkissian, 1996: 4).

It would be an over-generalization to say that planners (students, educators, and practitioners) are not ecologically literate, in the sense that they do not understand how ecosystems work. However, it is plausible to argue that they are unaware of the ethical dimensions of their relationship with Nature (Sarkissian, 1996: 4). Throughout their education and professional careers planners have been, and still are, met with demands to attain new skills and knowledges. They are almost forced by society and the institutions in which they operate to learn what is 'acceptable' and 'proper,' all the while not truly understanding the anthropocentric nature and ecological ramifications of these 'acceptable' skills and knowledges.

A major aspect of the move to an ecological ethic in planning education would be a firm focus on ethical and moral issues. While traditionally being seen as inconsistent with the 'goals' of planning education a focus on these issues would be symbiotic with a movement towards value-driven curriculum. It would foster a new breed of planners who could arguably realize their abilities in the radical sense, as discussed by Sandercock and Friedmann, and thus push for social transformation at both an institutional and communities level.

Redefining Planning Education: From Awareness to Action

In order to move towards an ecological ethic in planning education, the educational experience needs to be holistic, collaborative and deeply grounded in direct, concrete experience of the natural world (Sarkissian, 1996: 288). More

importantly, however, is the fact that some fundamental tenets of contemporary education would have to be changed, in turn allowing for radical reconceptualization.

Perhaps to better comprehend the pitfalls of contemporary education in the context of what needs to change it is worthwhile to analyze the various aspects of ecologically responsible education (Sarkissian, 1996). Firstly, there is the issue of holism. In the circumstance of current education, holism comes from the institutional belief in objective, rational thought. This is not to say that planning programs do not recognize a greater need for ecological literacy or that they accept the rational model, but merely a realization that the current systematic linkages with the larger university institution and accreditation bodies inherently focuses the program on a predetermined set of skills and knowledges.

Another important aspect in deconstructing holism in the comprehensive, rational sense is to question the liberal educational tradition that the student is an atomistic individual (Sarkissian, 1996: 293). An inherent product of this assumption is an increased difficulty for the student to accept the concept of holism as it is necessary for the realization of an ecological ethic in planning education. Students become confused as to their ability to operate in the contradictory roles between individualism (liberal tradition) and the concepts of interconnectedness that are necessary for an ecological ethic.

Second, is the need for education to be collaborative. It may be argued that for this notion to be authentic, designing planning curricula would have to be more inclusive of different 'communities' of people, in Friedmann's sense. Curricula would not be designed by individual professors or groups of professors, outside the realm of the involvement of these communities, nor would they validate certain skills and knowledge while invalidating others. Instead, curriculum development would become a creation of intersubjective mutual understanding (as Healey and Innes have discussed) among professors, planning students and other communities (i.e. other disciplines in the university, gay and lesbian groups, or aboriginals). However, it becomes important for the mediation role of the radical educational planner not to be forgotten. The maintenance of critical distance is essential such that the educational planner can permit the free flow of ideas and allow the transformation of communities' formal and experiential knowledge into concrete curriculum restructuring.

A third prominent aspect of redefining planning education will be the emphasis placed on direct and concrete experience of the natural world. Although many current planning programs are moving away from traditional professorial lecture formats, they still need to advance in terms of offering this direct, concrete experience. Once individuals are subjected to the natural world they become undoubtedly more aware of it. Furthermore, from this awareness they begin to recognize the interconnectedness of their actions with the environment and the ramifications of their everyday and professional activity.

Education and Ecological Literacy

Ecological literacy, according to Garret Hardin, is the ability to ask “What then?” (Orr, 1992: 85). While considerable attention has been paid to teaching and educating society in literacy and numeracy, there seems to have been a failure to develop ecological literacy (Orr, 1992: 85). To become ecologically literate and teach ecological literacy we must develop a more demanding capacity to observe nature with insight and awareness (Orr, 1994; Orr, 1992: 86). As Orr so delicately phrases it, we must develop the ability to “...merge our landscape and mindscape” (Orr, 1992: 86).

As pointed out in the literature review of Sarkissian, the tenets of the liberal education tradition are unable to fundamentally address ecological problems. Thus we must rethink both the substance and the process of education at all levels (Orr, 1992: 90). Orr (1994; 1992) notes that we must premise this redefined education on six foundations:

1. All education is environmental education.
2. Environmental issues are complex and cannot be understood through a single discipline or department.
3. For inhabitants, education occurs in part as a dialogue with a place and has the characteristics of good conversation.
4. The way education occurs is as important as its content.
5. Experience in the natural world is both an essential part of understanding the environment, and conducive to good thinking.
6. Education relevant to the challenge of building a sustainable society will enhance the learner’s competence with natural systems.

Starting Points for Planning

Keeping in mind these six foundations, addressing the work of Timothy Beatley now seems appropriate. With a more specific focus on planning issues, Beatley advocates the need to develop a new ethic for sustainable places. Similar to Sarkissian, Beatley supports what are arguably the convictions of an ecological ethic, but refers to it as an *ethic for sustainable places* (Beatley, 1997: 195). Aspects of this ethic include interdependence, farsightedness, altruism, regionalism, nonmaterialism, humility, and kinship (Beatley, 1997: 195). Beatley (1997) outlines the importance of teaching ecological literacy and notes that what we leave out of education is just as important as what we include in terms of indicating the priority and importance of the natural environment. Therefore, to achieve the consciousness needed we must never miss the opportunity to incorporate the educative function into educational activity.

As far as graduate planning education goes these ideas are of great importance. The skills and knowledges that are currently taught may not necessarily be useless, but undoubtedly must be reconceptualized in the terms of what would be valued under the adoption of a new ethic. This is to say that what skills are considered 'acceptable' in current planning curriculum may still very well be needed, but not necessarily the basic foundation from which the program is driven. Instead, 'biophilic' values, meaning the deep biological need for affiliating with life and nature, will be the starting point from which to guide

planning education (Beatley, 1997: 201-202). Furthermore, these biophilic values must be cultivated to achieve their full expression. Beatley points out, “they depend on repeated exposure and social reinforcement before emerging as meaningful dimensions of human emotional and intellectual life” (1997: 202).

Beatley further goes on to say that the difficulty or perceived improbability of reaching sustainability and ecological literacy should not paralyze us into complacency or nonaction. It is in this sense that the role of the educational planner becomes paramount. In order to realize the type of education justified by the new ethic the educational planner will seemingly have to adopt radical tendencies. There will be tremendous pressure upon the individual to seek greater self-awareness in order to maintain the conviction to overcome the institutional obstacles they are undoubtedly going to face in their pursuit of this educational transformation.

The Planner as Radical Environmentalist

To truly make the radical shifts in planning education that have been argued for here, we will have to question our own intellect and the intellect that universities seek to train. We must realize that this intellect fits the demands of instrumental rationality built into the industrial economy (Sarkissian, 1996: 330). A move towards a greater ecological intelligence will be required and to attain this intelligence a radical change or refocusing is necessary. Within planning it will entail the adoption of techniques, skills and knowledges outlined by the various

camps of radical theory. While the embracing of the more radical framework, discussed by Friedmann and Sandercock, seems necessary many of the concepts of communicative action theory should not be dismissed. The planning processes that are developed within the communicative turn are undoubtedly essential in achieving the aspired state of an ecological ethic, however, the purpose must not simply be those processes. Focus must be given to substantive issues of ecological ethics and in doing so planners must adopt a counter-hegemonic perspective to prepare communities' for social transformation.

3.2 Chapter Summary

This chapter began by addressing the anthropocentric biases of 'rational' historic writings and pointed out how these writings have helped shape the way humans perceive and interact with the biophysical environment. It outlined the sheer magnitude of the global ecological crisis and formulated an argument that supports the need for radical change. The role of planning education within this radical change was discussed and ideas of how to operationalize a more ecologically responsible planning education explored.

This chapter further worked to inform the design of the methodological strategy and the nature of the questions seen in the next chapter. Specific ideas that were discussed here influenced the type of information that was sought and provided context in the analysis of this data.

Chapter 4: Research Tactics

4.1 Research Instruments

Apart from questioning relevant literature this study also employed two different research techniques. The research tools that were used to gather empirical data included focus group interviews and key informant, qualitative interviews.

Focus Groups

The reason for using focus groups was to get people who possess certain characteristics to provide data of a qualitative nature in a focused discussion (Krueger, 1988: 27). The advantages of focus groups as outlined by Krueger (1998: 44-46) are:

1. It is a socially oriented research procedure, thus placing participants in natural, real-life situations as opposed to controlled experimental situations.
2. It is a format that allows the moderator to probe.
3. Focus groups have high face validity.
4. Focus group discussions are relatively low in cost.
5. Focus groups provide speedy results.

For the purpose of this study two focus groups were conducted. One group was made up of 4 current planning students in the City Planning Department at the University of Manitoba and the other was made up of 6 planning practitioners who are members of the Manitoba Professional Planners Institute. Each group session ran approximately one-and-a-half hours. The focus groups were tape recorded for transcribing purposes, however, in no way were statements attached to the individual identities of participants. Furthermore, all tape recordings and notes from the focus group sessions were destroyed upon completion of the

research project. Participants were informed that they were free to withdraw from the session at anytime without penalty or consequence.

None of the questions asked in the focus groups were “why” questions as they imply a rational answer. Furthermore, these types of questions have a sharpness or pointedness to them that seems almost interrogative (Krueger, 1988: 62). This sharpness can seemingly set off defensive barriers and the cause respondents to take a position on the ‘socially acceptable’ side of a controversial issue and not necessarily reflect the respondents true feelings (Krueger, 1988: 62).

The focus groups were premised on the position that graduate planning programs should adopt an ecological ethic. The purpose of the focus groups was not to determine whether or not this type of ethic is necessarily the ‘correct’ way to structure graduate planning programs. Instead, the aim was to get participants’ thoughts and ideas on developing a set of ecological principles that may be used to guide future planning curriculum. It is important to note that the focus group sessions did not seek to gain consensus on the issues, but merely to gather the perceptions and feelings of the participants.

In order to minimize concern over possible participant inability to operate from the aforementioned perspective a targeted recruitment strategy was undertaken. In the case of the student group, the researcher was relatively familiar with all possible participants and their viewpoints on environmental and/or ecological

issues. Therefore, it was the goal of the researcher to involve those individuals who have expressed sympathy and interest in a movement towards increasing the environmental focus of graduate planning education, in the focus group session. For the session involving planning practitioners recruiting was also done on the basis of personal viewpoints on environmental ideas. However, this was slightly more difficult since the researcher was unfamiliar with most of the prospective participants. Therefore, a review of past thesis/practicum documents was done in order to get a sense of which practitioners may have been more focused on environmental planning issues in the past. In addition, those practitioners that are currently working in areas more specifically related to environmental planning were targeted.

With this in mind, it should be noted that the recruitment of planning practitioners was extremely difficult due to their busy work schedules. Thus, once a location and date were finally secured it was a matter of involving those that were available for that specific time. In doing this, only four of the six participants were part of the original 'possibilities for recruitment,' while the other two could perhaps be perceived as being less explicitly involved with the subject matter in the discussion. However, it should be noted that including these two individuals in the focus group session did not appear to influence the discussion in a negative way, in terms of these individuals not being able to significantly contribute to the discussion.

The data obtained in the focus groups was analyzed according to Krueger's key characteristics of focus group analysis: a disciplined process, systematic steps, a defined protocol, verifiable results, and multiple feedback loops (1998c: 4).

Within these characteristics the qualitative data analysis method of successive approximation as outlined by Neuman (1991) was used. To ensure consistency, the process of conducting and analyzing the focus groups was done in a systematic manner. Firstly, the sequencing and structuring of the questions allowed maximum insight by participants. The moderator allowed each individual to become familiar with the topic through the introductory and transition questions, thus permitting participants the chance to give maximum insight when key questions were posed. The key questions related to the core topic of interest and were later followed by a final summary question that provided all participants the opportunity for expansion and/or clarification. This summary also acted as a means of participant verification, since any inconsistent assumptions that the moderator made were open to critique by the participants. Moreover, an abbreviated transcription was done immediately following each group session to capture the first impressions and highlights of that session.

Within this initial debriefing consideration was given to matters such as important themes, differences from expected outcomes, points to be included in the report, usable quotes, and possible improvements or changes for future sessions (Krueger, 1998c: 50).

As noted above, a method of successive approximation was used for the data analysis (Neuman, 1991: 419). This comprised repeated iterations or cycling through steps moving toward a final analysis. It entailed the attachment of labels to, or the categorization of, dominant ideas and phenomena. Furthermore, it allows the researcher to fracture the data and to reassemble them in new ways (Krueger, 1998c: 10-11).

The level of interpretation of the data is also extremely important. Krueger identifies the four levels along the analysis continuum as; raw data, description, interpretation, and recommendation (1998c: 27). For the purpose of this study the level of interpretation went beyond mere description of the data towards an attempt at interpreting or understanding what the data means.

The Interview

For the purpose of this study 8 qualitative interviews were conducted with various faculty members from planning programs across Canada. The respective programs were chosen largely to obtain a good representation of planning schools in Canada and thus overcome some of the limitations that may arise from a more geographically focused study.

The interviews took place over the phone, but initial contact with the participants was done by way of electronic mail. Initially, the interviewees were contacted and informed of the purpose and objectives of the project. Those agreeing to

participate were then sent a letter of informed consent and a mutually acceptable interview time was arranged. To provide greater legitimacy to the request (at the point of initial contact) electronic mail communications were also carbon copied to the City Planning Department Head at the University of Manitoba, who is also the primary advisor of this project. In addition, it is also important to note that a request to tape record the interview was made in the initial correspondence and again immediately before the interview was took place. Participants were informed that they were free to terminate the interview process at anytime without penalty or consequence.

With respect to the interview questions, a number of drafts were done before a final set of questions was decided upon. An understanding of developing questions for the purpose of qualitative research was gained through a review of social science methodology literature (Hessler, 1992; Holstein & Gubrium, 1995; Plays, 1997; Rubin and Rubin, 1995). Early drafts of potential questions were scrutinized and pre-tested by individuals comparable to the proposed interviewees (namely planning educators). However, it must be realized that the nature of this qualitative research required some changes in the questions once early interviews were undertaken. To allow the possibility of exploring unexpected themes or areas that may arise, flexibility in the research design was seen as imperative (Rubin and Rubin, 1995: 44-48).

Analysis of the interview data began with the interviewer transcribing the contents of the interview. Following this, the data was coded into dominant themes and/or ideas which built towards an overall explanation of how and why things happen (Rubin and Rubin, 1995: 234). Finally, the analysis entailed looking for linkages across the coding categories which ultimately enabled the construction of an integrated explanation.

The presentation of the analysis (see Chapter 5) was influenced largely by David Brown's thesis, Planning Places: Enabling the Practitioner (1999). The clarity and flow of Brown's analysis was admirable, and therefore a similar presentation format was adopted for this thesis.

4.2 Limitations of the Research Instruments

The Focus Groups

Ideally focus groups are composed of participants who are reasonably homogeneous and relatively unfamiliar with each other (Krueger, 1988: 28). With respect to this study the participants can be deemed to be homogeneous in the sense that they all have a vested interest in graduate planning education. However, some problem does arise in the unfamiliarity aspect, with the participants in both groups being very well known to each other. This raises questions about some underlying power relations that may or may not be present. It would be difficult to attribute to what degree responses are being given based on known past experiences or previous discussions with certain other members of

the group. However, in this study this problem seems unavoidable. On the other hand, the interviewer was also familiar with most of the participants, so while the relationships between him and each of them remain an unmeasured influence, it was possible to convene the group with knowledge of the relationships among participants.

Another limitation of the focus group was realized in the fact that the moderator of the group sessions was the same individual who is pursuing the thesis. This required that the moderator be extremely aware of his own personal biases within the study and work to ensure that they did not influence the discussion to fit personal preference, as opposed to seeking insight, understanding and wisdom from the participants.

While the validity of focus group results has been questioned by positivists due to the qualitative nature of the data source, this study will operate on an assumption that this is the most able research method to obtain the type and greatest amount of information needed (Krueger, 1988; Neuman, 1991).

The Interviews

The major limitation with respect to the interviews in this study was the lack of personal contact with the subjects. Due to the fact that the research subjects were geographically located throughout Canada the interviewer does not have the resources to meet each one 'face-to-face.' This obviously impeded the ability of

the interviewer to record the body language of respondents when answering various questions. This is significant in the undertaking of qualitative interviews as researchers often consider more than just the verbal responses in the analysis of the event.

4.3 Chapter Summary

This chapter has outlined the general research strategy for the empirical portion of the thesis. The types of research instruments that were used were described and the tactics for analyzing, interpreting and presenting the data explained. In addition, some of the perceived limitations of the research tactics were discussed.

Based on the framework developed in this chapter, the following chapter presents the analysis of the data.

Chapter 5: Responding to the Possibility of Change in Planning Education

5.1 Introduction

In Chapters 2 and 3 a theoretical foundation has been presented that has not only shaped the methodological approach of the study, but also the nature of the data that resulted. In turn, Chapter 4 outlined the tactics that were used to gather the data and the approach that was used to analyze this information. It is in this chapter where the results of the empirical research will be presented.

In the course of analyzing the empirical material, a number of themes emerged. The presentation of the empirical research is structured around these themes, in particular, how they appeared throughout the individual components of the methodological strategy (i.e. focus group or interview). As a result, this chapter will be separated into four sections: one looking at the themes that arose out of the focus group session with professional planning practitioners; another looking at the themes seen in the focus group session with current graduate planning students; a third discussing those that came out of the numerous interviews with planning faculty from across Canada; and a final section which sums up some of the major highlights of the empirical research and reflects on the dominant themes which crosscut various components of the research. Within the first three sections each theme will be presented as a separate sub-section, providing a description of participant responses. In addition to outlining the themes that arose in the data, each sub-section also has an interpretive summary in which the researcher attempts to clarify why the participants may have given the types of responses

they did. These summaries are largely a result of numerous observations the researcher made both during the respective sessions and also following the completion of the sessions when further analysis was being conducted.

5.2 Focus Group—Professional Planning Practitioners

Themes that emerged during the focus group with planning practitioners included the interpretations of key terminology; the emphasis on ecological issues in planning education; the relationship between planning education and professional planning practice; the relationship between program principles and the Canadian Institute of Planners *Statement of Values*; and the possibility of developing planning education around a distinct set of ecological principles.

It is important to note that the 6 participants for this focus group session were all practicing planners and current members of the Canadian Institute of Planners. They came from a variety of positions within the sphere of planning and had a wide degree of responsibilities. At the beginning of the focus group session all participants were given a copy of the current CIP *Statement of Values* (see Appendix B). There was also a fairly even distribution in terms of both the junior/senior planner distinction and male/female distinction.

Theme 1: Interpretations of Key Terminology

This theme presents participants' views on the key terms that are crucial to the research project and, perhaps more importantly, their perceived understanding of

the questions. For the purpose of this study it was necessary to attempt to make sense of how the various participants differentiated between the term 'environmental' and 'ecological.'

While there was common agreement that the two terms were inherently different, there was less consensus on the actual meaning of each of the terms.

While one senior planner recognized that 'ecological' and 'environmental' took on "completely different meanings," it was felt that:

'Ecological' deals with regional issues. Things such as carrying capacity in a regional sense and other things that are beyond the realm of a predominantly local focus. 'Environmental' on the other hand, implies an ethnocentric view, therefore, leaving planners with a perception that we can control it. 'Ecological' ultimately deals with things that may be beyond our realm of control.

This viewpoint was built upon by another participant when it was noted that:

'Ecological' is a far more holistic approach, which goes beyond the natural towards the economic and the social. 'Environmental' is a more narrow approach.

Another senior planner added to this by addressing the terms in the context of the planning work that was part of their everyday life:

'Ecological' encompasses 'environmental.' It is a more holistic approach which includes and considers the ecology of places and people. It doesn't simply consider land-use issues, but also accounts for issues of community, culture, and the cultural diversity within a place.

Another planner, however, seemed to move towards a contradictory understanding of the two terms:

For me, the two both emphasize issues of sustainability. However, 'environmental' is broader as it encompasses the social, economic, and political. 'Ecological' seems to focus more on life-forms and the biophysical environment.

The same planner, however, then added:

The term 'ecological' is limiting as the general population may think of these terms differently than would professional planners. Therefore, it would be difficult to approach planning from an ecological perspective as it may not be properly understood.

Building on the concept of the 'general population' lacking understanding, another planner pointed out that people most often have gut reactions to these types of constructs:

In a sense, 'ecological' sparks or implies urgency and a feeling of life or death. 'Environmental' allows for the same sensitivity [to natural systems] without the same sense of urgency.

One junior planner, on the other hand, saw the two terms from a slightly different perspective and focused on how each related to planning processes:

I agree with those of you that see 'ecological' as more complex and more inclusive, but it becomes a matter of process. 'Ecological' is process-oriented and planning could benefit from an ecological ethic. Since an ecological ethic places emphasis on process and the interaction of various components within that process, it allows or frames a greater consciousness about interaction.

Interpretive Summary

When looking at the responses given by the participants there was an obvious lack of consensus on the meaning of the terms. As noted earlier, it seems the only thing that could be agreed on was that the two terms were not perceived as being the same. Perhaps most interesting was that some of the planners were concerned

that misunderstandings of the terms by the 'general population' would pose difficulties to the operationalization of an ecological approach to planning. This in mind, they placed little emphasis on their own differing interpretations of the terms and the potential obstacles that may materialize as a result.

However, there did not seem to be any correlation between the level of experience of the respective planners and their subsequent interpretation of the two terms. One may have expected that senior planners, who by their own admission were educated largely in the technical aspects of planning during an era of 'comprehensive rationality,' would have related 'ecological' to more of an applied 'natural' science outside the realm of planning. While this was true of one senior planner, another seemed more 'contemporary' in interpreting the term, not necessarily relating it automatically to a natural science context, but addressing the underlying assumptions of the concept in the context of professional planning.

To understand this dichotomy it seems to be important to have a greater knowledge of the individuals. For instance, in previous encounters [by the researcher] with the aforementioned individuals it has become apparent that one may practice planning from a more 'pragmatic' approach, whereas the other seems to take a more 'reflective' approach, not only in terms of the daily tasks they perform, but also in terms of developing a deeper sense of 'self' and understanding their connection to a realm "largely outside their control."

On the other side of the spectrum was the inconsistency between junior planners who, for all intents and purposes, graduated at the same time from the same planning program. An explanation for this may arise partly from the vastly different undergraduate degrees each person obtained and the development of different values within these degrees, or possibly from previous experiences. It may also be attributed to the nature of the work they have undertaken since graduation and the 'schooling' they have received during their relatively short professional careers. This is to say that some of the individuals have operated in an extremely rigid bureaucratic system where the concept of an 'ecological' approach may run counter to certain aspects of the institutional philosophy. Others have worked primarily in a consulting role and on a contract basis where the 'rules of operation' may not have been as rigidly defined and thus not as limiting.

Theme 2: The Emphasis on Ecological Issues in Planning Education

This theme presents participants' views on the prominence of the ecological approaches to planning during their graduate planning education. Within this theme there was far more consensus, particularly in terms of the perceived lack of emphasis on ecological approaches. However, the causes that the participants attributed to this deficiency were more varied. Moreover, some did not feel that this lack of emphasis should even be perceived as a deficiency.

One junior planner pointed out that:

I'm not sure it [planning education] did address ecological issues. I now feel that I lack this type of knowledge. I would definitely like to pursue or address these types of issues now as I find them popping up in my work. Come to think of it I don't think the word 'ecology' ever came up throughout my planning education. However, I feel that one teacher tried to get us thinking about these types of issues. I mean, in a sense of using holistic approaches to problems. Knowing this though, the hard skills necessary to address these issues were never taught.

These sentiments were largely echoed by another junior planner. However, they did not appear to be as convinced that an implicit 'holistic' approach was conveyed. Furthermore, it is important to realize that this planner disagreed with the above planner on the meaning of the term 'ecological.' This planner felt that 'ecological' encompassed a more natural sciences approach and dealt predominantly with the biophysical environment. This planner noted:

The ecological focus in my planning education dealt with how ecological principles effected urban form. There was nowhere that developed a full understanding of the interdependence of social, economic, and cultural effects.

Understanding this planner's initial interpretation of the term 'ecological' it seems that the above statement may be inherently flawed by confusing the interpretation from the first sentence to the next. While there is agreement with the first planner in the last sentence of the statement, by using ecological approaches in terms of a deeper understanding of the complex nature of social, political, economic and cultural relations, the first sentence of the statement seems to move towards addressing ecological principles in more narrow terms of how natural systems provide limitations and obstacles to the development of urban form. Thus, the

planner seemed uncertain with respect to how to truly differentiate between 'environmental' and 'ecological' and in many cases may have been reacting to a statement made by another individual.

One senior planner also discussed the absence of ecological issues in previous planning education as a 'sign of the times.' However, it was noted that an individual could still gain the necessary knowledge through a commitment to learning and an ability to recognize the importance of multidisciplinary learning:

My planning education in no way addressed these types of issues. Curricula in those days were based on a technical and skills approach. There was no stress on interdependency of different parts of the various environments. The understanding of this interdependency was realized through one's familiarity with other disciplines, such as anthropology, history, art, and music. It was this multidisciplinary approach on the part of certain individuals that allowed the understanding of the ecology of places.

Another senior planner, however, took a different approach to the question:

The role of planning education is not to produce ecologists. Therefore, to say that my education did not address ecological issues is somewhat of an obvious statement. Accepting this though, I do feel that there was an implicit sense of an 'ecological approach' in terms of emphasizing interrelationships and the interface of built environment to other aspects of the planning realm.

Finally, a junior planner, who initially focused on the process orientation of an ecological approach noted:

I do feel these issues were present in my education. I would dare to say though that it was mostly as a result of one teacher who promoted that sort of thing. Through this person, I became engulfed in it and in fact, my thesis had an ecological component to it. Not only in terms of the interdependency focus, but also in the narrow sense of paying attention to

natural systems.

Interpretive Summary

It became apparent within discussion of a question on the emphasis of ecological issues in one's planning education that some of the participants began to respond based on varying definitions of the term 'ecological.' As noted above, there were even cases where individuals confused the term in the same statement. In other comments, however, the degree to which this became apparent was much more subtle. For instance, the senior planner who felt it was not the role of planning education to produce ecologists seemed to be making that statement based on a personal interpretation of the term. In turn, when pointing out that there was an implicit sense of an ecological approach in terms of stressing interrelationships, it appears the comment is arising out of what they may perceive as the more acceptable definition at that place and time (e.g. IF an ecological approach IS this then, yes, I would say there is some underlying evidence of it).

It could also be determined from the responses that none felt that an ecological approach was a fundamental philosophy of their respective planning programs. While some participants noted that the ideas were implicitly fostered, perhaps in a sub-conscious manner, others felt it was largely a result of an individual faculty member's personal agenda. Accepting that an ecological approach was either implicit or the personal agenda of individual faculty members it may be more explainable why participants from the same program were so varied in their perceived exposure to these ideas. Some students may not have consciously

recognized the presence of these ideas or also may never have had a close relationship with the individual professors who promoted these concepts.

Theme 3: Relationship between Planning Education and Professional Practice

This theme presents participants' views on how they see their planning education influencing the professional planning practice they have since undertaken. The focus of the relationship was mainly the influence of values that were developed within planning school and how those have manifested themselves in professional practice.

It seemed that most individuals did not feel that planning school changed their personal values in any significant way. However, this did not necessarily equate to a feeling that planning education in no way influenced these personal values and how they (values) have been articulated in practice.

One junior planner seemed to have an excellent sense of how personal values were contextualized within a planning program and subsequently in professional practice:

I must admit that personal values drive how I practice planning. Planning theory allows the implementation of personal values, or at least, a means of evaluating how personal values fit into the grander scheme of things.

Another junior planner built upon this when it was noted that:

Personal values also drive my planning practice. Planning education helped clarify these values and in doing so built upon what it is I believe is important.

An interesting response to the above statements came when a senior planner pointed out:

So what you two are saying is that planning theory gives us a guidebook.

This same individual then went on to add:

Well, I think it is a little more complicated than that. In my opinion, the reason there is no one theory of planning is that everyone has their own personal biases and planning thought or theory is incorporated into this. Maybe everyone has their own planning theory, or should I say, theory of planning! I guess it becomes a matter of planners influencing theory and vice versa. There is a constant interaction between the two that should not be overlooked. For me though, planning education gave me a means of approaching my work in a systematic way—a knowledgeable manner.

Another senior planner then discussed this influence as it relates to the purpose of planning education:

It was definitely not the goal of professional education (during my years in planning school) to approach planning from a value-development philosophy. Therefore, I cannot say that planning education influenced the way I practice planning. The way I practice really came out of my own personal value set, and my views on social justice, democracy, and cultural diversity. What my education did give me is the technical ability to perform essential planning duties.

Following these statements, another senior planner felt that the others were not giving planning education enough credit:

I am a bit shocked at what I have heard. Planning education largely influenced the way I practice. My undergraduate degree was in architecture and it stressed individuality. Planning education differed from this in its emphasis on collaboration and teamwork. It taught how to solicit local communities opinions and recognized the importance of

these opinions. I do agree though that many of your own values are brought into the way you practice. This, however, is the beauty of planning, as it embraces diverse values and is a fuller, richer profession as a result.

Interpretive Summary

Although a number of the participants indicated that they did not feel that planning changed their existing values or gave them a new set of values, it does not appear that they were discrediting the education that they received. In turn, it is not evidence that they felt that an educational program, such as planning, should not attempt to foster a particular value set. Instead, the comments may point to the tacit nature in which planning education influenced their personal values, therefore, requiring one to engage in a reflective exercise to truly understand the complex relationship between education and the development of personal values.

Another interesting insight with respect to this theme could be seen in the comments made by the senior planner who graduated during an era concerned with a 'rational' approach to planning. It may be argued that part of this 'rational' approach was not to 'educate' in an academic sense, but rather to 'train' in terms of developing the required technical competencies to perform planning tasks. This outlook to planning education has changed considerably, and there is now recognition of the inherent problems of a 'value-neutral' perspective. Understanding this, it is unlikely that most of the planners, who graduated after

this 'rational' era, have not had their values influenced significantly by the education they received.

Theme 4: Relationship between Planning Program Principles and the Canadian Institute of Planners Statement of Values

This theme presents participants' views on how the fundamental principles of the planning programs they attended addressed the adoption of a particular set of values. Specifically, the comments further reflect how these principles relate to those values outlined by the Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP), which is the accreditation body for planning programs in Canada.

In overviewing the *CIP Statement of Values* one senior planner again related the relevance of these values to the era in which they attended planning school. The planner pointed out:

These values were not emphasized during my years in school, and nor were any others. The theory discussed emphasized a need for professionalism and focus was given to planning expertise. Remember, this was a while before all the talk about sustainability, environmental stewardship, and natural resource management which are prominent aspects of the CIP values. In addition, we now live in a vastly different cultural environment where many characteristics from my day are no longer acceptable.

Following up on the above statement, another senior planner added:

There definitely was not a strong connection between the schools and CIP during my years. In fact, the professional side of planning was used largely for providing examples of all that was wrong with planning. The school did not look to CIP to set the values. However, implicitly I think the current set of values did become apparent throughout the program, in one way or another.

Although the other participants felt somewhat differently, it should be mentioned that they were products of a more contemporary education. Unlike the two planners above, all the remaining individuals felt that CIP values were strongly present, but noted other problematic aspects:

The CIP values always came up. I do feel something was lacking in terms of how far our education went in providing us the tools or mechanisms for achieving some of the stated values. One example could be seen with respect to the values on fostering public participation. I do not feel I was taught the hard skills necessary to do a really good job at this. Upon graduation I felt almost letdown in terms of what I had as a skill set.

This sentiment was embarked upon by another planner who agreed:

While the CIP values were present, I would also say the skills were not. I think those (the skills) were something that we had to pick up on our own, once we entered the world of professional practice.

However, another junior planner adamantly disagreed with the notion that there seemed to be a lack of emphasis on skill development. This planner noted:

I agree that these values were present, but I feel the total opposite about the development of skills as they relate to these values. I think the studio experience provided students with a venue to develop these skills.

This same junior planner then seemed to qualify the statement when they added:

Who knows, maybe my experiences at school were largely influenced by one particular professor. Lucky for me they just happened to teach one of the studio courses.

Interpretive Summary

Since planning programs are accredited by the Canadian Institute of Planners it may be reasonable to assume that they would try and emphasize the values of the CIP. Thus, it is not surprising that the majority of the participants agreed that these values were present throughout their education. However, what was striking was the strong disagreement between two planners (who graduated relatively close together), about the provision of 'hard' skills in the planning program.

To explain these diverse perceptions one needs to attempt to understand the underlying aspects of their comments. For example, one individual constantly refers to the "influence of a particular" professor, therefore, it may be fair to assume that the degree of influence of values upon a student can largely be attributed to the nature of personal relationships with various faculty members of a planning department. If students have a strong relationship with a particular professor (who will undoubtedly convey a certain set of values, either implicitly or explicitly) they may carry the influence of these values through the program as a whole and receive greater benefit in all the courses they take. In contrast, if a student does not forge these same types of relationships with individual professors, they may feel somewhat 'cheated' in terms of what they get out of the educational experience. The student may not readily tap into the resourcefulness

of the various faculty members and consequently suffer in terms of both clarifying their personal values and sharpening 'hard' skills.

Beyond just the personal nature of relationships between faculty and students the issue of skill development may have something to do with the fundamental changes in planning theory and methods of practice. As pointed out by the senior planner who came out of the 'rational' era, the emphasis was singularly on the development of technical skills. In a more contemporary era, which could be termed 'postmodern,' mechanisms or 'tools for action,' in the practical sense of achieving CIP values, may not be culturally acceptable. For instance, the solutions for problems encompassing multicultural issues may not have any rigid operational models. Instead, increased emphasis is put on 'softer' skills such as critical analysis and self-reflection. It is the attainment of these competencies that may more greatly empower the planner to address the complexity of contemporary planning problems, by enabling them to adapt more 'traditional' methods to meet the needs of their constituencies.

It also becomes important to realize that planning education does not end upon graduation from a planning school. Instead, there is a period of more practical development once entering the world of professional practice and subsequently a certain degree of lifelong learning. With the diverse nature of the planning, it is not reasonable to assume that an educational program can address the wide variety of skills needed to enter the numerous aspects of professional planning.

This may account for why individuals who graduate from the same program have different opinions on how successful the school was at addressing the required skills of their planning work.

Theme 5: Possibility of Developing Planning Education Around a Distinct Set of Ecological Principles

This theme presents the participants' perceptions as they relate to the possibility of explicitly adopting an ecological ethic to guide planning education. As in the initial theme, which dealt with the interpretations of the term 'ecological,' it becomes necessary here to understand the perspective from which the participants were addressing the issue. Therefore, much insight was gained about the responses when they were compared to statements made about the differentiation between 'environmental' and 'ecological.'

Perhaps the most startling response came from one senior planner who hastily noted:

This would be a terrible idea. I am Catholic and I have had enough indoctrination! I am not just saying this because I do not see myself as an environmentalist. I think it would be equally as bad to operate from a distinct set of laissez-faire principles, or a right-wing corporate ethic.

Another senior planner quickly added to this by reiterating what was earlier said:

We are not ecologists. I think we are venturing beyond our realm of influence. In fact, I do not believe it is the place of a planning program to operate 'explicitly' from any particular perspective. It is the job of a planning department to teach students 'how' to think and not 'what' to think.

These extremely strong viewpoints were somewhat tempered by another senior planner, who reflected on their own previous comments and then pointed out that:

Aspects of the ecological approach are extremely useful for planners. If a program were to be developed around this approach it would be extremely important to clarify exactly what the term 'ecological' means. There would have to be a coherent definition because as we can see from this discussion different folks have different understandings of the term.

Perhaps as a result of the above statement, other individuals within the room seemed to feel more comfortable addressing the initial comments by the two senior planners. One junior planner noted:

I would definitely be supportive of the idea of adopting ecological principles to guide a planning program. It would seem difficult to argue with an ideology that fosters a holistic approach to planning issues.

The support for an ecological ethic to guide planning education was further supported by another junior planner, but some suggestions were also noted:

I definitely agree that the aspects of the approach seem promising, but I cannot help but wonder how the program would address the important issue of teaching important implementation mechanisms.

These suggestions were expanded when the senior planner who posed support for the idea pointed out:

Considering the last comment and knowing what I know about the difficulty of delivering, it becomes extremely critical to prepare students for the harsh realities of the political arena. With a planning program operating from an ecological approach and stressing the interrelationships within a system, students cannot become discouraged when they face the tough institutional obstacles they are guaranteed to come up against.

Interpretive Summary

When analyzing the comments that were made it became evident that there were a number of internal inconsistencies. Perhaps the most remarkable of these could be seen in the response by the senior planner who likened an ecologically-driven planning program to religious indoctrination. What was most interesting was that this same individual initially characterized the term 'ecological' to be an encompassing idea that fostered an understanding of regional issues. In addition, they added that they saw 'ecological' as implying a less ethnocentric viewpoint.

Equally as intriguing was the assertion that the purpose of planning education was not to produce ecologists. It is important to note that this individual maintained a relatively consistent viewpoint throughout the sequence of questions and also pointed out that there is a tendency to have a 'gut reaction' to these types of terms. While the point raised is extremely relevant in terms of actualizing an ecologically-driven planning program, it was surprising that when asked to look at possibilities of explicit ecological principles for planning education the tendency was to fall back to a 'gut reaction.' However, this may be an indication that the participant did not have a frame of reference on hand, so instinctively went to the 'gut.' Moreover, this tendency appears to reinforce the necessity for a clear articulation of terms and how they would be used in developing a set of program elements.

Synopsis of Practitioner Group

When reflecting on the overall nature and tone of the practitioners comments it brings to light the importance of what was left out of their planning education. Priority towards understanding the importance of the affects of planning on the natural environment was never developed. This is not to say the practitioners were not aware that planning was linked with the biophysical environment, but rather a feeling that they were never attuned to the ethical dimensions of the interrelationships between planning and Nature.

5.3 Focus Group—Graduate Planning Students

Themes that emerged during the focus group with graduate planning students included the interpretations of key terminology; reasons for choosing a particular graduate planning program; the relationship between program principles and the Canadian Institute of Planners *Statement of Values*; and the possibility of developing planning education around a distinct set of ecological principles.

It is important to note that the 4 participants for this focus group session were all graduate students in the Department of City Planning at the University of Manitoba and current student members of the Canadian Institute of Planners. At the beginning of the focus group session all participants were given a copy of the current CIP *Statement of Values* (see Appendix B). While all participants are currently enrolled in planning at the University of Manitoba (at varying stages in the program), they did come from a wide range of undergraduate backgrounds

from different schools across Canada. There was an even number of male and female participants.

Theme 1: Interpretations of Key Terminology

Similar to the first focus group session, this theme presents participants' views on the key terms that are crucial to the research project and, perhaps more importantly, their perceived understanding of the questions. For the purpose of this study it was necessary to attempt to make sense of how the various participants differentiated between the term 'environmental' and 'ecological.'

Within this focus group there seemed to be a relatively high degree of consensus on the meaning of each of the terms.

Out of the group all but one of the individuals seemed to be confident in their personal understanding of the terms. One of the students characterized the difference as such:

I definitely differentiate between the two terms. I see 'ecological' as being far more holistic in its approach to any issue. It is more organic than mechanistic. In order to understand a system we have to get out of the habit of looking at parts individually, whether it be planning or otherwise. 'Environmental' on the other hand brings connotations of the 'natural' environment. Things such as science and biology. This being said it also moves away from a systems approach.

These thoughts were further expanded upon by another student who noted:

'Ecology' looks at things as an interrelated system. Focus is given to the integration of various parts of

a community. 'Environment' is a basis for a system. For example, there are many different environments within a system.

One other student seemed to contextualize the terms with respect to the role of a planner when they pointed out:

I agree that 'ecological' focuses on a holistic approach and emphasizes interdependency. Adopting an 'ecological ethic' would require a planner not to disregard the value system or value systems of the community in which they work.

However, there was one student who struggled with what the terms actually meant. They noted:

I am not sure that I do differentiate. I definitely have trouble dealing with the ambiguity of the two terms. I see the 'ecological' as being more specific or substantive knowledge. 'Environmental' is perhaps less well defined, more broad. 'Environmental' seems like such a buzzword these days and it is used in so many different ways. Honestly, I am still not sure what I think.

Interpretive Summary

Within this group the degree of certainty may have been attributed to the participants' familiarity with the academic environment. All of the individuals had been in school for a number of years and actually had recent experience in courses addressing these types of issues.

Interestingly enough the student who struggled with the differentiation of the two terms had the most educational background of the group and also had a greater amount of practical planning experience than any of the others. However, past experience with this individual has shown that they are extremely conservative in

terms of their approach. This is not to say they are not progressive in their outlook, but more a reflection of their preference of thinking through difficult issues and not commenting before they have a greater understanding of how they truly feel.

Theme 2: Reasons for Choosing a Particular Graduate Planning Program

This theme presents participants' views on why they chose a certain planning program over others. These thoughts were deemed to be essential in terms of understanding whether or not the philosophical principles of planning programs were prominent in the decisions of students to attend the school they did.

As might have been expected, the students all had varying reasons for attending the University of Manitoba, and in fact, each student had numerous motivating factors that helped finalize their decision.

One student felt that there was little doubt that Manitoba would be the planning school that they attended:

I did not even look at any other schools. I grew up in Winnipeg, did my undergraduate degree here, and really enjoyed my experiences at this University as a whole. Winnipeg is home!

This student then went on to discuss some of their experiences with students from other programs:

Well I went to the CAPS (Canadian Association of Planning Students) conference last year and talked to a lot of other students. I think that this program ranks right up there with the best of them. I like the approach

that is taken. Other schools seem too technical or some seem too specifically focused. This is just the right mix. I think I made a good choice!

Another Winnipeg-born student had experienced two different planning schools.

The first one was an undergraduate program at a school in Halifax and the second was the program at the University of Manitoba:

For my undergraduate degree in planning I was at a point in my life where I wanted to see the Maritimes. I also liked the thought of a planning program as part of a Fine Arts school, which this one was. I felt this would definitely bring an interesting perspective to how the school dealt with significant issues. On top of all this, the school was located in a really interesting area of the city. With respect to Manitoba, it was partly a matter of coming 'home.' Beyond that though, I was planning on practicing here in Winnipeg and felt coming here would enable me to make good connections and consequently good opportunities for future practice.

Students who had come from different parts of Canada had other reasons why they chose to come to the University of Manitoba. One pointed out:

I applied to the program in my home city and to this one. I did get accepted at both, but chose to come here. When I looked at the program description I noticed that this school was knowledge-based, but still allowed the development of technical skills within its framework. There seemed to be emphasis placed on critical understanding of complex issues, and not simply learning technical applications. The program here was also very well established, in terms of how long it had been around. In addition, I have an idea of what types of issues I would like to deal with in my future planning work and I think Winnipeg provides the best opportunity for me to increase my awareness of these issues. I guess something just grabbed me and seemed to fit with what I want to do.

Another out-of-town student added:

Well, part of it comes down to where accepted me first. However, I did talk to a student who was already in the

program and liked what I heard. The context of Winnipeg was also very appealing. You cannot beat the rich architectural history of this city.

Once the students had shared their personal stories of what drew them to the University of Manitoba the discussion moved more towards the perceived differences between the philosophical principles of various planning programs across Canada. On this issue there were somewhat differing opinions with some feeling that planning schools were quite different in their approach and others being a little more skeptical.

One student felt that the differences were less apparent in the 'marketed' philosophies and more to do with the situation (location) of the individual school:

While I think all programs are fairly similar, in terms of the theory and methods they address, I do think there is a tendency to align with the prominent issues of the region or city within which it is located. It is on these prominent issues where the program places its emphasis.

This idea was supported by another student who pointed out:

I do not feel the programs are all that different across the country. For instance, I think the name of a program (i.e. Environmental Planning, or City Planning) is more of a reflection of the era the school was established. They are all more or less based on the same theory just the application of these theories may be different. As was discussed in the last statement, the program links itself to the strengths, or weaknesses, of the region where they are located. Examples of this are everywhere. Manitoba focuses on community-based programs, inner-city housing issues, and downtown revitalization...is it a coincidence that Winnipeg has a crappy downtown and poor housing conditions. UBC deals heavily with the natural environment...and happens to be located right on the ocean and heavily involved forestry and fishing. Halifax focused the environment...and has a history of environmental

degradation from the past.

However, another student agreed in part, but felt a little differently on certain aspects of the argument:

While most schools may address the same theory I see them attacking it from different angles. It can quickly become apparent in a theory class discussion which ideologies are more 'acceptable' than others. This is where I see the philosophies of the different departments becoming apparent.

Interpretive Summary

There is obviously no concrete answer as to why students choose particular planning programs. However, it is apparent that an individual's perception of a programs philosophical principles can sometimes weigh heavily on the decision. Furthermore, it is somewhat unlikely to expect that program principles can influence students who are choosing a school based on extenuating circumstances, such as locational concerns or more personal reasons, sometimes without ever having researched other possibilities.

It would be a mistake to assume that since most planning programs design their theory courses around similar readings that they are necessarily adopting similar ideological standpoints. As noted in the final comment, the 'acceptability' of the presented viewpoints can become apparent fairly quickly and thus implicitly influence the way students receive a certain theoretical perspective.

In turn, it would be an error to assume that schools do not take advantage of their geographical, historical, and cultural situations, but again it becomes a matter of how these resources are 'exploited.' The philosophical approach of the program will arguably dictate what types of partnerships are forged and the extent to which certain resources are given preference over others.

Theme 3: Relationship between Ecological Issues and the Canadian Institute of Planners Statement of Values

This theme presents participants' views on how an ecological approach is reflected in the CIP *Statement of Values*.

Of particular interest in this theme was the change in perspective following an initially positive feeling about how the CIP addressed ecological issues within its official values.

At first glance one student commented:

It seems that in many of the statements that they put a lot of focus on ecological issues. CIP mentions issues such as diversity and ecosystems. I must admit I am a bit surprised, as I would not have thought these issues would be so prominent.

This was built upon by another student who noted:

The *Statement of Values* discusses overcoming and compensating for jurisdictional limitations. To me this puts focus on an adoption of ecological principles of interdependency. It moves away from the ethnocentrism of artificial political boundaries and emphasizes the importance of natural and cultural boundaries. Something like a watershed or a neighborhood.

Further praise was given on the nature of the relationship when another student pointed out:

Not only do these values address the substantive aspects of an ecological approach, but they also discuss the application of these values. Almost like saying do not just think about it, it is important to act.

One student did offer a somewhat different interpretation of the official values:

This does seem to address ecological issues, but I get a sense that these may be in place to 'remind' planners not to fall into traditional traps (or arguments) about economic feasibility of a truly ecologically-responsible solution. I am not sure if they go far enough.

However, after this comment and closer scrutiny of the values student opinion began to change:

This may sound bad, but I am not so sure these values truly foster an ecological approach. There seems to be some inherent contradictions. Initially, it seemed to discuss the importance of a holistic approach to planning, then it follows up by saying planners should assume roles as stewards of these environments. To me stewardship implies the separation between man and the rest of the biophysical environment. It falls back to traditional planning in a 'rational-comprehensive' sense.

Another student changed their initial perception and realized:

I too am getting a sense that these are somewhat shallow. They seem to develop a very pragmatic approach to planning. They almost portray the planner as a political broker, rather than an agent of change.

One strong indication of the 'change of heart' came from another student who noted:

This one about respecting diversity is really interesting. It talks about protecting and respecting diversity in values, cultures, economies, ecosystems, and the built environment. I think ecosystem encompasses or includes all of the other

things and should not be a part of that statement in the context it currently is. I would say that this is an extremely narrow view of what an ecosystem really is. They almost use it in an environmental sense.

Interpretive Summary

What is perhaps most interesting about this theme is the way in which the perceptions of the relationship between the official values of CIP and ecological issues changed so dramatically. Understanding this attitudinal change becomes paramount for a couple of reasons, both of which are fundamentally important to this research project.

The first major issue that is reflected by what occurred can be said to relate to students' perceptions of the contradictory nature of the *Statement of Values*. If the official set of values of an organization that is accrediting a professional planning program is inherently inconsistent, then adopting these values as guidelines for a program or using them to influence the philosophical principles of a school would further perpetuate these inconsistencies.

A second major concern that arose out of the shift in attitudes does not directly correspond to the relationship between values and an ecological approach, rather it is the example it provides for the importance of thoroughness. Once students had an opportunity to overview the set of values, they began to gain a greater understanding. They noted that within something as paramount as an official set

of values it was almost incomprehensible that such inconsistencies could arise. In a sense, it took away from the credibility of these values.

Similarly, in the development of a set of program elements it is essential to maintain internal uniformity and clarity. Therefore, there may be some merit in designing an explicit, focused set of principles that are fundamentally based on an ideology which stresses interdependency and the holistic approach to problem solving.

Theme 4: Possibility of Developing Planning Education Around a Distinct Set of Ecological Principles

This theme presents the participants' perceptions as they relate to the possibility of explicitly adopting an ecological ethic to guide planning education. Similarly to the initial theme, which dealt with the interpretations of the term 'ecological,' it becomes necessary here to understand the perspective from which the participants were addressing the issue. Therefore, much insight was gained about the responses when they were compared to statements made about the differentiation between 'environmental' and 'ecological.'

Keeping in line with the consensus in the first theme, there was relatively strong support on the part of most of the participants with respect to the development of a distinct set of ecological program elements.

One student who addressed the question first was quite confident in pursuing this type of approach:

For me this is easy. I come from a background in anthropology which views everything as part of an extremely complex set of interrelationships. With this background, and reflecting on my limited professional experience, they [the government] ask communities to develop holistic plans to obtain funding. However, the initial development of the funding program has gone against the ideology of inclusiveness and does not accept things that do not fit into these predetermined categories or labels. Essentially, these well-intentioned government programs end up failing in the sense they become very exclusive.

The same student then further contextualized the comments in terms of how this relates back to planning education:

While I perceive these types of programs as being very exclusive I become disheartened at how they are seen around the office. People really think the problems are getting solved and nobody wants to challenge the constraints that arise from the bureaucracy. I think if planning education focused on principles that are emphasized in an ecological approach then planners would be more prepared to demand more inclusive, and arguably better, programs.

Another student also related back to some of the theories they had picked up throughout their educational career:

It is a contemporary trend [in academia] to look at our [human] role as within a system. Understanding one's place within the world and within nature is extremely important and even greater emphasis should be put on how this understanding could be translated through planning.

Picking up on the viewpoints by the others, another student added:

If planners looked at things from an ecological perspective, in terms of understanding the ramifications of their actions [or recommendations] then we would likely see much 'better' planning. Therefore, these types of ideas need to be emphasized throughout our education, regardless of what the subject matter.

Another student focused less on the implications of any one set of values, but added that:

I feel that it is important for values to be consistent throughout the program requirements. These values will then manifest themselves in the discussions on the various 'topics of the day.'

Following the above comments the student who had initially struggled with the definition of the two terms pointed out:

I am now beginning to understand the definition that has obviously been accepted by the rest of you. I still think that one would have to be extremely careful in how they painted an ecological approach, as it may scare some people off. If worded carefully enough and it was understood as it is here, then I think it would be an extremely strong foundation for a planning program to build upon.

Interestingly enough the session ultimately ended on a comment by one student that relates strongly to Friedmann and his views on the role of the planner as a link between knowledge and action. The student bluntly said:

This approach will increase what we know. You need to know stuff to be able to plan it.

Interpretive Summary

While the responses given by the students are perhaps more collectively supportive with the viewpoint of the researcher it remains essential to question why these similarities are present. One explanation would obviously be the influence of various professors, on both the participants and the researcher, within the program at the University of Manitoba. However, it should be noted that one of the students was just beginning the program and had not actually been exposed

to a classroom situation with any professors. This case may be partly an example of the influence that can affect the nature in which opinions are formulated within a group situation. Since the new student was in a discussion with others that were more familiar with planning issues they might have felt slightly intimidated to raise conflicting points of view.

Beyond the collective support for the ideas of the project, there was also a greater internal consistency throughout the questions. This is to say that the individuals did not seem to contradict what they had said at other points in the discussion. It was noticed throughout the session that there were far longer pauses, indicating that individuals were giving greater thought to the questions. In addition, participants often asked the researcher to repeat the question and provide clarification on exactly what was being asked.

Important to note though was the comment by the student who was initially quite confused on the differentiation between the two terms. Once they had heard other viewpoints they were perhaps more willing to operate from a position of assumption, than the professional planners in the other group. Answers were qualified by noting that further clarification would be necessary, but then it was acknowledged that if this were an accepted definition it would be a strong foundation from which to build a planning program.

Synopsis of Planning Students

In noting the lack of emphasis on the ethical dimensions of the interrelationships between planning and the biophysical environment (in the synopsis of practitioners), the necessity to prioritize these understandings is reinforced by the planning students. It may be argued that current students are more knowledgeable about the dynamics of these relationships (likely through increased exposure in academia), but it seems they still need assistance in clarifying and understanding how this knowledge can translate into their future practice.

5.4 Interviews— Planning Academics

Themes that emerged during the interviews with planning academics included the interpretations of key terminology; the emphasis on ecological issues in planning education; the relationship between program principles and the Canadian Institute of Planners *Statement of Values*; and the possibility of developing planning education around a distinct set of ecological principles.

It is important to note that the 8 participants for these interviews were all current faculty members of different planning programs throughout Canada, with many being the Directors of their respective programs. In all the cases where the Director was unavailable for an interview session, other candidates, who were recommended (by the Director) were interviewed.

Theme 1: Interpretations of Key Terminology

Similar to both focus group sessions, this theme presents participants' views on the key terms that are crucial to the research project and, perhaps more importantly, their perceived understanding of the questions. For the purpose of this study it was necessary to attempt to make sense of how the various participants differentiated between the term 'environmental' and 'ecological.'

When asked to differentiate between the two terms the participants were always quick to point out their ambiguous nature:

It is definitely not a straightforward thing to differentiate between the two. 'Environmental' is a construct that implies a distinction between man [sic] and environment—almost a sense of what's out there. 'Ecological' refers more to the study of an organism within its environment. In a planning sense, this is a more integrated concept. It is a construct of ideas that are more preventative and imply a deeper understanding than 'environmental' does. Recognizing this as a personal interpretation, I would not be confident saying that this is a widely accepted understanding.

Another professor offered a personal perspective and then reflected on some experiences of how they saw others understanding the concepts:

Having an ecological focus to my work I am quite familiar with how these terms are often used interchangeably. Personally, I see 'ecological' emphasizing interrelationships within a complex system. I guess an understanding of cause and effect. 'Environmental' or 'environment' refers to many different parts of the system, or should I say 'ecosystem.' However, getting back to the interchangeable usage of these terms, it becomes a matter of implication. In general, I would say people are more comfortable with the term 'environmental' and do not truly realize that one encompasses the other.

One of the academics interviewed noted that the school they taught at was a leader in environmental planning and seemed to offer an extremely articulate opinion on the difference:

Our society has a dominant philosophical stance that there are two separate systems manifested in economy and the environment (natural environment). We are consumers of the environment according to this stance and the implications of this are of integral importance to planners. An 'ecological' approach does not recognize this separation. The economy is a dependent subsystem of a finite 'ecosphere.'

After this wonderful articulation, a question was posed as to why the program at the school still focused on 'environmental' planning as opposed to 'ecological' planning:

Interestingly enough, much of it comes down to bureaucracy. You may not have much experience with this type of thing, but to change the name of the program is an enormous hassle. This is something we [the academic unit] have discussed, but as of now have not had the time to undertake this project.

Accepting the difficulty in such a change, the participant was then probed to comment on the content of the courses within this stream of the School:

I am glad you asked. This is where the evidence of the progressive nature of the program lies. Focus in the courses definitely addresses these problems and emphasizes, not only the limitations of seeing things as separate, unrelated systems, but the problems associated with operating from the 'ecological' approach. By this I am referring to implementing strategies that go against the dominant philosophical stance I discussed before.

Other faculty may have had similar outlooks on the nature of the two terms, but seemed more concerned that the ambiguity of the terms was an obstacle that did

not necessarily need to be addressed. These individuals largely avoided their personal interpretation of the term and related what an 'ecological' approach to planning may do for the image of a particular planning program:

How I perceive the terms is less of an issue, in terms of this particular program. What is important is not portraying a planning program as being exclusive of anyone who may consider entering planning as a profession. I would say people see an 'ecological' approach as a very narrow approach—almost as if we are putting ecology ahead of people. That is not an image this program would be comfortable with.

These thoughts were brought forward by another participant who pointed out:

We do not want to be seen as too narrow. Planning is a general profession where a specialty could become dated quite fast. We aim to produce a generalist or a general in a military sense. They need to see the lay of the land even if they cannot see deeply into any of the trenches.

Interpretive Summary

Although not all the participants gave their direct viewpoints on the differentiation between the two terms it could be said they seemed to have relatively similar understandings. However, some individuals seemed to address the terms in the context of an administrator who had to be much more concerned with the institutional limitations of a perceived 'radical' approach.

While all the individuals qualified the ambiguity of the terms as something that would need to be carefully considered, those operating in this 'administrative' context became fixated with how the program may be viewed by those outside the School.

Another interesting point was that those professors who had a more focused ‘environmental’ background, in terms of both education and professional practice, were more willing to interpret the terms and comment on how approaches based on these terms related to overriding social philosophies.

Theme 2: The Emphasis on Ecological Issues in Planning Education

This theme presents participants’ views on the prominence of the ecological approaches to planning within their respective programs. The responses for this theme were quite similar, in terms of respondents feeling confident that their program addressed ecological ideas.

One professor, who admitted he came from a “conservative, pragmatic school” outlined the emphasis on an ecological ideology in the program as follows:

This program firmly and comprehensively addresses the importance of an integrated approach to planning. We create planners who can work at any scale and in a variety of disciplines. To work at any scale one must have an understanding of how everything relates.

Another participant echoed the above when it was pointed out:

The program is an environmental planning program to start with. Everything from the theory, methods, and studio courses emphasizes the complexity of planning problems.

One professor felt that the emphasis was evident, but again qualified the response:

This program emphasizes one hundred percent the importance of environmental consideration. There are different connotations of the concept though. With

planning drawing from a number of different disciplines, including sociology, architecture, and engineering, a planning program must inform students on the different understandings of 'ecology.' Realize though, that the importance of the basic vitality of the biophysical environment is not forgotten with respect to it being essential for the survival of all other parts of the system.

The qualification of response was also present when another professor noted:

The different courses may address issues about the natural environment from different perspectives, so I would not say that there is a coherent philosophy on what people are exposed to. There are a wide variety of backgrounds on this staff though, so undoubtedly students will have exposure to the alternative perspectives as all courses recognize the magnitude of these issues.

An interesting response came from a professor who described the relationship between the location of the campus and the means by which they operationalized an ecological approach:

This campus is located in a major metropolitan area and therefore our opportunities are framed by this. I would say we take an 'urban ecological' approach, focusing on 'real' examples in the region. Most emphasis on planning and the environment manifests itself through these examples. Beyond these types of connections I do not believe environmental concerns underlie all courses.

After clarifying the question in terms of stressing interrelationships between all aspects of an urban system, the professor noted:

We promote acting in an ethical and moral manner. To do this it is essential that a planner [or planning student] recognize that the things they do have wide reaching effects.

Another professor also gave numerous examples of what their program had done recently to move more towards an ecological approach to planning education:

First off, this approach is becoming increasingly apparent in this [academic unit]. We have recently moved our required Ecology course into the first year, which implies it is more of a necessity for influencing the skills and knowledges that will come later. In addition, important ecological issues are discussed and addressed in all the studio courses and to some degree all of the other required courses in the program.

Interpretive Summary

Within this theme there seemed a tendency for participants to answer the questions on multiple levels. While pointing out the presence of courses that addressed substantive concerns between planning and the 'environment,' they also discussed the ways in which the programs took an 'ecological' approach in terms of emphasizing the integrated nature of dealing with planning issues.

The multi-layered aspect of a few of the responses offers some explanation as to why most professors felt that their program strongly emphasized an ecological approach to planning education. It seems that all programs, no matter what the philosophical stance, can justify how they operate from, and purvey notions of, an integrated approach. This is again evidence of the various interpretations of the concepts and highlights the seemingly subconscious way planning educators address these constructs from a multitude of perspectives.

The fact that responses related to such ambiguous, yet essentially important, concepts are given in this multi-faceted manner, may be a reflection of

contemporary, postmodern planning. Since planners are familiar with the ‘multi-’ (cultural, disciplinary, etc.), they tackle issues from many sides. However, in doing this they must be careful that the ‘true’ understanding of the concepts and approaches they are discussing are not lost or demeaned in any way. In the context of ecological approaches to planning education it is exemplified in the difference between having a few ‘token’ courses dealing with the relationship of planning to the natural environment or fundamentally adopting an approach which emphasizes, in all courses, the necessity to be integrally aware of the ramifications of planning action.

Theme 3: The Relationship Between Program Principles and the Canadian Institute of Planners Statement of Values

This theme presents participants’ views on how the fundamental principles of the planning programs they work within relate to a particular institutionalized set of values. Moreover, the comments further reflect how these principles relate to those values outlined by the Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP), which is the accreditation body for planning programs in Canada.

For some respondents there seemed to be a certain degree of contention with respect to associating program principles with a particular set of values.

One professor outlined this observation quite clearly by pointing out:

I would not necessarily associate a set of principles with the fostering of a particular set of values. All

programs have principles which they operate from, however, this is not to say that within these principles is the acceptance of one set of values over another. It is not the job of a planning program to officially state a set of values, but instead to help students identify issues and allow them to come to their own decision about what is plausible and what is not.

Aspects of this thought were further clarified in a statement made by another professor who added:

I feel that values should be stated. It is useful for both students and faculty to be able to see the institutionalized values and it allows for a certain degree of focus throughout the department. Keep in mind though that it may be both difficult and a bit dangerous to state specifics as it may be implied that those are the only values. This will cause a perception that a program is exclusive. For instance, one of the values should be an openness to other points of view or approaches.

Others seemed to reiterate the effect a stated set of values could have on a program:

Values provide a program with a sense of vision. This allows a focus within the program that is otherwise not there. On the opposite end of things though, is a need to respect diversity of opinion.

In turn, another professor doubted how an official set of program values could actually focus the learning environment:

I do not believe anyone could say that they are value-free. In fact, when in a planning environment an individual is entangled in a messy web of moral and ethical issues. My experiences have led me to believe that whether they announce it or not, people will act in a manner that they feel is appropriate, based on their personal values. Just because there is an institutionalized set of values in place does not mean that they offer any 'real' sense of guidance.

This same individual then went on to provide a relatively humorous, yet vivid, example:

Look at the CIP, there are a lot of folks in there that are supposed to operate based on a distinct set of values, yet many planning decisions end up in court with planners on both sides of the argument. Then you think, that was the same guy at the CIP annual general meeting. Really though, I am not trying to make fun, but simply prove a point.

Staying with the topic of the Canadian Institute of Planners and their official *Statement of Values*, some of the planning academics discussed how they saw these values influencing the program principles within their department.

One professor made a point of noting that since they were a CIP accredited program that they supported the values of that organization:

What type of values do we try and foster? Those of the CIP. It just makes sense that a professional program would have a set of values that are consistent with those of the professional body.

Another participant did not feel the relationship was as direct, but noted the differences were minimal:

I do not think that when these principles were developed we looked to the CIP values. However, because planning values have to acknowledge complexity and cover such a broad range of issues, there ultimately is not much difference between the two.

Interpretive Summary

Within this theme it became apparent that most respondents were skeptical of the possibility of operationalizing a strongly focused set of values for a planning program. Even though some of the academics personally felt it would be advantageous to do this, their past experience within an institutional bureaucracy seemed to temper thoughts of actually realizing such an ambitious project. Therefore, responses that initially seemed supportive of such an undertaking were always later qualified to reflect a more negative practical reality.

Acknowledging the lack of focus within an official set of values, such as those of the CIP, may cause some of the participants to view their worth as somewhat trivial. The 'necessary' generality of CIP's *Statement of Values* provides little guidance for planners and arguably allows room for justifying actions that may run counter to the implicit intent of the principles.

Realizing these problematic aspects of CIP's official values may contribute to the variety of responses addressing the influence of these values on respective program principles. Some programs may perceive it as worthwhile to follow the lead of the CIP, in terms of recognizing the values in the principles of their program. Other programs may find these value statements quite contradictory and give them less influential significance. While others still, may not accept that their program has 'principles' as such, but instead a set of official 'expectations'.

outlining what are the fundamental skills and knowledges that hope to be purveyed through the course of the program.

Theme 4: Possibility of Developing Planning Education Around a Distinct Set of Ecological Principles

This theme presents the participants' perceptions as they relate to the possibility of explicitly adopting an ecological ethic to guide planning education. Similarly to the initial theme, which dealt with the interpretations of the term 'ecological,' it becomes necessary here to understand the perspective from which the participants were addressing the issue. Therefore, much insight was gained about the responses when they were compared to statements made about the differentiation between 'environmental' and 'ecological.'

Similar to a number of the other themes, the manner in which the planning academics responded to a question about the possibility of developing a planning program around an explicit set of ecological principles was almost enigmatic.

One professor had quite a strong opinion to the possibility and remarked:

I absolutely would not favor developing planning around such radical principles. Extremism is quite upsetting and this would definitely be going off the deep end.

Another had similar sentiments, but related back more on some of their earlier comments when they noted:

That would be putting ecology ahead of people. Again, I do not feel a program should explicitly state anything. Our role is to educate the planner to think critically and rigorously. The goal of a planner should be to

hurt as few people as possible. It must be realized that when a planner acts they alter the advantages and disadvantages of everyone in the city. They must be very conscious of the effects they have on people and the natural environment.

Another participant discussed how they felt this approach may be somewhat dangerous:

It is a bit of an authoritarian approach and authoritarianism is not good for anyone. It implies zero tolerance and that is not good either.

Interestingly enough the participant then seemed to provide some insightful commentary on stated biases and premise of the session:

I assume from your questions and your consent form that you support this approach. I think you would like to see a learning environment where people can truly discover themselves. There are other ways to go about it. Our program does not operate from this approach, but we do stress that students are honest about their beliefs and remain consistent in those beliefs. We provide them with the opportunity to discover themselves through opening their eyes to a multiplicity of perspectives. Not by limiting their options!

A different focus was taken by another professor who initially offered some personal feelings, but then discussed some difficulties that may arise in attempting to operationalize such a set of principles:

As I said before I think that an explicit set of values would offer an opportunity to provide guidance for a program. However, the values cannot be too ideological because that can be perceived as a bad thing. It also becomes case-specific, in the sense of how many faculty the department has and the position of the program within the larger university environment. For instance, a program that is based in a design environment is inherently anthropocentric. Also, the bigger the faculty the more problematic it would be to have a 'radical' stream. These would definitely be major stumbling

blocks to overcome.

The issue of faculty size was also noted by another professor who came from one of the larger programs:

I think ecological principles will be seen more in the natural environment sense and less in terms of the processes they emphasize. This would turn off the majority of faculty as it may be deemed too narrow. Within my School there would likely be only 3 or 4 of us that would really accept an ecological approach to planning.

Possibility of misinterpreted intentions were again addressed by a participant who remarked:

There is a tendency for people to equate 'eco' with the biophysical and this would be seen as putting the natural environment ahead of human concerns. While I cannot argue that the intentions of such principles are good, there would be a tremendous communications challenge to ensure that others fundamentally understand the points you are trying to make.

Another participant seemed to be more positive about the possibility and commented on the inevitability of criticism:

I think adopting principles which push the boundaries is really important. It is the first step in moving towards greater social and environmental justice. I do not think that embracing an ecological approach to planning is necessarily ignoring the practical side of things either. Quite frankly, I see pure economic arguments as a somewhat weak means of justifying bad planning. People need to realize that when looking at economic feasibility it becomes a matter of accounting. They fall into short-term traps and do not focus on the long-term costs.

Finally, another professor discussed the approach and expanded on this by offering some suggestions on how they may go about doing so:

I strongly support the idea of pushing a truly integrative approach and I think it could be done if there were a really committed individual. It would take a real articulation of these social constructs and how values are developed. Things would have to be broken down to critique even the development of theory so students would build a deeper understanding... If I were going to sit down and attempt this, I would begin by looking at some of the contemporary literature such as David Orr and the Sandercock section (TAMED). I would also recommend that the [academic unit] forged better links with [other units in engineering and resource management]. I do not mean having students take electives over there, but instead having their input into our theory and studio classes. I would also take the Ecology course and develop a second part, which would be a deeper, more technical course. This would give students a more advanced understanding of applied science and lead to greater comprehension of difficult environmental issues. Another important component would be an ecological economics course that emphasized some of the drawbacks of traditional arguments and outlined different courses of action. It would be extremely important throughout the program to stress how all this theory comes together at the implementation level.

Interpretive Summary

As was the case within some of the other themes, the academics' responses based, not only on personal opinion or experience, but also on their administrative standpoint. However, this did not limit the emergence of their personal feelings, as they would discuss these feelings and then expand upon these thoughts with the more 'practical' outlook.

As a result of many offering the ‘administrative’ response to such a possibility it was difficult to get participants to offer ideas on what a set of ecological principles might be. Those who obviously felt that it was unlikely a distinct set of ecological principles could be operationalized seemed reluctant to offer any concrete suggestions about what these principles might look like or how this project would be undertaken.

In turn, those professors that seemed more confident and comfortable with the possibility were much more willing to outline the weaknesses of other approaches and provide insight into the strengths of an ecological approach. However, even these ‘optimists’ warned of the politically sensitive nature of these principles and emphasized the importance of clarity and consistency.

Synopsis of Planning Academics

The comments made by the planning academics seem to specify and emphasize the need for the development of ethics in planning education, but appear to shy away from the substantive aspects of this ethical development. They are undeniably suspicious of appearing dogmatic, not in their personal viewpoints, but more so in their institutional positions.

5.5 Highlights of the Empirical Research

This section will center around the highlights of the empirical research. The discussion focuses on what can be determined from the themes that were dominant throughout various components of the research.

Reflecting on Dominant Themes

When dealing with the dominant themes of this research, perhaps the most intriguing finding was how the different types of participants interpreted the social constructs that were central to the project. The term ‘ecological’ was interpreted by the participants in a number of different ways including both as a noun and as an adjective. Many individuals would discuss their understandings in both senses, but it was in the group with the graduate planning students where one could confidently say there was a strong common understanding of the terms. Realizing this, the responses of this group seemed the most internally consistent throughout and had the least amount of disagreement. Within this group it seemed that as more students outlined their interpretation of the concepts, others gained confidence in how they articulated the two terms.

In the responses of the professional planners and the planning academics, the discussion of these social constructs became somewhat more complex. The professionals, in a group environment, ‘fed off’ each other to a small degree, but seemed less compromising in terms of adjusting their current personal opinions. Some professional planners also addressed the concepts in terms of the perception

they may elicit to those 'outside.' In this sense they were similar to many of the planning academics and could be said to have approached the exercise from a 'marketing' perspective. Viewing the terms in this context may point to a greater understanding of the 'political arena' in which planners operate and thus may explain why in a 'practically' inexperienced group, such as the students, there was an easier time focusing the discussion on a singular interpretation of the constructs.

The interpretations of these constructs was also paramount in two other dominant themes; the emphasis on ecological issues in planning education, and the possibility of developing planning education around a distinct set of ecological principles. With some planning practitioners and academics addressing the concept of 'ecological' from less of a personal point of view and more from that of an 'administrator' concerned with outside perceptions, it sometimes became difficult to develop a sense of where each individual stood. However, this development signifies some important issues that would no doubt have to be addressed if one was to undertake the development of a set of ecological program principles.

A greater understanding of the political and institutional limitations, at this stage, provides important insight into how recommendations would have to be developed and defended. It creates an atmosphere that demands a careful articulation of ideas and arguably makes these ideas stronger as a result.

Another theme that cut across the different sessions was the relationship between program principles and the *CIP Statement of Values*. While the planning practitioner group largely felt that CIP's official values were addressed in their education, they almost overwhelmingly pointed to their program's lack of providing the 'hard' skills that they saw as necessary to operationalize these values.

Looking at how the planning academics and the planning students remarked on the CIP values may shed some light on why programs were perceived as deficient in providing a practical 'toolkit.' The students noted the contradictory nature of these values and the planning academics implicitly hinted that the contradictions are a result of the necessary generality of the statements. This in mind, it may be argued that the lack of practical skills was a result of a planning program not explicitly equating the development of distinct skills to the relating values of CIP. In turn, individuals may have difficulty coming to terms with the applicability of the skills they did learn and the relationship of these skills to the official values. This is to say that because the values are so general, it is extremely difficult to make strong connections between the respective skills and values that the practitioners were looking for.

5.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the results of the empirical research. It outlined and described the themes that emerged during the interview/focus group sessions and

provided the reader with interpretive summaries to more greatly inform of the dynamics of the various research components.

The findings of this chapter will now be used to enlighten and inform the recommendations that are formulated in Chapter 6. They provide insight into the readiness of planning to accept a radically different approach and highlight the 'deficiencies' in terms of the ecological literacy of contemporary planning academics, students and practitioners.

Chapter 6: The Foundation of an Ecological Planning Education

Resting on the assumption that human relationships with Nature must be dramatically transformed to avoid a global ecological catastrophe, this thesis has addressed the role graduate planning education should play in this reformulation. It has been maintained that for planning education to remain consistent with these altered relationships, and work towards 'true' ecological sustainability, an explicit set of ecological principles should inform and guide curricula. Therefore, the goal of this thesis has been to contribute to the development of a set of program principles that adopts an ecological ethic and fundamentally influences the manner in which planning education is delivered.

In Chapter 6 the purpose is two-fold. The first objective is to address how the findings of the empirical research ultimately relate to the literature. The second objective is to outline the recommended set of ecological program elements. In meeting these objectives the two key questions of the research are also addressed. The answers to these questions include determining, firstly, what the contemporary purpose and responsibility of graduate planning education is, and secondly, how can it be best situated to meet the needs of a rapidly changing world.

6.1 Connecting the Pieces

To develop a connection between the empirical research and the literature it is worthwhile to further discuss the work of Sandercock and Sarkissian. In particular, focus is given to the appendix (TAMED), at the end of Sandercock's Towards Cosmopolis (1998), and to Sarkissian's T.EN.C.E.L model that was developed in her 1996 dissertation.

“The Planner TAMED” discusses the nature of professional planning program and contextualizes the effect that this has on planning students and consequently, planning practice:

[Professionally driven education] has a tendency to reduce the knowledge and understanding of a subject as complex as the urban/regional habitat to a shopping list of skills, methods, and competencies. Professional accreditation bodies all too often simply list subjects that must be taught, staying firmly within a technocratic paradigm framed around levels of government and planning legislation. A more helpful approach would be to think about the kinds of qualities they would like to see in graduates. If the question is framed this way, we could talk about the literacies we would like our future planners to be armed with. (1998: 225)

When considering how Sandercock describes contemporary planning education it almost inspires a ‘sense of duty’ to, not only discuss its shortcomings, but also to begin to work on implementing a radically different approach around a set of five fundamental literacies, which include; Technical, Analytical, Multi- or cross-cultural, Ecological, and Design (1998: 225).

In addition, to Sandercock's TAMED section that argues for the development of literacies in planning education, Sarkissian's T.EN.C.E.L model similarly calls for; Teamwork, Experiencing Nature Directly, The Community Ground, Environmental Ethics, and Literacy to form the basis of the learning model (1996: 344). Each aspect of the model represents one of five critical relationships:

- 1) Self cooperating with others
- 2) Self anchored in Nature
- 3) Self grounded in community
- 4) Self as responsible to all life
- 5) Self seeking understanding

She argues that it should be the aim of planning education to strengthen the student's capacity to function effectively within all of the relationship styles developed in the model (1996: 344). Sarkissian further justifies the need to weave these relationships into all aspects of education because it is apparent that "educators specializing in teaching ethics have relatively little impact on shaping the substantive values of their students" (1996: 344-45). She then notes that "without concerted effort, we can expect little result" (1996: 345).

Obstacles to Radical Change?

In addressing the shortcomings of current planning education, this thesis has been more or less concerned with those deficiencies that perpetuate ecologically irresponsible planning. Discussion has centered around contextualizing the historical development of planning and further investigating some of the 'cutting-edge' literature which develops ideas about how things could improve. The new empirical work that has also been undertaken has contributed to developing a

strong sense of where planning currently is in terms of accepting a radically different approach. The data gathered in all three components of the methodological strategy has pointed to three major insights, which provide commentary on: the current sense of helplessness (or perhaps unwillingness) among professional planners to push for radical change; a fundamentally 'conservative' set of values that guide many planning programs in Canada; and finally, the optimistic attitudes of current planning students, in terms of recognizing what is wrong with the way things are done and truly believing things can change.

Planner as a Catalyst for Change

In the focus group session with planning practitioners (outlined in Chapter 5) it became apparent that many could not, or were unwilling to, push for a radical, systematic change in the nature of planning. Whether this was a result of personal satisfaction with the way things currently are, or a reflection on both the academic education and professional 'schooling' which produced these individuals is up for debate. However, the fundamental point is that the current situation of planning does not seem to foster an environment suited to social transformation or, more specifically, for the development of the 'radical' planner who would mediate this transformation. Planning education, for instance, may provide future planners with competency in the substantive theories of people like Healey, Friedmann and Sandercock, however, it arguably does not go far enough in developing the moral and ethical values that are unquestionably needed to act on these theories.

For example, in the focus group with practitioners many said that planning education had little to do with the development of their values and likewise, many planning academics felt it was not their role to 'push' values upon students. This is where the question of the purpose of planning education becomes paramount. If we recognize that planning plays an integral part in how our societies and communities are shaped then would it not seem justifiable to explicitly develop the moral and ethical dimensions of those who plan? This is not to say that planning education should teach people 'what to think,' but instead an acceptance that there should be some fundamental preference given to developing the aspects of planning that are critical in understanding what it takes to ensure the survival of all life.

This 'new' planning education would be based around what Timothy Beatley calls biophilic values (1997: 201-202) and would nurture an ecological literacy (Orr, 1992; Sandercock, 1998: 228-229). It is this education that would produce the radical planner that Friedmann speaks of, as it would not only provide students with a base in traditional and contemporary substantive planning theory, but also inform these theories with specific social values (1987: 393-394).

The Values of Canadian Planning Education

In the academic community of planning the presence of a few 'radical' programs seems accepted and even desired. On the surface it appears to provide students

who want to explore the radical aspects of planning thought an excellent chance to delve deeper into the exploration of insurgent forms of planning, as they are discussed by authors like Sandercock. While the labeling of these schools as radical, in no way suggests that other programs do not outline, or even mandate, the coverage of this literature, it simply provides commentary on a perception that the essence of the learning environment in these 'radical' schools may be such that it encourages and emphasizes the further understanding of these streams of planning thought. However, as noted earlier, the underlying values of these programs still remain relatively similar to 'non-radical' schools because of the perceived necessity to keep values general in nature. In addition, the lack of a strong core curriculum, in some schools, does not ensure that even a minority of students will adopt a program of study that begins to develop the range of literacies that are so important in the making of the radical planner.

With a growing urgency to change the way planners operate, in terms of ecological sensitivity, the onus rests squarely on the shoulders of planning educators to nurture a 'new breed' of planner. The contemporary planning educator must not simply disregard the development of radical principles on administrative grounds because, as Friedmann notes, "administration refers to the management of program routines and is therefore concerned chiefly with activities of system maintenance" (1987: 33). This is in contrast to the very foundation of what planning should be about, which is "informing processes of system change" (Friedmann, 1987: 33). Planners should not be 'managers' and

likewise the concerns of planning educators should not be 'administrative,' but instead focused on what types of graduates a program should be producing.

Realizing this, planning academics must rise above the limitations of the political order and deliver education which may infiltrate some parts of this order, but will ultimately operate outside the public domain where radical planning and revolutionary practice overlap (Friedmann, 1987: 30). In doing this, they would seek the dissolution and breakdown of the political order and pave the way for the development of a distinct set of ecological principles to guide future planning education.

Learning How to Think

Quite often planning students are subject to criticism by professional practitioners with respect to the idealistic nature of their outlook. Arguments are made that students lack understanding of the practical realities of planning and that implementation is not only the most difficult stage of a project, but something students know little about. Suggestions are brought forward by the profession (through accreditation and otherwise) to planning programs, that increased emphasis must be placed on the development of the skills and knowledges 'necessary' to 'succeed' in the profession. In some cases students may even be discouraged from exploring the seemingly limitless boundaries of postmodern planning theories and methods as they linger all too close to the 'dangers' of revolution.

When it is noted that the goal of planning education is to teach students “how to think,” the essence of that very notion is lost. If students are truly going to conceive ‘how to think’ academia must realize this is not something that is taught. The ‘art’ of articulation is something that comes from within an individual, through a deep understanding of both oneself and the multiple identities that this self entails. Therefore, accepting this notion as a legitimate goal of planning education justifies the need for a major shift in how education is delivered. This new education would be fundamentally based on constructs that attempt to uncover “the most profound level of human-nature relationships, stressing the need for personal realization as accomplished by integrating the self with nature” (Thomashow, 1995: 58). In short, if education emphasized the formulation of an ‘ecological identity’ not only would students cultivate critical self-reflection skills, but they would also be situated to overcome the traditional boundaries of professional and disciplinary learning, through emphasis on interdisciplinary scholarship (Beatley, 1997; Orr, 1992; Sarkissian, 1996; Thomashow, 1995).

When moving beyond this reformulated education into the world of practice these graduates would be poised to address critics through direct action. They will have developed an ecological citizenship that stresses a simpler way of life and challenges prevailing concepts of affluence, well-being, and need. Perhaps most important, however, is these graduates will be ecological ‘professionals’ in the sense that they will understand the importance of building coalitions, develop a

voice for preservation, and through beautiful articulation, explain a politics of posterity (Thomashow, 1995).

The Why and The What

In recommending a distinct set of ecological principles to guide future planning education it becomes important to understand the significance of both the literature and the empirical findings. It has become apparent through the description of the results, the interpretive summaries and the brief respondent type synopsis', what is currently offered with respect to preparing for the complexities of planning problems. In the context of addressing the main thesis questions it explains what is missing, and in doing so, points to why things need to change. Recognizing this, it becomes important to look to the empirical findings, not to provide the details of the ecological principles, but instead to provide greater context for the development and operationalization of these principles. In turn, the specific details for the program elements are largely drawn out of the substantive ecological theories explored in Chapter 3.

6.2 Recommended Ecological Principles: A Guideline for Planning Education

This section of the thesis takes the form of five recommended ecological principles for a planning program. The five elements address the main issues that have been discussed in this thesis and attempt to set the foundation from which future educational restructuring could be based. The goal of this set of principles is to inform an educational program that would foster an ecological ethic and

equip planners with the necessary literacies to resolve extremely difficult contemporary planning problems.

The first principle of the program is an emphasis on ecological sustainability. It is based on a belief that human relationships with the biophysical environment must be dramatically transformed to avoid a global ecological catastrophe. This principle seeks to foster a deep understanding of the intricate dynamics of human-nature relationships and develop student comprehension of the limitations of traditional attempts at sustainable practice.

The second principle of the program is an emphasis on multi-disciplinary learning. It is based on a belief that planning does not easily fit into defined educational or professional categories. This principle seeks to engage students to approach all aspects of planning in a holistic manner, in terms of understanding the interdependencies of the natural, social, economic, cultural and political environments. Sensitivity to the ramifications of planning action will be nurtured along with the development of acute awareness to methods of evaluation.

The third principle of the program is an emphasis on critical self-reflection. It is based on a belief that through deep introspection a student develops an increased awareness and further ground their actions on an ecological worldview. This principle seeks to cultivate the students sense-of-place within all social and

physical environments and formulates an understanding that damage to any part of the ecosystem is coextensive to oneself.

The fourth principle of the program is an emphasis on problem definition. It is based on a belief that in order to comprehend the complexity of contemporary planning issues a student must be adept at interpreting and incorporating all contextual components into the resolution of a dilemma. This principle seeks to ensure both methodological rigor and technical literacy, as they relate to the inclusion of natural and social communities, in the collaborative solutions to planning problems.

The fifth principle of the program is an emphasis on professional identity. It is based on a belief that traditional notions of the 'professional as expert' are outdated and uncompromising. This principle provokes students to redefine the role of the professional planner and pursue this redefinition in terms of its effects on contemporary planning practice. Ideas of professional responsibility to both communities and the state will be developed, in the sense of how the planner mediates contradictory agendas.

6.3 Suggestions for Future Research

While it has been within the scope of this thesis to outline a set of principles that would be the foundation for the development of an ecological ethic amongst future planners, it is by no means a completed journey. These principles are only

the beginning in terms of designing a program that would foster this ethic. To operationalize the suggested program elements future research would have to be conducted on, but not limited to, the specifics of course design and delivery, financial implications of implementation, partnership and coalition-building with other academic units, and the institution of 'new' evaluation and assessment criteria so as to determine the 'true' success of the changes.

Much literature has already been published on the specifics discussed above that could ultimately inform and guide any future research. The works of authors like Wendy Sarkissian, David Orr, Timothy Beatley, Leonie Sandercock and Mitchell Thomashow would be essential in more deeply informing the possibilities for curriculum restructuring, but is by no means an exhaustive list.

6.4 Closing Remarks

To conclude this thesis is not to 'close the book' on the development of our ecological identity, but instead, to open a chapter of our lives that may or may not have lain dormant. We should feel challenged to confront what we are getting from our education and particularly how it is shaping the ethical and moral positions that we hold. We should consider it an injustice to simply be 'taught' a finite set of skills and knowledges and work hand-in-hand with our educators to nurture awareness. We must act in a manner that values all life by realizing that while we are a small part of a beautiful system, we have an undeniable capability to affect it.

Appendix A: Empirical Research Questions

Focus Group Questions (Practitioner Session)

1. Tell us your name, where you obtained your planning degree(s) and a little bit about your current planning work.
2. When you hear the phrase ecological ethic, what comes to mind and do you differentiate between the terms 'ecological' and 'environmental'?
3. Tell us about how your planning education addressed ecological issues.
4. How do you feel your planning education influenced the way you practice planning?
5. Do you feel that your planning education emphasized the adoption of a particular set of values? How do these values relate to the official CIP *Statement of Values*?
6. Discuss your thoughts on the possibility of developing planning education around a distinct set of ecological principles.
 - If supportive, what might some of these principles be?
7. Is there anything that you feel we should have talked about but didn't?

Focus Group Questions (Student Session)

1. Tell us your name, a little bit about your previous academic degree(s) and any planning related work experience which you have.
2. Understanding that planning offers such diverse possibilities for employment, what type of planning work do you see yourself doing in the future?
3. When you hear the phrase ecological ethic what comes to mind and do you differentiate between the terms 'ecological' and 'environmental'?
4. What were your reasons for choosing the planning program at the University of Manitoba? (i.e.: location, cost, reputation, perceived philosophical principles of the program, etc.)
5. Looking at the Canadian Institute of Planners *Statement of Values* and realizing that this influences the ethical aspects of professional planning practice, discuss your thoughts on the emphasis they place on ecological issues.
6. Discuss your thoughts on the possibility of developing planning education around a distinct set of ecological principles.
 - If supportive, what might some of these principles be?
7. Is there anything that you feel we should have talked about but didn't?

Interview Questions (Planning Academics)

1. What is your current position at the school?
2. What is your personal educational background?
3. Do you feel your previous education fostered any particular set of values?
4. Do you feel that it should be the role of an educational program, such as planning, to explicitly foster certain types of values?
5. Would you say that the program at your school has undergone fundamental changes since you have been there? Can you comment on the nature of these changes over the years. (What sparked them? Reasons they were seen as necessary.)
6. When you hear the phrase ecological ethic what comes to mind and do you differentiate between the terms 'ecological' and 'environmental'?
7. To what degree does your program emphasize the relationship between the environment and planning?
8. Discuss your thoughts on the possibility of developing planning education around a distinct set of ecological principles. What might some of these principles be?

Appendix B: Canadian Institute of Planners *Statement of Values*

1. **To respect and integrate the needs of future generations.** CIP members recognize that their work has cumulative and long-term implications. When addressing short-term needs, CIP members acknowledge the future needs of people, other species, and their environments, and avoid committing resources that are irretrievable or irreplaceable.
2. **To overcome or compensate for jurisdictional limitations.** CIP members understand that their work can affect many jurisdictions and interests. Therefore they practice in an holistic manner recognizing the need to overcome the limitations of administrative boundaries.
3. **To value the natural and cultural environment.** CIP members believe that both the natural and cultural environments must be valued. They assume roles as stewards of these environments, balancing preservation with sustainable development.
4. **To recognize and react positively to uncertainty.** CIP members believe that the long-term future is unpredictable and develop adaptable and flexible responses to deal positively with this uncertainty.
5. **To respect diversity.** CIP members respect and protect diversity in values, cultures, economies, ecosystems, built environments and distinct places.
6. **To balance the needs of communities and individuals.** CIP members seek to balance the interests of communities with the interests of individuals, and recognize that communities include both geographic communities and communities of interest.
7. **To foster public participation.** CIP members believe in meaningful public participation by all individuals and groups and seek to articulate the needs of those whose interests have not been represented.
8. **To articulate and communicate values.** CIP members believe in applying these values explicitly in their work and communicating their importance to clients, employers, colleagues, and the public.

Bibliography

- Afshar, Farokh. 1990. Inequalities, Western Roots and Implementation Problems: Three Challenges to a One World Planning Education. In *Breaking the Boundaries: A One-World Approach to Planning Education*. ed. Bishwapriya Sanyal. New York: Plenum Press.
- Amirahmadi, Hooshang. 1990. Incongruities Between the Theory and Perception of Regional Development in Less Developed Countries: Towards Bridging the Gap. In *Breaking the Boundaries: A One-World Approach to Planning Education*. ed. Bishwapriya Sanyal. New York: Plenum Press.
- Beatley, Timothy., and Kristy Manning. 1997. *The Ecology of Place: Planning for Environment, Economy, and Community*. Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- Beatley, Timothy. 1995. Teaching Environmental Philosophy to Graduate Planning Students. In *Planning Ethics: A Reader in Planning Theory, Practice and Education*. ed. Sue Hendler. New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Research.
- Beatley, Timothy, 1994. *Ethical Land Use: Principles of Policy and Planning*. London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Beauregard, Robert A. 1996. Between Modernity and Postmodernity: The Ambiguous Position of U.S. Planning. In *Readings in Planning Theory*. eds. Scott Campbell and Susan S. Fainstein. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Becker, Robert W. 1996. Core Values and Principles of Effective Planning. In *Planners on Planning: Leading Planners Offer Real-Life Lessons on What Works, What Doesn't, and Why*. eds. Bruce W. McClendon and Anthony James Catanese. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Brown, David. 1999. *Planning Places: Enabling the Practitioner*. Master of City Planning Thesis. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba
- Burayidi, Michael A. 1993. Dualism and Universalism: Competing Paradigms in Planning Education? *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 12:223-229.
- Campbell, Scott., and Susan S. Fainstein. (eds.) 1996. *Readings in Planning Theory*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Dandekar, Hemalata C. 1990. Educating First and Third World Development Planners: The Role of Qualitative Evaluations. In *Breaking the Boundaries: A One-World Approach to Planning Education*. ed. Bishwapriya Sanyal. New York: Plenum Press.

- Day, Christopher. 1990. *Places of the Soul: Architecture and Environmental Design as a Healing Art*. Wellingborough, Northamptonshire: The Aquarian Press.
- Eagan, David J., and David W. Orr. (eds.) 1992. *The Campus and Environmental Responsibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- El-Shakhs, Salah. 1990. The Language of Planners: A Central Issue in Internationalizing Planning Education. In *Breaking the Boundaries: A One-World Approach to Planning Education*. ed. Bishwapiya Sanyal. New York: Plenum Press.
- Fainstein, Susan S. 1996. Planning in a Different Voice. In *Readings in Planning Theory*. eds. Scott Campbell and Susan S. Fainstein. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Feldman, Marshall M. A. 1994. Perloff Revisited: Reassessing Planning Education in Postmodern Times. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 13:89-103.
- Foerster, James F., and G. C. Hemmens. 1988. Adapting Planning Education to Changing Student Demands. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 8(1):19-23.
- Forester, John. 1996. Learning from Practice Stories: The Priority of Practical Judgement. In *Readings in Planning Theory*. eds. Scott Campbell and Susan S. Fainstein. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Forsyth, Ann. 1995. Diversity Issues in a Professional Curriculum: Four Stories and Some Suggestions for Change. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 5:58-63.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse On Language*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Friedmann, John. 1996. The Core Curriculum in Planning Revisited. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 15:89-104.
- Friedmann, John. 1996. Feminist and Planning Theories: The Epistemological Connection. In *Readings in Planning Theory*. eds. Scott Campbell and Susan S. Fainstein. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Friedmann, John. 1987. *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Friedmann, John. 1979. *The Good Society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Galloway, Thomas D., and Riad G. Mahayni. 1977. Planning Theory in Retrospect: The Process of Paradigm Change. *American Institute of Planners Journal* 34(1):62-71.

- Garcia, Raul Bruno. 1993. *Changing Paradigms of Professional Practice, Education and Research in Academe: A History of Planning Education in the United States*. Michigan: U.M.I Dissertation Services, A Bell & Howell Information Company.
- Grant, Jill., and Patricia Manuel. 1995. Using a Peer Resource Learning Model in Planning Education. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 15:51-57.
- Greene, Sherwin. 1988. Making the Studio Experience Work for Part-Time Students. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 8(1):9-11.
- Harvey, David. 1996. On Planning the Ideology of Planning. In *Readings in Planning Theory*. eds. Scott Campbell and Susan S. Fainstein. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Healey, Patsy. 1997. *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Healey, Patsy. 1996. Planning Through Debate: The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory. In *Readings in Planning Theory*. eds. Scott Campbell and Susan S. Fainstein. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Hendler, Sue. (ed.) 1995. *Planning Ethics: A Reader in Planning Theory, Practice and Education*. New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Research.
- Hershey, Cary. 1974. *Teaching Social Policy: Concepts and Objectives*. Paper No. 3 of Occasional Papers in Planning Education. Prepared for the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning Program at the American Society of Planning Officials Conference at Chicago, Illinois.
- Hessler, Richard M., 1992. *Social Research Methods*. St. Paul: West Publishing Company.
- Hinojosa, Rene C., Lyons, Thomas S., and Frank D. Zinn. 1992. The Relevancy of North American Planning Education for Overseas Practice: A Survey of Graduates. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 12:32-38.
- Hoch, Charles. 1995. Teaching Ethics and Planning Theory. In *Planning Ethics: A Reader in Planning Theory, Practice and Education*. ed. Sue Hendler. New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Research.
- Holstein, James A., and Jaber F. Gubrium. 1995. *The Active Interview*. Qualitative Research Methods Series Volume 37. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Hudson, Barclay. 1974. *Praxis as a Medium for Evaluation: Some Implications for Research and Teaching in Planning*. Paper No. 6 of Occasional Papers in Planning Education. Prepared for the American Institute of Planners meeting at Denver, Colorado. Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.
- Illich, Ivan. 1971. *Deschooling Society*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Innes, Judith E. 1995. Planning Theory's Emerging Paradigm: Communicative Action and Interactive Practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14:183-189.
- Kaufman, Sanda., and Robert Simons. 1995. Quantitative and Research Methods in Planning: Are Schools Teaching What Practitioners Practice? *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 15:17-33.
- Kihl, Mary R. 1990. Design Education for International Practice: The Alumni Perspective. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 9(2):142-146.
- Krueger, Richard A. 1998a. *Developing Questions for Focus Groups: Focus Group Kit #3*. California: Sage Publications.
- Krueger, Richard A. 1998b. *Moderating Focus Groups: Focus Group Kit #4*. California: Sage Publications.
- Krueger, Richard A. 1998c. *Analyzing and Reporting Focus Group Results: Focus Group Kit #6*. California: Sage Publications.
- Krueger, Richard A. 1988. *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. California: Sage Publications.
- McClendon, Bruce W., and Anthony James Catanese. (eds.) 1996. *Planners on Planning: Leading Planners Offer Real-Life Lessons on What Works, What Doesn't, and Why*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Milroy, Beth Moore. 1996. Some Thoughts About Difference and Pluralism. In *Readings in Planning Theory*. eds. Scott Campbell and Susan S. Fainstein. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Neuman, W. L. 1991. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Orr, David W. 1994. *Earth in Mind: On Education, Environment, and the Human Prospect*. Washington D.C.: Island Press.

- Orr, David W. 1992. The Problem of Education. In *The Campus and Environmental Responsibility*. eds. David J. Eagan and David W. Orr. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Orr, David W. 1992. *Ecological Literacy: Education and the Transition to a Postmodern World*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Orr, David W. 1990. Environmental Education and Ecological Literacy. *Education Digest* 55(9):49-54.
- Palys, Ted. 1997. *Research Decisions: Quantitative and Qualitative Perspectives*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace & Company Canada, Ltd.
- Reid, Jim. 1996. What They Don't Teach You in School. In *Planners on Planning: Leading Planners Offer Real-Life Lessons on What Works, What Doesn't, and Why*. eds. Bruce W. McClendon and Anthony James Catanese. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Ritzdorf, Marsha. 1996. Feminist Thoughts on the Theory and Practice of Planning. In *Readings in Planning Theory*. eds. Scott Campbell and Susan S. Fainstein. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Rubin, Herbert J., and Irene S. Rubin. 1995. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Sandercock, Leonie., and Ann Forsyth. 1996. Feminist Theory and Planning Theory: The Epistemological Linkages. In *Readings in Planning Theory*. eds. Scott Campbell and Susan S. Fainstein. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Sandercock, Leonie. 1998. *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sandercock, Leonie. 1995. Voices from the Borderlands: A Meditation on a Metaphor. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14:77-88.
- Sanyal, Bishwapriya. (ed.) 1990. *Breaking the Boundaries: A One-World Approach to Planning Education*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Sanyal, Bishwapriya. 1989. Poor Countries' Students in Rich Countries' Universities: Possibilities of Planning Education for the Twenty-first Century. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 8(3):139-155.
- Sarkissian, Wendy. 1996. *With a Whole Heart: Nurturing an Ethic of Caring for Nature in the Education of Australian Planners*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Perth: Murdoch University, Institute of Science and Technology Policy.

- Siembieda, William J. 1988. Providing Continuity for Part-Time Graduate Students. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 8(1):13-17.
- Thomashow, Mitchell. 1996. *Ecological Identity: Becoming a Reflective Environmentalist*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Thompson, Ian H. 1998. Environmental Ethics and the Development of Landscape Architectural Theory. *Landscape Research* 23(2):175-195.
- Willig, Richard. 1974. *Planning Education: Conceptual Alternatives In The Developing World*. Paper No. 9 in Occasional Papers in Planning Education. Prepared for the AIP Conference at Denver, Colorado.