



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Why It Is Important to Give Voice to Young Practitioners

Taşan-Kok, T.; Oranje, M.

DOI

[10.4324/9781315726854-1](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315726854-1)

Publication date

2018

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

From Student to Urban Planner

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Taşan-Kok, T., & Oranje, M. (2018). Why It Is Important to Give Voice to Young Practitioners. In T. Taşan-Kok, & M. Oranje (Eds.), *From Student to Urban Planner: Young Practitioners' Reflections on Contemporary Ethical Challenges* (pp. 1-11). (The RTPi Library Series). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315726854-1>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

FROM STUDENT TO URBAN PLANNER

YOUNG PRACTITIONERS' REFLECTIONS ON CONTEMPORARY ETHICAL CHALLENGES

EDITED BY TUNA TAŞAN-KOK AND MARK ORANJE



RTPI

mediation of space · making of place



From Student to Urban Planner

For many young planners, the noble intentions associated with going to planning school seem starkly out of place in the neoliberal worlds they have come to inhabit. For some, the huge gap between the power they thought they would have and what they actually do is not only worrying, but also deeply discouraging. But for some others, practice means finding practical and creative solutions to overcome challenges and complexities.

How do young planners in different settings respond to seemingly similar situations like these? What do they do – give up, adjust, or fight back? What role did their planning education play, and could it have helped in preparing and assisting them to respond to the world they are encountering?

In this edited volume, stories of young planners from sixteen countries that engage these questions are presented. The sixteen cases range from settings with older, established planning systems (e.g., USA, the Netherlands, and the UK) to settings where the system is less set (e.g., Brazil), being remodeled (e.g., South Africa and Bosnia Herzegovina), and under stress (e.g., Turkey and Poland). Each chapter explores what might be done differently to prepare young planners for the complexities and challenges of their ‘real worlds’. This book not only points out what is absent, but also offers planning educators an alternative vision.

The editors and esteemed contributors provide reflections and suggestions as to how this new generation of young planners can be supported to survive in, embrace, and change the world they are encountering, and, in the spirit of planning, endeavor to ‘change it for the better’.

Tuna Taşan-Kok is an urban social geographer and planner, and works as a university professor in the Department of Human Geography, Urban Planning and International Development at the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. She holds a PhD in social geography and planning from the University of Utrecht, the Netherlands, and a MSc. in regional planning from METU, Ankara, Turkey.

Mark Oranje is a professor in the Department of Town and Regional Planning at the University of Pretoria, South Africa. His key areas of teaching, research, and consulting are planning policy, planning history, regional development, intergovernmental development planning, and the interface between mining and settlement development.

THE RTPI Library Series

Editors: Robert Upton, *Infrastructure Planning Commission in England*
Jill Grant, *Dalhousie University, Canada*
Stephen Ward, *Oxford Brookes University, United Kingdom*

Published by Routledge in conjunction with The Royal Town Planning Institute, this series of leading-edge texts looks at all aspects of spatial planning theory and practice from a comparative and international perspective.

Conflict, Improvisation, Governance: Lessons in Democratic Planning from the Netherlands

David Laws and John Forester

The Craft of Collaborative Planning: People Working Together to Shape Creative and Sustainable Places

Jeff Bishop

Future Directions for the European Shrinking City

Edited by Hans Schlappa and William J.V. Neill

Insurgencies and Revolutions

Edited by Haripriya Rangan, Kam Mee NG, Libby Porter and Jacquelyn Chase

Planning for Small Town Change

Neil Powe and Trevor Hart

Regent Park Redux: Reinventing Public Housing in Canada

Laura Johnson and Robert Johnson

Planning in Indigenous Australia: From Imperial Foundations to Postcolonial Futures

Sue Jackson, Libby Porter and Louise C. Johnson

From Student to Urban Planner: Young Practitioners' Reflections on Contemporary Ethical Challenges

Edited by Tuna Taşan-Kok and Mark Oranje

From Student to Urban Planner

Young Practitioners' Reflections on
Contemporary Ethical Challenges

Edited by Tuna Taşan-Kok
and Mark Oranje

First published 2018
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2018 Taylor & Francis

The right of Tuna Taşan-Kok and Mark Oranje to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Taşan-Kok, Tuna, editor. | Oranje, Mark, editor.

Title: From student to urban planner : young practitioners' reflections on contemporary ethical challenges / edited by Tuna Tasan-Kok and Mark Oranje.

Description: New York : Routledge, 2017. | Series: The RTPI library series | Includes bibliographical references.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017031066 | ISBN 9781138847347 (hardback) | ISBN 9781138847354 (pbk.)

Subjects: LCSH: City planning—Moral and ethical aspects. |

Urban policy—Moral and ethical aspects. | Professional ethics.

Classification: LCC HT166. F75 2017 | DDC 307.1/216—dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2017031066>

ISBN: 978-1-138-84734-7 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-138-84735-4 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-72685-4 (ebk)

Typeset in Goudy

by Keystroke, Neville Lodge, Tettenhall, Wolverhampton

Dedicated to our parents Mevlüt Taşan and Tineke Oranje, who
will inspire us forever . . .



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Contents

List of Figures	xi
List of Tables	xiii
List of Boxes	xv
Contributors	xvii
Preface	xxvii
1 Why It Is Important to Give Voice to Young Practitioners <i>Tuna Taşan-Kok and Mark Oranje</i>	1
Part I: Education, Reality, and Ethical Challenges	13
2 Mismatch Between Planning Education and Practice: Contemporary Educational Challenges and Conflicts Confronting Young Planners <i>Tuna Taşan-Kok, Ela Babalık-Sutcliffe, Elsona van Huyssteen, and Mark Oranje</i>	15
3 Challenges of Planning Practice and Profession: To What Extent Are Young Planners Able to Intervene? <i>Jef Van den Broeck</i>	33
Part II: Lost, Oblivious, or Boundary Pushing? Responses from Practicing Planners	43
4 A Spider in the Web or a Puppet on a String? Swedish Planning Students' Reflections on their Future Professional Role <i>Moa Tunström</i>	45
5 Lost in Transition: Fledgling Planners in Bosnia and Herzegovina <i>Aleksandra Djurasovic</i>	60

6	Good Intentions, Deep Frustrations, and Upward Mobility: Just Another Young Planner's Day in South Africa <i>Mark Oranje, Sanell Venter, and Albert Ferreira</i>	74
7	Breakfast at Tiffany's: Young Planners Mobilising against the Planning of Towers in Tel Aviv <i>Talia Margalit</i>	88
8	Confronted and Disappointed? Struggle of Turkish Planners against Authoritarian State-Regulated Urban Development <i>Tuna Taşan-Kok and Mehmet Penpecioglu</i>	107
9	In Search of a Place: Young Planners' Reflections on Planning and Practice <i>Yesim Sungu-Eryilmaz</i>	126
10	"Things Can Only Get Better"? Transitioning from Planning Student to Planner in the England of the 1990s and 2000s <i>Olivier Sykes</i>	137
11	"The Door Is Now Half Open": How Work Placement Experiences Better Prepare Planning Graduates for Practice – An Australian Case Study <i>John Jackson</i>	152
12	Planning for Rights: Bewildered Young Planners in Brazil <i>Roberto Rocco</i>	168
13	Facing up to Finnish Planning Pathologies: A Contextual Interpretation of Planner Capabilities and a Call for Change <i>Jonna Kangasoja and Hanna Mattila</i>	182
14	The Self-Conception of German Planners as Pioneers for Sustainability Transition <i>Joerg Knieling and Katharina Klindworth</i>	198
15	"I Shall Survive": Planners' Strategies in the Face of the Strong Asymmetry of Illegal Powers in Italy <i>Daniela De Leo</i>	215
16	A New Generation of Professionals in Urban Planning – A System Full of Limitations: The Case of Hungary <i>Zsuzsa Földi</i>	228
17	A New Role for Young Planners in the Netherlands: Still a Planners' Paradise? <i>Willem K. Korthals Altes and Tuna Taşan-Kok</i>	241

18	Deregulation of the Spatial Planners' Profession in Poland and the New Inconsistent System: What Happens Next? <i>Magdalena Zaleczna</i>	256
19	Planning Pedagogy and Practices in Transition: Taiwan's Young Planners and Their Challenges of Finding Purpose in Planning <i>Sue-Ching Jou and Shu-Mei Huang</i>	269
	Part III: Recommendations, Reflections, and Conclusions	285
20	A Quest for a Critical Debate and New Ideas <i>Louis Albrechts</i>	287
21	Editors' Reflections and Conclusions <i>Tuna Taşan-Kok and Mark Oranje</i>	296
	Afterword: Notes on the Critical Study of Planning Practices <i>John Forester</i>	312
	Index	317



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Figures

7.1	Map showing POPS located near expensive dwellings in central Tel Aviv–Jaffa and the picnic sites	94
7.2	The second picnic	96
7.3	The fourth picnic in Zameret Park	97
11.1	How would you describe yourself professionally?	161
12.1	A word cloud prepared using keywords mentioned in the online questionnaire responded to by 30 young planners	178
13.1	Definition of professional agency within a subject-centred sociocultural framework	190
13.2	The job demands–resources (JD–R) model	190
14.1	Multi-level perspective of transition management	200
14.2	Criteria for the identification of planning practitioners as change agents for sustainable spatial development	203
16.1	The approaches in the formal education and practice of urban planning	231



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Tables

11.1	Planning education in Australia: Accredited programmes and work placement	156
11.2	What 13 work placement students said (2014)	158
11.3	Focus group findings on students' experience of work placements	158
11.4	What 17 placement students reflected on	159
11.5	What did you learn from your time at RMIT?	161
14.1	Possible roles, competencies, and main tasks of change agents in transformation processes	201
14.2	Overview of interviewed transition pioneers	203
14.3	Analytical framework for interview analysis	204



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Boxes

4.1	Swedish practitioner Sandra Oliveira e Costa's self-reflection on her profession and practice	47
6.1	South African practitioner Maggie Tsotetsi's self-reflection on her profession	82
7.1	Israeli practitioner Naama Riba's self-reflection on her profession	90
8.1	Turkish practitioner Deniz Kimyon's self-reflection on her profession	112
11.1	Australian practitioner Mia Zar's self-reflection on her profession	154
12.1	Brazilian practitioner Higor Carvalho's self-reflection on his profession	174
16.1	Hungarian practitioner Viktória Csupor's self-reflection on her profession	233
17.1	Ekistics members' self-reflection on their profession	244
19.1	Taiwanese practitioner Yu-Ting Lin's self-reflection on her profession	275
21.1	Self-reflection by Tuna Taşan-Kok	303
21.2	Self-reflection by Mark Oranje	305



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Contributors

Louis Albrechts is Professor Emeritus of Strategic Spatial Planning in the Department of Architecture, Urbanism and Planning at the University of Leuven, Belgium. He has Master's degrees in urban and regional planning, social studies, and the study of developing countries, and a PhD in urban and regional planning from the University of Leuven. He was a full professor at the University of Leuven from 1987 till 2007, was a visiting professor at the Universities of Poznan, Pecs, Lille, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Alghero, and Bari, and was a visiting research fellow at the University of West Australia, Perth. He is a corresponding member of the German Academy for Research and Planning, founder and editor of *European Planning Studies*, member of the editorial board of several international journals, and chair of the first and second World Planning Schools Congresses. He was the president of the Association of European School of Planning and the chair of the advisory board of the Global Research Network on Human Settlements (UN-Habitat HS-Net). Currently he is the chair of the planning commission of his hometown. His current research focuses on the practice and nature of strategic spatial planning, diversity and creativity in planning.

Willem K. Korthals Altes is a professor of land development (since 1997) and a member of the executive committee (since 2003) of OTB Research for the Built Environment at TUDelft, the Netherlands. Within OTB he leads the subprogram on Governance of Land Development and coordinates the section Geoinformation and Land Development. Between 1995 and 2003 he has also worked in practice as a (senior) consultant and later partner with Kolpron Consultants and (after a merger with NEI and Ecotec) Ecorys in Rotterdam. In 1995 he finished his PhD (*cum laude*) at the University of Amsterdam on a research project financed by NWO (the Dutch Science Foundation) and supervised by Professor Andreas Faludi on national spatial planning in the Netherlands. He has done (in 1989–1990) research on urban planning between 1919 and 1934 in Vienna at

TU Vienna with a research grant from the Austrian ministry. He holds a Master's degree in planning (*cum laude*) from University of Amsterdam.

Ela Babalik-Sutcliffe is a member of the academic staff in the Department of City and Regional Planning, Middle East Technical University (METU), Ankara, Turkey. She did her Bachelor's degree in city planning at METU, her Master's degree in urban policy planning in the same university, and her PhD in urban transport planning in the Centre for Transport Studies, University College London, UK. Her research topics include transport policy, sustainable mobility, public transport planning and operation, and planning education. She is a member of the editorial board of the *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*; a member of the Permanent Scientific and Technical Committee of *Coopération pour le Développement et l'Amélioration des Transport Urbains et Périurbains (CODATU)*; and a member of the executive committee of the Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP), acting as the association's representative in the Global Planning Education Associations Network (GPEAN).

Aleksandra Djurasovic obtained her PhD at the Institute for Urban Planning and Regional Development, HafenCity University Hamburg, Germany. She holds a Bachelor's degree in landscape architecture (from the University of California–Davis, USA) and a Master's degree in urban planning (from the City College of New York, USA). Recently she completed a post-doctoral program at the Center for Advanced Studies of Southeast Europe, Rijeka, Croatia, focusing on large-scale development projects in Serbia and Croatia in the context of the late phase of post-socialist transition. Djurasovic's academic interests lie in Southeast European urban geographies, transition, political economy, and sustainability, among others.

Albert Ferreira is registered as a professional planner with the South African Council for Planners (SACPLAN). He completed his Master's and Bachelor's degrees in the Department of Town and Regional Planning at the University of Pretoria, South Africa (2012 and 2016, respectively). After completion of his Bachelor's degree, he took on a position as an assistant lecturer in the department, while undertaking research towards his Master's degree (2012–2014). Albert has been involved in several research projects, the most noteworthy being the Resiliency Strategies for Aspirational African Cities, where he focused on the application of resilience theory in urban settings through an in-depth study of the retail sector in the City of Tshwane. Albert has presented papers on his research at international and local conferences. Since 2014, he has worked on several high-level spatial development frameworks, infrastructure investment plans, and asset management plans. He has worked both in South Africa and in Kenya.

Zsuzsa Földi graduated as a teacher of geography and English language and literature in 1996 at the University of Debrecen, Hungary. She set off her doctoral studies at ELTE University Doctoral School for Regional Sciences in 1998. While completing the program, her interest turned towards urban studies. In 2002 she spent seven months at Utrecht University with a Huygens Scholarship, where – with the support of URU – in 2006 she promoted her PhD. As for her professional career, she left teaching for consultancy in regional and urban planning in 2001, and was keeping her leading consultant's position at Terra Studio Ltd. while doing her PhD research. In 2008 she got a position as a researcher at the Centre for Regional Studies, Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Zsuzsa gained working experience in academic environments, conducted and also coordinated research projects, attended a number of conferences, and produced over 30 publications. Being attracted to the practice of planning and the real life of the profession, in 2014 she fully returned to consultancy and presently is working as a freelancer.

John Forester is a professor of city and regional planning at Cornell University. He received his BS (1970) and MS (1971) in Mechanical Engineering and his MCP (1974) and PhD (1977) in city and regional planning from the University of California, Berkeley, USA. He has served as Director of Graduate Studies and Department Chair in city and regional planning and as Associate Dean of Cornell's College of Architecture, Art, and Planning. Drawing upon sabbatical research in the USA (twice at MIT), Israel, Holland, and Italy, Forester's research has focused on the micro-politics of planning with particular attention paid to issues of power and conflict, negotiation and mediation, and practices of organizing, deliberation and improvisation. Forester's best-known books are *Planning in the Face of Power* (1989), *The Deliberative Practitioner* (1999), and *Dealing with Differences: Dramas of Mediating Public Disputes* (2009). His recent publications include *Planning in the Face of Conflict* (2013), *Conflict, Improvisation, Governance* (with David Laws, 2015), and *Rebuilding Community After Katrina* (with Ken Reardon, 2016). His *Beyond Plan Making* (with Daniela DeLeo, 2018) is forthcoming. Forester serves as a senior editor for the international journal *Planning Theory and Practice*.

Shu-Mei Huang is an assistant professor at the Graduate Institute of Building and Planning, National Taiwan University. Shu-Mei received her PhD in built environment from the University of Washington, USA. Her research interests include postcolonial urbanism, dark heritage, participatory planning, recovery planning, and care transnationalization. She has carried out research into defunct prisons built by the colonial regimes in several East Asian cities, including Taipei, Seoul, Singapore, and Lushun.

In collaboration with her Korean colleague, she is preparing for a book project on the remembering of punishment in postcolonial Asian cities. She is also author of *Urbanizing Carescapes in Hong Kong* (2015).

John Jackson, from Yorkshire and educated as a historical geographer, lived and worked in southern Africa and Canada before settling in 'Marvellous Melbourne'. He is now the longest serving academic planner in the Department of Global, Urban and Social Studies at RMIT University Melbourne, Australia. His research interests are varied; he is currently writing about the values and practices of planners in Glasgow, Toronto, and Melbourne.

Sue-Ching Jou is a professor of geography and the Associate Dean of the College of Science at National Taiwan University (NTU). She also serves as the director of the International Degree Program in Climate Change and Sustainable Development at NTU. Her research interests are mainly in the fields of urban studies, including the political economy of urban development, urban and regional governance, and geographies of sustainable city governance. Her recent research focuses are on urban climate governance and participatory river governance. She has been devoted to interdisciplinary learning and education for years by focusing on social innovation and social entrepreneurship in local development.

Jonna Kangasoja is the co-founder and managing director at Akordi Oy, a Helsinki-based consultancy specializing in facilitation, mediation, and negotiation for multi-stakeholder processes in contexts of, for example, urban planning, natural resources, and energy. During the years between 2008 and 2016, Jonna worked as a researcher and teacher at Aalto University, Helsinki, in the Department of Built Environment. Jonna's background is the study of new forms of work and learning. Her research at Aalto University focused on the competence needs of urban planning professionals, especially as these are related to integrating multiple perspectives, conflict management, and creative joint problem solving. She has studied public policy mediation and consensus building at MIT and Harvard's Program on Negotiation. She is a program director at the Finnish Institute for Deliberative Democracy and a member of the CBI Global Network of mediators.

Katharina Klindworth works as a research associate at the Institute of Urban Planning and Regional Development at HafenCity University Hamburg, Germany. She holds degrees in geography and urban planning and regional development. Her work focuses on the governance of sustainable urban and regional development, transition processes to low-carbon and resilient cities, as well as energy transition, climate mitigation, and adaptation of cities and regions. She has worked on transdisciplinary research projects involving cities and universities across Europe.

Joerg Knieling is a professor of urban planning and regional development at HafenCity University Hamburg, Germany. His academic background is spatial planning (Dr.-Ing.) and social sciences (M.A. pol./soc.). As former “Directeur de recherche”, he is associated with “l’Institut d’études avancées” in Paris. Also, he has been a visiting professor at Politecnico di Milano, Italy. His research is focused on sustainable urban and regional planning, territorial governance, and international planning cultures. Among his recent book publications are *Climate Adaptation Governance in Cities and Regions* (2016), *Soft Spaces in Europe* (2015), *Cities in Crisis* (2015), and *Planning Cultures in Europe* (2009). He is a member of the German Academy for Spatial Research and Planning and of the Scientific Board of the German Federal Ministry of Transport and Digital Infrastructure. He has been teaching undergraduate and graduate students of urban and regional planning at different German universities for more than 20 years.

Daniela De Leo is a tenured researcher and assistant professor in urban planning at the Sapienza University in Rome. Her research focuses on challenges for planners, and urban planning theories and practices, in the face of the Mafia in contested spaces and in areas with strong asymmetries of power and inequality.

Hanna Mattila is a university lecturer at Aalto University, Department of Built Environment, Helsinki, Finland. She teaches in the Bachelor’s program in built environment (e.g., introduction to land use planning) and the Master’s program in spatial planning and transportation engineering (e.g., planning theory and land use planning systems). Her research interests include communicative planning, critical theory, ethics, and aesthetics in planning and comparative planning studies. Previously, Hanna has worked as head of education at the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, Helsinki University of Technology. Her main responsibility was to design and manage continuous professional development programs in the field of urban planning and development. Hanna has also worked with regional planning and regional development at the Helsinki–Uusimaa Regional Council.

Talia Margalit is a senior lecturer at the David Azrieli School of Architecture at Tel Aviv University, Israel. Her teaching and research addresses scholarship dealing with the politics of urban design and planning, and she poses historical and current questions on planning relations in Israeli cities. Talia recently concluded a three-year research project with sociologist Adriana Kemp on planning objections and justifications in nine Israeli cities, funded by the Israeli National Science Foundation. She has published in journals such as *Environment and Planning A*, *Cities*, *Planning*

Perspectives, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, and *Planning Theory and Practice*, among others. She co-organized two international seminars on urban citizenship with colleagues from Israel and from Humboldt University in Berlin, and co-edited a journal symposium on urban citizenship and the right to the city in *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. Talia is also the author of several refereed book chapters, including a wide-angle chapter on the historic and theoretical components of Israeli urban planning (in Hebrew). Before joining Tel Aviv University, she wrote on architecture and urban planning for the Israeli daily *Haaretz* (in Hebrew and English), and worked as an urban planner, architect, and preservation specialist in New York City and Israel.

Mark Oranje is a professor in the Department of Town and Regional Planning at the University of Pretoria, South Africa. His key areas of teaching, research, and consulting are planning policy, planning history, regional development, intergovernmental development planning, and the interface between mining and settlement development. Over the course of the last three decades, Mark has authored and co-authored numerous academic papers, articles, chapters in books, and technical reports, and acted as a consultant to national and provincial government departments, municipalities, NGOs, planning commissions, science councils, and private companies on a wide range of issues related to his areas of interest.

Mehmet Penpecioglu is an urban planner and urban politics scholar. He graduated from the Department of City and Regional Planning at Dokuz Eylul University, Turkey, and received his Master's and PhD degrees from the Regional Planning and Urban Policy Departments at Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Turkey. He completed his post-doctoral research at TU Delft OTB – Research for Built Environment and analyzed young practicing planners' changing roles and attitudes under the influence of authoritarian and neoliberal urban policies in Turkey. He is currently working as an assistant professor at the İzmir Institute of Technology, Department of City and Regional Planning. Research interests include urban politics and governance, planning theory and practice, politics of local economic development, and urban social movements.

Tuna Taşan-Kok is an urban social geographer and planner, and works as a university professor in the Department of Human Geography, Urban Planning and International Development, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands since September 2015. She received a PhD in social geography and planning on the topic of “Budapest, Istanbul, and Warsaw: Institutional and Spatial Change” from University of Utrecht, the Netherlands, under the supervision of Professor Dr. Jan van Weesep in

2004. She was awarded with FURS (Foundation for Urban and Regional Research) and SYLFF (The Ryoichi Sasakawa Young Leaders Fellowship Fund) grants for her PhD work. She has published widely, and conducted and coordinated numerous international research projects. After completing a large EU-funded research project (DIVERCITIES) recently as one of the lead coordinators, she is currently leading a NWO/ESRC/FAPESP-funded research project (*PARCOUR – Public Accountability to Residents in Contractual Urban Redevelopment*). She is associate editor of both *European Urban and Regional Studies* and *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, and Chair of the Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP) Best Congress Paper Prize Committee.

Moa Tunström is a senior research fellow at Nordregio – Nordic Centre for Spatial Development – in Stockholm, Sweden. She is educated as a planner and holds a PhD in human geography from Örebro University (2009) in Sweden. Her research often focuses on contemporary urban discourses and storytelling – in urban plans and visions, planning practice, education, and more. In projects and writings, she has investigated discourses on the urban and suburban in planning as well as the social in sustainability. She is currently involved in research on the impact of citizen participation in planning.

Roberto Rocco is an assistant professor in the Spatial Planning and Strategy section of the Faculty of Architecture of the TUDelft in the Netherlands. He is responsible for course development and coordination in research methodology in areas of planning and design practice, regional planning, and regional design and governance. He leads the Summer School “Planning and Design with Water”. He coordinates courses in EMU (the European Master of Urbanism) and AMS (Amsterdam Metropolitan Solutions). His main research efforts are into governance of slum upgrading strategies, and the relationships between the public sector, the private sector, and civil society for the improvement of informal settlements.

Yesim Sungu-Eryilmaz is a senior lecturer at the City Planning and Urban Affairs program at Boston University, Massachusetts, USA, and a visiting lecturer at the Urban Studies program at Brown University, Rhode Island, USA. Her teaching and research areas include planning sustainable cities, quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, spatial analysis, and smart cities.

Olivier Sykes is a senior lecturer in European spatial planning and a Policy Impact Fellow of the Heseltine Institute for Public Policy and Practice at the University of Liverpool, UK. He has published extensively on European territorial policy and international comparative planning and urban policy. He is Chair of Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP)

Excellence in Teaching Prize Committee and a convenor of the French and British Planning Study Group.

Elsona van Huyssteen holds a position as a principal urban and regional planner and researcher at the CSIR (national research council, South Africa), responsible for leading transdisciplinary research initiatives in support of multi-stakeholder collaboration and spatial decision making. She has led numerous projects including spatial analyses and interregional alignment for the National Spatial Development Perspective (2005–2009); settlement change profiling, research, and policy analyses for the National Development Plan (2011), the Integrated Urban Development Framework (2014), and the national Risk and Vulnerability Atlas (ongoing). Elsona is passionate about the role of action and future-orientated practices, collaborative innovation, and transformation in engaging our unfolding future. She currently drives research and multi-stakeholder engagement on town futures through stepSA (Spatial Temporal Evidence for Planning, SA) and the CSIR/IDRC climate change project. She is finalizing her PhD thesis, “Being, Becoming and Contributing in Planning”, in the Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Pretoria.

Jef Van den Broeck is Master of Science in Engineering/Architecture (1963) and Master in Urban and Regional Planning (1985). He was former CEO of “Studiegroep Omgeving” (Office for Spatial Planning, Urbanism, Architecture and Land Survey) (1973–1997), honorary professor at the University Leuven, Belgium (1998–2010), and honorary lecturer at the Artesis, University College, Antwerp (1978–2005). He teaches strategic spatial planning, which is also his research and professional field. He was chairman of the Antwerp City Commission for Spatial Planning (GECORO: 2006–2014) and was ‘coach’ of the Antwerp City Planning Organisation (2001–2009) and in other cities and regions. He was chairman and general manager of the project “Antwerp: City and the River” and active in different countries on different spatial scales. He is author and co-author of many articles, papers, plans, and projects, among them the Strategic Plan for the Port Area of Ghent (European Award), the Second Benelux Structural Scheme, and the Strategic Plan for the Nairobi Metropolitan Area (competition 2010, second award).

Sanell Venter is registered as a professional planner with the South African Council of Planners (SACPLAN). Her areas of specialization are strategic spatial planning and information design. She graduated with distinction from the Department of Town and Regional Planning at the University of Pretoria, South Africa, in 2008, stayed on as assistant lecturer, and later became a researcher in the department until 2015. Having studied further in the field of graphic design, she currently divides her time between

part-time lecturing and consulting in the fields of spatial planning, spatial communication, and graphic design.

Magdalena Zaleczna is a lawyer and an economist. She works at the University of Lodz, Poland, in the Department of Investment and Real Estate. She obtained a PhD in 2000 on the basis of a doctoral dissertation, “Conditions for Development of the Polish Real Estate Market in Transition”, and a post-doctoral degree (habilitation) obtained in 2012. In the course of scientific work, she has participated in many research projects, including projects funded by the European Commission (Marie Curie Programme) and private sponsors. Together with Dr. Tuna Taşan-Kok, she gained research grant from Ernst & Young, “EU Single Market Regulations and Legislation of Public–Private Partnership (PPP) in Urban Development Projects in Poland”. She was also invited as an expert for the COST Land Management for Urban Dynamics program and for the Planning and Sustainable Urban Land Use program organized by Norwegian University of Life Sciences.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Preface

Tuna Taşan-Kok and Mark Oranje

In July 2013, we presented a paper at the Joint AESOP–ACSP Congress in Dublin entitled “Lost, oblivious . . . and/or just ‘liking’ it? Being a planner in a time and space of contestation and challenge” in a session devoted to planning theory. The paper was an outgrowth of our shared frustration with the deeply worrying political–economic events in our respective countries (Turkey and South Africa) and their impacts on society, urban policy-making, and planning. Beyond its local roots, our paper was grounded in a wider, more generic argument: that the role of the planner in contemporary society is primarily shaped by the prevailing political–economic conditions (neoliberalism, market-led urban development, opportunism, entrepreneurialism, consumerism, etc.) and far less so by ‘the ethos of planning’ or the beliefs and teachings of planning educators. This ‘departure from the planning ideal’, we held, is both evident in and compounded by glaring mismatches between: (1) the theory and day-to-day practices of planning; (2) the stated objectives and disparate outcomes of urban development and management; and (3) the contents of planning curricula and what young planners need to know. This grim reality, we argued, not only challenges us (as planners and educators) to rethink the main tenets of planning, to reassess the passion and care with which we pursue our profession, and to review what is being taught in (our) planning program, but even more importantly to research what shakes and often undermines the confidence and ‘faith’ of our young graduates. This inadequate foundation, we held, not only produces intense inner turmoil and disillusion in many young practitioners but also induces them to abandon the ‘planning ethos’ they were taught – often very early in their careers.

To our surprise, the paper resonated with the experience of many of the delegates in our session. Several young planners, but also some older ones who took the interests of young planners to heart, were particularly responsive to our stance that planning education and theory did not provide much assistance to the young planners confronted with these kinds of challenges. They had observed similar concerns and tendencies amongst young planners

where they were from, even in countries that were not in turmoil or going through major societal transitions.

Professor Jill Grant, who chaired the session, suggested that we consider putting together an edited volume for Routledge on ‘the experiences of young planners’. Several scholars immediately expressed interest in participating; others provided names of colleagues and friends who had done research in the field, some committed themselves to doing new research and taking part in the project of “sourcing, engaging, and making sense of the voices of young planning practitioners in a selection of countries”. Towards the end of the conference, we were ready to write a proposal for what was veering in the direction of a rather sombre book, full of our middle-aged misgivings and concerns. But then we met up with John Forester at the closing dinner. John convinced us to be more hopeful and less cynical: to open our eyes and ears to the tenacity, idealism, and resourcefulness of young planners. We are deeply grateful to him for sharing his wisdom, passion, and care. We took to heart his insistence on capturing ‘the full story’: documenting not only deep disappointment, coping and getting by, ‘just doing my job’ and holding out for better days but also holding on to what planning stands for, pushing boundaries, and taking decisive action to bring about real change.

This book would not have been compiled and published had it not been for the tireless effort and support of Jill Grant, Judith Newlin, and Krystal LaDuc at Routledge/Taylor & Francis. Special thanks are due to John Forester, Louis Albrechts, Jef Van den Broeck, Willem Korthals Altes, and Willem Salet for believing in and supporting the effort with their insight, wisdom, and dedication to planning education. Numerous planning scholars from all over the world acted as reviewers for each chapter; we cannot reveal their names due to the blinded refereeing procedure, but we owe them huge thanks for making time in their busy agendas for their role in this project. We would also like to thank Nancy van Weesep-Smyth for her editorial work on several chapters of the book. Last, but not least, both of us are grateful to all the authors of the case studies as well as to the young practitioners who participated in the research and allowed us to see the world through their window. Their enthusiasm, energy, and willingness to contribute to the debate made the project worthwhile.

We hope that the book’s content will be taken up, considered, and, where applicable, put into practice with the same concern, care, and commitment that went into its preparation.

23 May 2017, Amsterdam and Pretoria

1

Why It Is Important to Give Voice to Young Practitioners

Tuna Taşan-Kok and Mark Oranje

Background

This book grew out of a simple set of questions. Their perplexing nature is perhaps as much a function of being pensive middle-aged planning educators as of projecting our own concerns and misgivings about planning practice onto the next generation. How do young practitioners experience ‘planning practice’? How does this experience fit with what they had been taught at ‘planning school’? How has the exposure to practice shaped their views on planning? And where has it left them?

Turning to theory, as those who teach tend to do, we took note of the study by John Forester (2013) on how planners respond to challenging, stressful, and messy situations. The position he derived from his groundbreaking work on planning practitioners was both hopeful and promising. While we were emboldened by his optimism, which incidentally also dovetailed with our view of planning as an ‘organisation of hope’ (Campbell, Tait, & Watkins, 2013), our own interactions with newly graduated students and young practitioners were less uplifting. Instead of triumph over adversity, far more often we encountered frustration, disappointment, and even despair. Especially perplexing was that, despite their deep unhappiness and exasperation, they stayed on and did not quit their jobs or leave the profession. At the same time, we met young planners who, in the spirit of John Forester, were not just getting by but fighting back and bringing the ethos of hope into their workplaces.

Mulling over their disturbing stories, wishing them more fulfilling lives, and discerning a trickle of hope in their actions, we realized that we simply knew too little about how young planners cope and needed to do some research. From this decision to investigate the matter came the presentation of a paper on the subject at the 2013 AESOP Conference in Dublin, Ireland. To our surprise the paper met with considerable interest in the discussion session and a suggestion was raised to write a book – and this is it.

When conceptualizing this book, we were cautious about making generalizations, ever mindful that planning occurs in a complex field of play, that

behaviour is contextual, and that the same professional may act in very different ways in similar situations. We also recognized that championing hope and safeguarding the public interest would call for more than technical knowledge and routine action. Instead, passion and the desire to make a difference are often the unseen drivers of progressive planning decisions and schemes – small, individual victories in highly unequal political-economic contexts and within corporate-led dynamics. Closer work with practitioners revealed how much creativity it takes for a planner to have any impact in a sea of bureaucracy, often entailing political choices, proactive roles, or even becoming a short-circuiting activist in the machine (Taşan-Kok et al., 2016). In contrast to the elitist, self-centred view of many a modernist planner, effective contemporary practitioners recognize the importance of collaboration, co-production and negotiation with public- and private-sector actors and social groups. On the flip side, these progressive actions, constructive and effective as they may be, tend to mute the planners' individual stories of endeavour and hope and mask the role these individuals have played in hard-fought victories.

By producing this book we sought to make a small contribution to breaking that silence by unearthing and revealing 'what is inside' and exposing what goes on behind the scenes. It is about giving young practitioners a voice; aside from in a few recent studies with that particular aim, their voice is rarely heard (Fox-Rogers & Murphy, 2016). To that end, the book presents a series of case studies that look into the minds and souls of young planners, documenting how they experienced, battled with, and responded to circumstances in which they found themselves. While its scope is modest – adding a layer in the almost empty vessel of empirical work on young planners' experiences of and responses to the world of practice – the book also pursues a bigger ambition. Through an emphasis on agency, it seeks to enrich the small body of studies that have focused on the planner as a person, as a human being with feelings, fears, beliefs, disappointments, and passions, some of which are shaped and fuelled by, caught up in, called upon, challenged by, and often required to function within the workplace.

The book also speaks to planning educators. Each chapter explores what might be done differently to prepare young planners for the complexities and challenges of their 'real worlds'. The aim is not only to point out what is absent but also to offer planning educators an alternative vision. These ideas were generated through: (1) engaging critically with the young professionals' experiences chronicled in this volume and (2) inviting distinguished scholars to ponder avenues for coping with, querying, and overcoming the many challenges young graduates face. By highlighting omissions in planning curricula and suggesting innovative solutions, we believe that the book will be of significant value (and utility) in courses on planning theory and professional practice.

Contemporary Context of Planning Practice

Economic, social, environmental, and political crises, coupled with the contradictions created by neoliberalization, financialization and the unabated privatization of state functions and responsibilities, have produced the highly challenging context in which planning practice takes place. The economic crisis has also drawn a blind on and limited the development of alternative visions of urban life (Brenner, Marcuse, & Mayer, 2009). In some cases, the limitations have created boundaries for planners, often ruling out meaningful public involvement or inclusionary planning practices and projects; in others, exclusionary forms of urban development have been spawned by collaboration between large private companies and the state. Most of these new forms are foreign to the progressive ethos taught at planning school. Furthermore, the values, principles and standards that planning education endeavours to cultivate and enhance are often at odds with planning students' cultural and religious norms and values, clashing with the views and standards fashioned by the highly unequal world they find themselves in. Young planners' expectations, ambitions, values, and interests frequently play a far greater role in shaping their values, perceptions, and behaviour than their formal education does. The result is a continuous, often tense negotiation between different value sets, in which 'planning norms/principles' often lose out to deeply ingrained value sets 'from home', on the one hand, and more recent value sets developed in response to 'the world we are living in and encounters in the workplace', on the other.

There is a large body of literature on how neoliberalization has influenced planning theory and practice (Fainstein, 2010; Gunder, 2010; Jackson, 2009; Purcell, 2009; Sager, 2009; Taşan-Kok & Baeten, 2011; Waterhout, Othengrafen, & Sykes, 2013); on how changing political contexts affect the context in which planners work (Knox & Schweitzer, 2010); how ethics and values of planning are influenced by external factors (Campbell, 2012); how planning practitioners are affected by the changing political and economic conditions of urban development; and how planners take decisions in conflicted situations and find practical and creative solutions (Forester, 2013). While this material provides useful angles for exploring the world of young planners, it does not help us understand their daily struggles or 'the planner as person'.

Some two decades ago, amidst a growing concern about the ascent of the New Right and the decreasing effectiveness of welfarist policies, Louis Albrechts (1991) called for a paradigm shift 'from planning for capital' to 'planning for society'. He advised planners not to become entrepreneurs and to avoid merely attempting to 'steer economic forces'. The call went largely unheeded; planners became facilitators of entrepreneurial, for-profit activities

and developments. This turn toward the market has meant that planning schools champion the idea of planners as change agents, future-makers and -shapers, community heroes, justice distributors, deliberative or reflective practitioners, dreamers, and so on. Meanwhile, young graduates discover, often to their deep dismay and disgust, that their actual role turns them into bureaucrats and/or technocrats, badly positioned to fend for the poor, and often on the wrong side of the public interest (Taşan-Kok et al., 2016). This realization, as we illustrate in this book, leads to consternation and confusion amongst young professionals. More importantly, they lack the mental, emotional, and legal-technical preparation for this world, a hiatus that prevents them from taking on progressive roles even when the opportunity does arise.

Over the last couple of years, the critical literature has highlighted the way in which neoliberalization and neoliberal urban development dynamics have impacted the work of planners. Some scholars have suggested that planners are practicing in environments that are increasingly ‘for profit, not for people’ due to the repositioning of cities within increasingly volatile and financialized circuits of capital accumulation. At the same time, theoretical work on strategic, communicative, and/or participatory planning has repeatedly posited that the planner has the mandate, the power, and the ability to play a leading role in multi-actor governance structures. However, the practitioner’s role falls far short of this ideal: it is prone to high levels of political and economic pressure, sometimes inducing planners to skirt the edges of what is regarded as ‘ethically sound’. In some cases, their behaviour borders on ‘corruption’. This growing contradiction between theory and practice, the gap in the literature on planners’ views of their activities, and the role and place of the planning profession in ‘today’s world’ are recurrent topics in this book and together form its guiding theme.

Context of the Book

The book was born from our observations during research into the worlds of young planning practitioners in South Africa and Turkey. That groundwork has been enriched here with the observations, research, and experience of planning scholars from around the world regarding young practitioners in 14 other contexts – Sweden, Bosnia Herzegovina, Israel, United States, United Kingdom, Australia, Brazil, Finland, Germany, Italy, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland, and Taiwan. In-depth interviews on the reflections, views, and beliefs of young Black planners in South Africa revealed serious doubts about the continued relevance of planning’s original call for ‘a better life for all’ and an equally strong dose of doubt about its ability to deliver on this promise. Strong sentiments, often highly sceptical and cynical, were

expressed in both regards. Instead of challenging the world ‘as it is’, most of the interviewees indicated that they were ‘simply going with the flow’, ‘staying out of trouble’, and enjoying their new-found middle-class status. They voiced stronger concern with the immediate, with the ‘me’ and the ‘we’ (i.e., the nuclear and extended family) than with ‘the future/longer term’ and the ‘us’ (i.e., the total South African population or humanity as a whole). Their concern with ‘moving on and up’ in the world that their parents were barred from often found expression in a desire to simply enjoy what post-Apartheid South Africa had to offer and to show off their newly acquired symbols of wealth and status. Many young planners noted that planning enabled them to enter the new Black middle class and enjoy everything that goes with that status, and they expressed a distinct fear of falling back into poverty.

In Turkey, young planners who found jobs in the public sector soon lost their enthusiasm for and faith in planning, as they were constantly confronted with political agendas that forced them to act in ways that contradicted their principles. These deep-seated feelings of discontent and unease have accelerated in the increasingly authoritarian political framework, which ironically derives much of its economic power from privatization and speculation in the urban land market. Within this framework, the positions of some planners, especially those in the public sector, have become very fragile and risky. Some of them, especially those who oppose the current government, have lost their jobs (as did one of the young planners we profiled in the book) based on decrees issued under the State of Emergency after the failed coup d’état of 15 July 2016. Thus, contrary to the expectation of being ‘the conductor of an orchestra’, a metaphor commonly used in Turkish planning education to teach planning students what their role in urban development will be, young planners soon realize that their position is rarely influential in policy-making. Their opinions are not asked, they cannot negotiate with stakeholders, and they often end up as ‘the technical instrument’ effectuating already determined policy. The luckier ones – including those at special planning agencies like the office that Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality established as a private company to prepare metropolitan development plans – end up disappointed because their efforts are consistently overruled by powerful actors in government, especially under current political conditions. As elaborated elsewhere, authoritarian state involvement in urban development overrules local planning legitimacy and principles, especially in places with high land value and speculation (Eraydin & Taşan-Kok, 2014). Young planners in the private sector are divided between those who work for the booming property-development sector and those in ‘classic’ urban planning offices. In both cases, confrontation with the contradictions of neoliberal planning occurs on a daily basis and, like the experience of South African planners, ‘a better life for all’ rings hollow in these settings. However, within this relatively

depressive environment some hopeful voices can be heard as well. After the Gezi Movement of 2010 against the authoritarian entrepreneurial state interventions (Eraydin & Taşan-Kok, 2014) in urban space, the collective spirit continued among young practitioners who, in their private and professional lives, face the authority daily. Although the democratic processes to fight against the authority were heavily influenced by the July 2016 'military coup attempt', the latest studies show that young practitioners continue their struggle by joining forces through activism, social movements, or professional networking and lobbying (Taşan-Kok et al., 2016).

Both in South Africa and Turkey, many of those interviewed pointed to a serious tension and even disjuncture between the values taught in planning programmes and those prevailing at the workplace. Some dealt with the dilemma by 'switching off', a tactic that, as a few ruefully noted, had put them in a state of 'moral numbness'. For most interviewees, the tension had led them to question the values of planning. This value-probing exercise was given further impetus by the perceived powerlessness of planning in the face of corporate and political actors and by a general lack of plan implementation. Most expressed the view that the issue of power was either shrugged off in planning curricula or dealt with in an admonishing, intellectualist, and/or ideological way, without providing any real guidance on how to deal with it. Underlying these sentiments was a deeply cynical view of the value and usefulness of social and planning theory in practical settings where serious moral issues were at stake. This lack of guidance from 'school' often resulted in a return to and reassertion of the values taught 'back home', with a tendency to fall back on 'home truths' for answers, and far less so on social or planning theory.

Although the South African and Turkish case studies paint a rather gloomy picture, this book does not dwell at length on the negative aspects of being a young planning practitioner in contemporary cities. In fact, our ongoing research shows that even in the darkest political-economic times, young practitioners find ways to cope (Taşan-Kok et al., 2016). Besides presenting accounts of hardship, we highlight how young planners from 16 countries rise to the occasion re-energized by the challenges. In subsequent sections, the readers hear from planners who are: (1) lost/broken/fallen; (2) ambivalent/oblivious/non-caring; or (3) provoked/re-energized/boundary-pushing. Regarding types of experiences to include, we asked the authors to select stories that fall into the above categories and to define the 'planner profile' they wanted to cover in their chapters. Obviously, planners usually embody multiple identities, so their opinions are seldom black and white. Constraints and opportunities go hand in hand, and each professional profile presented here has both a dark and a bright side. As such, the young planners chronicled in this volume rarely have just one identity and exhibit densely interwoven,

sometimes overlapping, often conflicting ways of coping with (and overcoming) constraints. Each case study in this book offers a glimpse of young practitioners in the field through the lens of an experience, a reflection (disappointment, not caring, or pushing the boundaries), or a mixture of these.

Planners have been cast into divergent fields of play by institutional transformation. In each context they tend toward optimism, in line with the definition of the profession given by a young practitioner: a 'swing between hope and hardship' (Kimyon, 2016). The swing is most apparent in cases from transitional countries like Hungary, Poland, and Bosnia Herzegovina, where an abrupt regime change and institutional transformation influenced the way planning is taught, implemented, and challenged. Disappointment and unhappy narratives – or the 'pessimistic shadow over the hopes and expectations of young people', as in the Polish study – may set the tone in these cases. Other chapters show how passionate young professionals seek to redefine their profession and make something good of it. Countries like Turkey, Italy, Brazil, Israel, South Africa, Italy, and Taiwan have been facing increasing (and visible) political and economic pressure, especially within the framework of privatization, market- and property-led development, and informalities. Daily challenges, institutional uncertainties, and asymmetric coercion by political and economic stakeholders may put practitioners into stressful situations and at times make them question their profession. Yet some of them have been actively seeking ways to cope with and even overcome the problems. Planners also seem to find themselves playing technocratic roles like deal- or contract-making, consensus-seeking, and negotiating with stakeholders to an extent that is criticized by scholars as leading to new forms of 'technocracy' (Raco & Savini, in press) and making them instruments of the system. In Poland, for instance, young planners indicated that this technocratic position made them feel like 'small lawyers'. Also noted in more institutionalized contexts like the Netherlands, Germany, Sweden, Finland, Australia, the UK, or the USA, but definitely not uncommon in the other case study areas, the technocratic role gives practitioners a feeling of certainty and comfort. Nonetheless, being technocrats does not necessarily prevent planners from getting close to the society or micro-communities that they are dealing with. In highly institutionalized contexts, activism, critical thinking, and social action become part of everyday planning practice, as described in Israel, Taiwan, or Turkey.

In addition to the many features already set forth in this introduction, these practitioners often embody competing personas such as a technocrat and activist or a fighter and a dreamer, almost like the 19th century fictional character Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde. Mee-Kam Ng (2014) refers to these incompatible positions as the system-maintaining and system-transforming roles of intellectuals involved in the production of space. Similarly, John

Jackson's case study of Australian planners refers to these conflicting identities as a 'bipolar distribution' between 'systems-orientated managers' and those that endeavour to make planning more accessible through 'social engagement', as described in this volume. Elsewhere, capturing the tension inherent in the field, Taşan-Kok et al. (2016) admonished planning professionals to 'float like a butterfly, sting like a bee'. Likewise, using the perspective of Berman (1983) regarding the dualistic nature of modernism, Oranje (1998) previously called the two faces of the profession 'planning as adventure' and 'planning as routine'.

The cases presented in this book correspond with this dualistic view and illustrate the impossibility of defining planners solely as technocrats or as agents of change. Even in countries with strong spatial regulation such as the Netherlands, where a technocratic approach to planning could be expected, the opposite is true – practitioners there join informal professional networks to share ideas on the challenges of an increasingly market-driven playing field. By highlighting the scope for action in these grey areas, as well as discussing a range of tailor-made coping strategies, the book gives pointers on what education could include to prepare graduates for their 'bipolar, dualistic existence' in the world of planning practice.

Contents and Structure of the Book

The book showcases some ways in which young planners from a wide range of countries read the changing political-economic context of planning and respond to its challenges. Arranged in three parts and consisting of 22 chapters, the book was intended to answer three broad questions:

- To what extent does planning education address the mismatch between the substance of planning and the contemporary context of urban development?
- To what extent do planning schools prepare students for dealing with potential mismatches and to which coping strategies do they expose them?
- How do the encounters of young planners with 'the real world' influence their perspectives of planning practice and the profession?

Trends in planning education, ethical dilemmas in the profession, and the position of young practitioners are analysed in the first part of the book. The first two chapters following the editors' introduction (chapter 2 by Taşan-Kok, Babalik-Sutcliffe, van Huyssteen, and Oranje; and chapter 3 by Van den Broeck) succinctly describe the gap between planning theory, education, and practice. These authors examine the first of the three questions

set forth above through the lens of the literature and an analysis of the case study chapters. Specifically, chapter 2 describes how young planners define and evaluate this gap and deal with the challenges facing planning education on a global scale. Then chapter 3 narrows the focus down to how one experienced academic sees the challenges of planning practice and the profession confronting young professionals and describes the conditions under which they can intervene. In the second part of the book, the case studies reflect on the other two questions. Each chapter recounts the experiences and feelings of diverse types of planners about the practice, the constraints they face, and coping strategies they have developed, both in turbulent cities that are constantly running into unanticipated challenges and in cities that are confronted with 'regular' challenges and recurrent situations. Throughout the book there are take-home messages for planning educators coming directly from the practitioners and scholars who have written about their experiences. The third part of the book is a compilation of recommendations on how to push the boundaries through improvisation (by John Forester) and critical debate (Louis Albrechts). The book concludes with a rejoinder by the editors in which they formulate proposals for improving planning education.

Within this framework, the book offers scope to expand on the simple questions set forth at the outset and to pose some more fundamental ones. Is it possible to change the rules of an existing system? If so, how fast can practitioners act as change agents? Do planners seek to understand the system and its levers? Do they move outside the system, do they change it, or do they give up? What can practitioners do to expand the range of 'surprising possibilities' (Forester, 2013) available to them? How do they feel about what they do? The list of questions is endless and the experiences are diverse. To comprehend them, we looked for patterns in these undertheorized reflections of young planners on their profession, and we asked esteemed scholars to comment on these reflections. We believe that the outcomes of this engagement will appeal to planning educators (especially those who teach planning theory), planning professionals, students, and to all who are intrigued by 'the mind of the young planning professional'.

By selecting both experienced and emergent authors from academia as well as from practice, we sought to produce a volume that will be academically sound but hopefully also fresh and thought-provoking. The diverse mix seems apt, considering the wide array of young planners who have not internalized the values, principles, and standards taught in planning school, largely because their values were set in pre-planning school days and/or have been and are still being shaped by other (more important) influences. Others, after just a short spell in practice, have come to the realization that the planning values, principles, and standards they were taught lack validity in 'the real world', primarily because the planning agenda is being set by other actors and

priorities. These newcomers often lose their faith in planning and turn to whatever principles and norms fit the situation, or else they succumb to a mindless legal-compliance mode. And finally, despite the mismatch between taught principles and practice and withstanding the pressures created by economic, political, or social realities, there are planners who are provoked by challenges, infused with passion, and driven to push the boundaries and find innovative solutions. While all three of these profiles are covered in this book, examples of planners pursuing creative solutions predominate, not just because of the authors' hope that such planners would still 'be out there' but because, as it turns out, there actually are many young practitioners out there who are still doing just that!

References

- Albrechts, L. (1991). Changing roles and positions of planners. *Changing Roles and Positions of Planners*, 28(1), 123–137.
- Berman, M. (1983). *All That Is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. London: Verso.
- Brenner, N., Marcuse, P., & Mayer, M. (2009). Cities for people, not for profit. *City*, 13(2–3), 176–184. doi:10.1080/13604810903020548
- Campbell, H. (2012). 'Planning ethics' and rediscovering the idea of planning. *Planning Theory*, 11(4), 379–399.
- Campbell, H., Tait, M., & Watkins, C. (2013). Is there space for better planning in a neoliberal world? Implications for planning practice and theory. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 34(1), 45–59. doi:10.1177/0739456X13514614
- Eraydin, A., & Taşan-Kok, T. (2014). State response to contemporary urban movements in Turkey: A critical overview of state entrepreneurialism and authoritarian interventions. *Antipode*, 46(1), 110–129. doi:10.1111/anti.12042
- Fainstein, S. (2010). *The Just City*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Forester, J. (2013). *Planning in the Face of Conflict: The Surprising Possibilities of Facilitative Leadership*. Chicago & Washington, DC: APA Planners Press.
- Fox-Rogers, L., & Murphy, E. (2016). Self-perceptions of the role of the planner. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 43, 74–92.
- Gunder, M. (2010). Planning as the ideology of (neoliberal) space. *Planning Theory*, 9(4), 298–314. doi:10.1177/1473095210368878
- Jackson, J. (2009). Neo-liberal or third way? What planners from Glasgow, Melbourne and Toronto say. *Urban Policy and Research*, 27(4), 397–417.
- Kimyon, D. (2016). How do we swing between hope and hardship? *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 621–651.
- Knox, P., & Schweitzer, L. (2010). Design determinism, post-meltdown: Urban planners and the search for policy relevance. *Housing Policy Debate*, 20(2), 317–327.
- Ng, M.-K. (2014). Intellectuals and the production of space in the urban renewal process in Hong Kong and Taipei. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 15(1), 77–92. doi:10.1080/14649357.2013.870224

- Oranje, M. (1998). *The Language Game of South African Urban and Regional Planning: A Cognitive Mapping from the Past into the Future* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). University of Pretoria, Town and Regional Planning, Pretoria.
- Purcell, M. (2009). Resisting neoliberalization: Communicative planning or counter-hegemonic movements? *Planning Theory*, 8(2), 140–165.
- Raco, M., & Savini, F. (Eds.) (in press). *A New Technocracy? Landscapes of Knowledge in Contemporary Cities*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Sager, T. (2009). Planners' role: Torn between dialogical ideals and neo-liberal realities. *European Planning Studies*, 17(1), 65–84.
- Taşan-Kok, T., & Baeten, G. (2011). *Contradictions of Neoliberal Planning: Cities, Policies, and Politics* (Vol. 102). Berlin & Heidelberg: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Taşan-Kok, T., Bertolini, L., Oliveira e Costa, S., Lothan, H., Carvalho, H., Desmet, M., DeBlust, S., Devos, T., Kimyon, D., Zoete, J. A., & Ahmad, P. (2016). 'Float like a butterfly, sting like a bee': Giving voice to planning practitioners. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 621–651. doi:10.1080/14649357.2016.1225711
- Waterhout, B., Othengrafen, F., & Sykes, O. (2013). Neo-liberalization processes and spatial planning in France, Germany, and the Netherlands: An exploration. *Planning Practice & Research*, 28(1), 141–159.

Why It Is Important to Give Voice to Young Practitioners

- Albrechts, L. (1991). Changing roles and positions of planners. *Changing Roles and Positions of Planners*, 28(1), 123137.
- Berman, M. (1983). *All That Is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. London: Verso.
- Brenner, N. , Marcuse, P. , & Mayer, M. (2009). Cities for people, not for profit. *City*, 13(23), 176184. doi:10.1080/13604810903020548
- Campbell, H. (2012). Planning ethics and rediscovering the idea of planning. *Planning Theory*, 11(4), 379399.
- Campbell, H. , Tait, M. , & Watkins, C. (2013). Is there space for better planning in a neoliberal world? Implications for planning practice and theory. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 34(1), 4559. doi:10.1177/0739456X13514614
- Eraydin, A. , & Taan-Kok, T. (2014). State response to contemporary urban movements in Turkey: A critical overview of state entrepreneurialism and authoritarian interventions. *Antipode*, 46(1), 110129. doi:10.1111/anti.12042
- Fainstein, S. (2010). *The Just City*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Forester, J. (2013). *Planning in the Face of Conflict: The Surprising Possibilities of Facilitative Leadership*. Chicago & Washington, DC: APA Planners Press.
- Fox-Rogers, L. , & Murphy, E. (2016). Self-perceptions of the role of the planner. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 43, 7492.
- Gunder, M. (2010). Planning as the ideology of (neoliberal) space. *Planning Theory*, 9(4), 298314. doi:10.1177/1473095210368878
- Jackson, J. (2009). Neo-liberal or third way? What planners from Glasgow, Melbourne and Toronto say. *Urban Policy and Research*, 27(4), 397417.
- Kimyon, D. (2016). How do we swing between hope and hardship? *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 621651.
- Knox, P. , & Schweitzer, L. (2010). Design determinism, post-meltdown: Urban planners and the search for policy relevance. *Housing Policy Debate*, 20(2), 317327.
- Ng, M.-K. (2014). Intellectuals and the production of space in the urban renewal process in Hong Kong and Taipei. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 15(1), 7792. doi:10.1080/14649357.2013.870224
- 11 Oranje, M. (1998). *The Language Game of South African Urban and Regional Planning: A Cognitive Mapping from the Past into the Future* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). University of Pretoria, Town and Regional Planning, Pretoria.
- Purcell, M. (2009). Resisting neoliberalization: Communicative planning or counter-hegemonic movements? *Planning Theory*, 8(2), 140165.
- Raco, M. , & Savini, F. (Eds.) (in press). *A New Technocracy? Landscapes of Knowledge in Contemporary Cities*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Sager, T. (2009). Planners role: Torn between dialogical ideals and neo-liberal realities. *European Planning Studies*, 17(1), 6584.
- Taan-Kok, T. , & Baeten, G. (2011). *Contradictions of Neoliberal Planning: Cities, Policies, and Politics* (Vol. 102). Berlin & Heidelberg: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Taan-Kok, T. , Bertolini, L. , Oliveira e Costa, S. , Lothan, H. , Carvalho, H. , Desmet, M. , DeBlust, S. , Devos, T. , Kimyon, D. , Zoete, J. A. , & Ahmad, P. (2016). Float like a butterfly, sting like a bee: Giving voice to planning practitioners. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 621651. doi:10.1080/14649357.2016.1225711
- Waterhout, B. , Othengrafen, F. , & Sykes, O. (2013). Neo-liberalization processes and spatial planning in France, Germany, and the Netherlands: An exploration. *Planning Practice & Research*, 28(1), 141159.

Mismatch Between Planning Education and Practice

- Ansaloni, F. , & Tedeschi, M. (2016). Ethics and spatial justice: Unfolding non-linear possibilities for planning action. *Planning Theory*, 15(3), 316332.
- Balducci, A. , & Bertolini, L. (2007). Reflecting on practice or reflecting with practice? *Planning Theory & Practice*, 8(4), 532555.
- Bertolini, L. , Frank, A. , Grin, J. , Bell, S. , Scholl, B. , Mattila, H. , Mynttinen, E. , Mntysalo, R. , & Bertolini, L. (2012). Introduction: Time to think; Planning (education) From marginal interface to central opportunity space?; Science for practice?; Educating professionals for practice in a complex world A challenge for engineering and planning schools; Project-based learning Core

university education in spatial planning and development; Managing planning pathologies: An educational challenge of the new apprenticeship programme in Finland; Conclusion: Time to act. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 13(3), 465490. doi:10.1080/14649357.2012.704712

Bolan, R. S. (1983). The structure of ethical choice in planning practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 3(1), 2334.

Brookfield, S. D. (2000). Transformative learning as ideology critique. In J. Mezirow & Assoc. (Eds.), *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress* (pp. 125148). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Campbell, H. , Tait, M. , & Watkins, C. (2013). Is there space for better planning in a neoliberal world? Implications for planning practice and theory. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 34(1), 4559. doi:10.1177/0739456X13514614

Carroll, W. K. , & Hackett, R. A. (2006). Democratic media activism through the lens of social movement theory. *Media, Culture & Society*, 28(1), 83104.

Carvalho, H. (2016). Planning as a political tool for urban and social reforms. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 632635.

Castells, M. (1998). The education of city planners in the information age. *Berkeley Planning Journal*, 12(1), 2531.

Cherry, G. E. (1974). *The Evolution of British Town Planning: A History of Town Planning in the United Kingdom during the 20th Century and of the Royal Town Planning Institute, 191474*. Leighton Buzzard: Leonard Hill.

Culpin, E. C. (1913). Impressions of city planning in America. *American City*, 8, 509511.

Dalton, L. C. (2001). Weaving the fabric of planning as education. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 20(4), 423436. doi:10.1177/0739456X0102000404

Davoudi, S. , & Pendlebury, J. (2010). Centenary paper: The evolution of planning as an academic discipline. *Town Planning Review*, 81(6), 613646. doi:10.3828/tp.2010.24

Faludi, A. , & van der Valk, A. (1994). *Rule and Order Dutch Planning Doctrine in the Twentieth Century*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Fischler, R. (2000). Communicative planning theory: A Foucauldian assessment. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 19(4), 358368. doi:10.1177/0739456X0001900405

Fox-Rogers, L. , & Murphy, E. (2016). Self-perceptions of the role of the planner. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 43, 7492.

Frank, A. I. (2006). Three decades of thought on planning education. *CPL Bibliography*, 21(1), 1567.

Friedmann, J. (1996). The core curriculum in planning revisited. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 15(2), 89104. doi:10.1177/0739456X9601500202

Geddes, P. (1915). *Cities in Evolution: An Introduction to the Town Planning Movement and to the Study of Civics*. London: Williams.

Geppert, A. , & Verhage, R. (Eds.) (2008). *Towards a European recognition for the planning profession. Planning Education* (No. 1, pp. 2325). Leuven: AESOP Working Group on the Curriculum of Planning Education.

Gilliard, L. , & Thierstein, A. (2016). Competencies revisited. *disP - The Planning Review*, 52(1), 4255. doi:10.1080/02513625.2016.1171048

Goldstein, H. A. , & Carmin, J. (2006). Compact, diffuse, or would-be discipline? Assessing cohesion in planning scholarship, 19632002. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 26(1), 6679.

Gunder, M. (2004). Shaping the planners ego-ideal. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 23(3), 299311. doi:10.1177/0739456X03261284

Hague, C. , Wakely, P. , Crespin, J. , & Jasko, C. (2006). *Making Planning Work: A Guide to Approaches and Skills*. Rugby, UK: Practical Action Publishing. doi:10.3362/9781780445380

Hall, P. (2002). *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century*. London: Wiley.

Howe, E. (1990). Normative ethics in planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 5(2), 123150.

30 Howe, E. , & Kaufman, J. (1979). The ethics of contemporary American planners. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 45(3), 243255.

Hurley, J. , Wilhelm Lamker, C. , Taylor, E. J. , Stead, D. , Hellmich, M. , Lange, L. , Rowe, H. , Beeck, S. , Phipps, P. , & Forsyth, A. (2016). Exchange between researchers and practitioners in urban planning: Achievable objective or a bridge too far?; The use of academic research in planning practice: Who, what, where, when and how?; Bridging research and practice through collaboration: Lessons from a joint working group; Getting the relationship between researchers and practitioners working; Art and urban planning: Stimulating researcher, practitioner and community engagement; Collaboration between researchers and practitioners: Political and bureaucratic issues; Investigating Research; Conclusion: Breaking down barriers through international practice? *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(3), 447473.

- Innes, J. E. (1995). Planning theory's emerging paradigm: Communicative action and interactive practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14(3), 183-189. doi:10.1177/0739456X9501400307
- Kunzmann, K. (2004). Unconditional Surrender: The Gradual Demise of European Diversity in Planning. Presented at the 18th AESOP Congress, Grenoble, France.
- Kunzmann, K. (2011). Spatial planning: For whom? *CRIOS*, 2, 920.
- Lennon, M. (2014). Finding purpose in planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 35(1), 63-75. doi:10.1177/0739456X14560573
- Liggett, H. (1996). Examining the planning practice consciousness. In S. Mandelbaum, L. Mazza, & R. Burchell (Eds.), *Explorations in planning theory* (pp. 299-306). New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.
- Lim, M. (2012). Clicks, cabs, and coffee houses: Social media and oppositional movements in Egypt, 2004-2011. *Journal of Communication*, 62(2), 231-248.
- MacDonald, K., Sanyal, B., Silver, M., Ng, M. K., Head, P., Williams, K., Watson, V., & Campbell, H. (2014). Challenging theory: Changing practice: Critical perspectives on the past and potential of professional planning. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 15(1), 95-122. doi:10.1080/14649357.2014.886801
- Mallows, E. W. N. (1965). *Teaching a Technology*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Marcuse, P. (1976). Professional ethics and beyond: Values in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 42(3), 264-274.
- Nettlefold, J. S. (1914). *Practical Town Planning*. London: St. Catherine Press.
- Ng, M.-K. (2014). Intellectuals and the production of space in the urban renewal process in Hong Kong and Taipei. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 15(1), 77-92. doi:10.1080/14649357.2013.870224
- Oranje, M. (1998). *The Language Game of South African Urban and Regional Planning: A Cognitive Mapping from the Past into the Future* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). University of Pretoria, Town and Regional Planning, Pretoria.
- Oranje, M. (2014). Back to where it all began? Reflections on injecting the (spiritual) ethos of the Early Town Planning Movement into planning, planners and plans in post-1994 South Africa. *HTS Theologies Studies/Theological Studies*, 70(3).
- Perkins, T., & Crews, J. (2015). *The Ethical Dilemmas of Local Government Planners in Western Australia*. Presented at the State of Australian Cities National Conference, Gold Coast.
- 31 Perloff, H. S. (1957). *Education for Planning: City, State, and Regional*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Peters, S. J., Grgoire, H., & Hittleman, M. (2004). Practicing a pedagogy of hope: Practitioner profiles as tools for grounding and guiding collective reflection in adult, community, and youth development education. In R. Vince & M. Reynolds (Eds.), *Organizing Reflection* (pp. 194-219). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishers.
- Poxon, J. (2001). Shaping the planning profession of the future: The role of planning education. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 28(4), 563-580.
- Price, M., & Kinghorn, J. (1999). Useful classes. *Planning*, 134(2), 114.
- Robinson, C. M. (1911). *The Width and Arrangement Of Streets: A Study In Town Planning*. London: Kessinger Publishing.
- RTPI (2012). *Policy Statement on Initial Planning Education*. London: Royal Town Planning Institute.
- SACPLAN (2014). *Consolidated Report on Competencies and Standards*. South Africa: South African Council of Planners.
- Sawicki, D. S. (1988). Planning education and planning practice: Can we plan for the next decade? *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 7(2), 115-120.
- Schein, S. (2015). *A New Psychology for Sustainability Leadership: The Hidden Power of Ecological Worldviews*. Austin, TX: Greenleaf Publishing.
- Sorensen, A. (1982). Planning comes of age: A liberal perspective. *The Planner*, 68(6), 184-188.
- Stead, D., & Cotella, G. (2011). Differential Europe: Domestic actors and their role in shaping spatial planning systems. *disP - The Planning Review*, 47(186), 132-140. doi:10.1080/02513625.2011.10557140
- Taan-Kok, T., Bertolini, L., Oliveira e Costa, S., Lothian, H., Carvalho, H., Desmet, M., DeBlust, S., Devos, T., Kimyon, D., Zoete, J. A., & Ahmad, P. (2016). Float like a butterfly, sting like a bee: Giving voice to planning practitioners. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 621-651. doi:10.1080/14649357.2016.1225711
- Taan-Kok, T., & Oranje, M. (2013). Lost, Oblivious and/or Just Liking it? Being a Planner in a Time and Space of Contestation and Challenge. Presented at the AESOP-ACSP Joint Congress, Dublin, Ireland.

UN-Habitat (2009). Planning education. In N. D. Mutizwa-Mangiza (Ed.), *Global Report on Human Settlements 2009: Planning Sustainable Cities* (pp. 185-201). Abingdon: Earthscan.

Valenzuela, S. (2013). Unpacking the use of social media for protest behavior: The roles of information, opinion expression, and activism. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(7), 920-942.

Van Huyssteen, E. (2017). Being, Becoming and Contributing, in (and through) Planning: Learning from Practitioners through Work-Life Narratives. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

Watson, V. (2002). Do we learn from planning practice? The contribution of the practice movement to planning theory. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 22(2), 178-187.

Watson, V. , & Agbola, B. (2013). *Counterpoints: Who Will Plan Africa's Cities?* London: Africa Research Institute.

Watson, V. , & Odendaal, N. (2012). Changing planning education in Africa: The role of the Association of African Planning Schools. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 33(1), 96-107.

Winkler, T. , & Duminy, J. (2014). Planning to change the world? Questioning the normative ethics of planning theories. *Planning Theory*, 15(2), 111-129. doi:10.1177/ 1473095214551113

Yiftachel, O. (1989). Towards a new typology of urban planning theories. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 16(1), 233-9. doi:10.1068/b160023

Yiftachel, O. (2006). Essay: Re-engaging planning theory? Towards south-eastern perspectives. *Planning Theory*, 5(3), 211-222.

Challenges of Planning Practice and Profession

Albrechts, L. (2006). Bridge the gap: From spatial planning to strategic projects. *European Planning Studies*, 14(10), 1487-1500. doi:10.1080/09654310600852464

Albrechts, L. , & Balducci, A. (2013). Practicing strategic planning: In search of critical features to explain the strategic character of plans. *disP The Planning Review*, 49(3), 162-7. doi:10.1080/02513625.2013.859001

Albrechts, L. , Van den Broeck, J. , & Segers, R. (2010). *Strategische ruimtelijke projecten: Maatschappelijk en ruimtelijk vernieuwend*. Brussels: Politeia.

Bajic-Brkovic, M. (2010). Societies in transition and planning education: The case of the West Balkan countries. In B. Scholl (Ed.), *HESP 2: Higher Education in Spatial Planning*. Zurich: ETH vdf Hochschulverlag AG.

ETH Zurich, Kanton Solothurn (2013). *Test Planning: A Method with a Future*. Canton of Solothurn: Swiss Confederation, Swiss Federal Institute for Technology.

Faludi, A. (1973). *A Reader in Planning Theory*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Fischler, R. (2012). Higher education for spatial planning: What and how? In B. Scholl (Ed.), *HESP: Higher Education in Spatial Planning, Positions and Reflections*. Zurich: ETH vdf Hochschulverlag AG.

Grunau, J. , Hemberger, C. , Schnwandt, W. , Utz, J. , & Voermanek, K. (2013). *Komplexe Probleme Isen: Ein Handbuch*. Stuttgart: Institut für Grundlagen der Planung, Universität Stuttgart.

Healey, P. (2008). Making choices that matter: The practical art of situated strategic judgement in spatial strategy making. In J. Van den Broeck, F. Moulaert, & S. Oosterlinck (Eds.), *Empowering the Planning Fields: Ethics, Creativity and Action* (pp. 234-1). Leuven: ACCO.

Lindblom, C. E. (1959). The science of muddling through. *Public Administration Review*, 19(2), 79-88.

Popper, K. (1974). Popper, K. (1974) Replies to My Critics. In Schilpp, P. A. (Ed.) *The Philosophy of Karl Popper*, II, pp. 117-311-90. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court.

Scholl, B. (Ed.) (2012). *HESP: Higher Education in Spatial Planning, Positions and Reflections*. Zurich: vdf Hochschulverlag AG, ETH.

Scholl, B. (2015). Why UPAT? From problems to action. In B. Scholl , M. Dubbeling , & A. Peri (Eds.), *Ten Years of UPATs: Reflections and Results* (pp. 13-20). Zurich: ISOCARP.

Van den Broeck, J. (2010). An opinion on key planning issues, spatial research, education, and practice. In B. Scholl (Ed.), *HESP 2: Higher Education in Spatial Planning*. Zurich: ETH vdf Hochschulverlag AG.

Van den Broeck, J. (2012). The core of the planning discipline: New paradigms, fields of knowledge, capacities, skills, maxims and methods. In B. Scholl (Ed.), *HESP 2: Higher Education in Spatial Planning*. Zurich: ETH-Zrich.

Van den Broeck, J. , Vermeulen, P. , Oosterlynck, S. , & Albeda, Y. (2015). *Antwerpen Herwonnen Stad? Maatschappij, ruimtelijk Plannen en beleid [Antwerp Regained? Society, Spatial Plans and Policies]*. Brugge: die Keure.

A Spider in the Web or a Puppet on a String?

- Alexander, E. R. (2001). What do planners need to know? *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 20(3), 376380. doi:10.1177/0739456X0102000309
- Allmendinger, P. (2000). *Planning in Postmodern Times*. London: Routledge.
- Allmendinger, P. , & Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2002). *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Brenner, N. (2009). What is critical urban theory? *City*, 13(23), 198207. doi:10.1080/13604810902996466
- Briassoulis, H. (1999). Who plans whose sustainability? Alternative roles for planners. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 42(6), 889902. doi:10.1080/09640569910885
- Campbell, H. (2006). Just planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 26(1), 92106. doi:10.1177/0739456X06288090
- Donald, J. (1997). This, here, now: Imagining the modern city. In S. Westwood & J. Williams (Eds.), *Imagining Cities: Scripts, Signs, Memory* (pp. 179199). London: Routledge.
- Forsyth, A. (1999). Soundbite cities: Imagining futures in debates over urban form. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 16(1), 3351.
- Frank, A. (2005). What do students value in built environment education? *CEBE Transactions*, 2(3), 2129.
- Gunder, M. (2004). Shaping the planners ego-ideal. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 23(3), 299311. doi:10.1177/0739456X03261284
- Gunder, M. (2011). Commentary: Is urban design still urban planning? An exploration and response. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 31(2), 184195. doi:10.1177/0739456X10393358
- Gunder, M. & Hillier, J. (2009). *Planning in Ten Words or Less: A Lacanian Entanglement with Spatial Planning*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Guzzetta, J. D. & Bollens, S. A. (2003). Urban planners skills and competencies. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 23(1), 96106. doi:10.1177/0739456X03255426
- Healey, P. (1999). Sandercock: Expanding the language of planning. *European Planning Studies*, 7(5), 545548.
- Howarth, D. (2010). Power, discourse, and policy: Articulating a hegemony approach to critical policy studies. *Critical Policy Studies*, 3(34), 309335. doi:10.1080/19460171003619725
- LeGates, R. T. (2009). Competency-based UK urban spatial planning education. *Journal for Education in the Built Environment*, 4(2), 5573.
- Oranje, M. (2002). Planning and the postmodern turn. In P. Allmendinger & M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds.), *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory* (pp. 172186). London: Routledge.
- Ozawa, C. P. , & Seltzer, E. P. (1999). Taking our bearings: Mapping a relationship among planning practice, theory, and education. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 18(3), 257266. doi:10.1177/0739456X9901800307
- Pinson, D. (2004). Urban planning: An undisciplined discipline? *Futures*, 36(4), 502513.
- Piiger, J. (2001). Millennium urbanism Discursive planning. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 8(1), 6372. doi:10.1177/096977640100800106
- Poxon, J. (2001). Shaping the planning profession of the future: The role of planning education. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 28(4), 563580.
- Richardson, T. (2002). Freedom and control in planning: Using discourse in the pursuit of reflexive practice. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 3(3), 353361. doi:10.1080/14649350214953
- Sandercock, L. (1999). Expanding the language of planning: A meditation on planning education for the twenty-first century. *European Planning Studies*, 7(5), 533544.
- Sehested, K. (2009). Urban planners as network managers and metagovernors. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 10(2), 245263. doi:10.1080/14649350902884516
- Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2011). *Urban Reflections: Narratives of Place, Planning and Change*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Throgmorton, J. A. (1993). Planning as a rhetorical activity: Survey research as a trope in arguments about electric power planning in Chicago. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 59(3), 334346.
- Torring, J. (1999). *New Theories of Discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Zizek*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tunström, M. (2009). P spaning efter den goda staden. Om konstruktioner av ideal och problem i svensk stadsbyggnadsdiskussion [In Search of the Good City: Constructions of Ideals and Problems in Swedish Urban Planning Discussion]. rebro: rebro Studies in Human Geography 4, rebro University.
- van Dijk, T. (2011). Imagining future places: How designs co-constitute what is, and thus influence what will be. *Planning Theory*, 10(2), 124143.

Lost in Transition

- Agencija za Statistiku Bosne i Hercegovine (2014). Anketa o radnoj snazi [Labour Force Survey]. Statistical Office Website. Retrieved 22 October 2015 from www.bhas.ba/ankete/LFS%202014%20-%20bos.pdf
- Ball, P. , Tabeau, E. , & Verwimp, P. (2007). The Bosnian Book of Dead: Assessment of the Database (Full Report No. HiCN Research Design Note 5). Brighton: The Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex Falmer. Retrieved from <https://hrdag.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/rdn5.pdf>
- Bojii-Delilovi, V. (2011). Decentralisation and Regionalisation in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Issues and Challenges (Research paper no. 2). London: The London School of Economics and Political Science, LSEE Research on South Eastern Europe. Retrieved from www.lse.ac.uk/europeanInstitute/research/LSEE/Research/SEE_Programme/images/Research_Paper_2.pdf
- Bollens, S. A. (2007). Comparative Research on Contested Cities: Lenses and Scaffoldings (Working Paper no. 17). London: Crisis States Research Centre, Development Studies Institute (DESTIN). Retrieved from <http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/PDF/Outputs/CrisisStates/wp17.2.pdf>
- Bollens, S. A. (2009). Comparative research on urban political conflict: Policy amidst polarization. *The Open Urban Studies Journal*, 2(1), 117. doi:10.2174/1874942900902010001
- Boi, M. (2012). Od Meke do Vatikana u par koraka. POSKOK [From Mecca to Vatican in a Couple of Steps. POSKOK]. Retrieved 25 April 2015 from <http://poskok.info/wp/od-meke-do-vatikana-u-par-koraka/>
- Chandler, D. (2000). *Bosnia: Faking Democracy After Dayton*. London & Sterling, VA: Pluto Press.
- Dawson, A. H. (1987). Yugoslavia. In A. H. Dawson (Ed.), *Planning in Eastern Europe* (pp. 275-291). London: Croom Helm.
- Deli, Z. , & ari, H. (2013). Moguost kritike Bolonjskog sustava obrazovanja u Bosni i Hercegovini iz perspektive odrivoga razvoja [The possibility of criticizing the Bologna system of education in Bosnia and Herzegovina from the perspective of sustainable development]. *Filozofska Istraiavanja*, 33(3), 441-457.
- Djurasovic, A. (2016). *Ideology, Political Transitions, and the City: The Case of Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Duilovi, D. , Sinanovi, N. , ipa, D. , Basari, H. , Dervievi, E. , Paranos, D. , Rotim, M. (2008). Mladi trebaju omladinsku politiku! Analiza poloaja mladih i omladinskog sektora u Bosni i Hercegovini. Sarajevo: Komisija za koordinaciju pitanja mladih u BiH [Young people need a youth policy! Analysis of the situation of young people and youth sector in Bosnia and Herzegovina]. Sarajevo: The Commission for Coordination of Youth Issues in BiH. Retrieved 28 October 2015 from www.mladi.gov.ba/pdf/Analiza_mladi_-_za_web.pdf
- 72 EHEA (1998). Sorbonne Joint Declaration: Joint Declaration on Harmonisation of the Architecture of the European Higher Education System. Paris: European Higher Education Area (EHEA). Retrieved from www.ehea.info/uploads/declarations/sorbonne_declaration1.pdf
- EUSR (2014). Sporazum za rast i zapoljavanje Nezaposlenost mladih i perspektive u BiH [Employment and Employment Agreement Youth Unemployment and Perspectives in BiH]. Sarajevo: Delegacija Evropske Unije u Bosni i Hercegovini i Specijalni predstavnik Evropske Unije u BiH (EUSR). Retrieved from http://europa.ba/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/delegacijaEU_2015030612124764bos.pdf
- Foo, S. (2005). Oglledi o Tranziciji [Reflections on Transition]. Zenica: Dom tampe.
- Fox, W. , & Wallich, C. (1997). Fiscal Federalism in Bosnia-Herzegovina: The Dayton Challenge (Policy Research Working Paper no. 1714). Washington, DC: The World Bank. Retrieved from www.wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/1997/01/01/000009265_3970625093950/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf
- GAP (2012). Politika u oblasti prostornog planiranja [Spatial Planning Policy]. Sarajevo: Governance Accountability Project (GAP). Retrieved from www.sogfbih.ba/uploaded/DOKUMENTI/Urbanizam/Politika%20u%20oblasti%20prostornog%20planiranja.pdf
- Grabrijan, D. , & Neidhardt, J. (1957). Arhitektura Bosne i put u suvremeno [Architecture of Bosnia and the Way (towards) Modernity]. Ljubljana: Dravna zaloba Slovenije.
- Grad Mostar (2006). Odluka o osnivanju Zavoda za prostorno ureenje [Decision on Establishment of the Institute for Physical Planning]. Retrieved 20 September 2015 from www.mostar.ba/sluzbeni-glasnik.html
- Hirt, S. , & Stanilov, K. (2009). Regional Study Prepared for Revisiting Urban Planning: Global Report on Human Settlements. Retrieved 23 October 2015, from www.archive.spia.vt.edu/SPIA/docs/shirt/Revisiting_Urban_Planning_in_the_Transitional_Counties.pdf on 23/10/2015

- ICG (1997). *Going Nowhere Fast: Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons in Bosnia and Herzegovina* (No. 23). Sarajevo: International Crisis Group. Retrieved from www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/europe/Bosnia%208.pdf
- Isovi, M. (2014). BUKA intervju: Situacija za mlade u BiH je loša, ni perspektiva nije puno bolja! [NOISE interview: The situation for young people in BiH is bad, no perspective is not much better!]. *Buka Magazin* [Noise Magazine]. Retrieved 22 October 2015 from www.6yka.com/novost/47437/buka-intervju-situacija-za-mlade-u-bih-je-losa-ni-perspektiva-nije-puno-bolja
- Magna Charta (1999). *The Bologna Declaration of 19 June 1999: Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education*. Bologna: Magna Charta Universitatum, Observatory. Retrieved from www.magna-charta.org/resources/files/BOLOGNA_DECLARATION.pdf
- Mari, . (2009). *The foreign direct investments entrance and its impact into countries in transition (Case of Bosnia and Herzegovina)*. *Interdisciplinary Management Research*, 5, 427437.
- Martin-Daz, J. , Nofre, J. , Oliva, M. , & Palma, P. (2015). *Towards an unsustainable urban development in post-war Sarajevo*. *Area*, 47(4), 376385. doi:10.1111/area.12175
- NALAS (2011). *Challenges of Regularization of Informal Settlements in South East Europe: Overview of the Relevant Urban Planning and Legalization Laws and Practice*. Skopje: NALAS. Retrieved from www.pur.rs/materials/publication/403%20Challenges%20of%20Regularisation%20ENGKekn.pdf
- 73 Nedovi-Budi, Z. , & Cavri, B. (2006). *Waves of planning: A framework for studying the evolution of planning systems and empirical insights from Serbia and Montenegro*. *Planning Perspectives*, 21(4), 393425. doi:10.1080/02665430600892146
- Peck, J. , Theodore, N. , & Brenner, N. (2009). *Neoliberal urbanism: Models, moments, mutations*. *SAIS Review*, XXIX(1), 4866. doi:10.1353/sais.0.0028
- Piha, B. (1973). *Prostorno planiranje: Beograd* [Spatial Planning: Belgrade]. Belgrade: Novinska Ustanova Slubeni List SFRJ.
- Pugh, M. (2005). *Liquid Transformation in the Political Economies of BiH and Kosovo*. Presented at the 46th Annual International Studies Association Convention, Honolulu. Retrieved from http://bradscholars.brad.ac.uk:8080/bitstream/handle/10454/4189/Pugh,_Mike_-_Liquid_Transformation_in_the_Political_Economies_of_BiH_and_Kosovo.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y
- Rusinow, D. I. (1978). *Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sherman, S. A. (2011). *The Effects of Elite-Led Power Sharing on Postconflict Urban Reconstruction: Consociationalism and the Mostar Case* (Master Thesis). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/24204>
- Simmie, J. M. , & Hale, D. J. (1978). *Urban self-management in Yugoslavia*. *Regional Studies*, 12(6), 701712. doi:10.1080/09595237800185641
- Tsenkova, S. (2008). *Housing Policy Reforms in Post-Socialist Europe: Lost in Transition*. Berlin & Heidelberg: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Tuli, Z. (2013). *BiH postaje drava staraca, mladi odlaze* (BiH becomes a state of old people, young people are leaving). *Veernji list BiH*, September 28, 2013. Retrieved 22 October 2015 from www.vecernji.ba/bih-postaje-drzava-staraca-mladi-odlaze-620255
- Velagi, A. , & Krhan, A. (2013). *Bosanskohercegovački gradovi u procesu politike modernizacije (1850-1950): Zbornik radova* [Bosnian-Herzegovinian Cities in the Process of Political Modernization (1850-1950): A collection of papers]. Sarajevo: Muzej Hercegovine, University Press.
- Vujanovi, M. , & Petovar, K. (2006). *Javni interes i strategije aktera u urbanistikom i prostornom planiranju* [Public interest and strategy of actors in urban spatial planning]. *SOCIOLOGIJA*, 48(4), 357382. doi:0038-0318/2006/0038-03180604356V
- Weber, B. (2007). *Kriza univerziteta i perspektive mladih naučnika u Bosni i Hercegovini* [The crisis of the University and the Perspective of Young Scientists in Bosnia and Herzegovina]. Sarajevo: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. Retrieved from <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/sarajevo/09245.pdf>
- iga, J. , Turilo, L. , Osmi, A. , Bai, S. , Dananovi-Mirajija, N. , Kapidi, D. , & Brki-migoc, J. (2014). *Studija o mladima u Bosni i Hercegovini* [Study on Youth in Bosnia and Herzegovina]. Retrieved 23 October 2015 from <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/sarajevo/11436.pdf>

Good Intentions, Deep Frustrations, and Upward Mobility

- Allmendinger, P. (2009). *Planning Theory*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- ANC Youth League (1944). *ANC Youth League Manifesto*. Johannesburg: ANC Youth League.
- Anhorn, M. R. (2009). *Spirituality and Planning in a Diverse World* (Masters Thesis). University of Saskatchewan, School of Community and Regional Planning, Saskatoon.
- Bloor, G. & Dawson, P. (1994). Understanding professional culture in organizational context. *Organization Studies*, 15(2), 275-295. doi:10.1177/017084069401500205
- Campbell, H. & Marshall, R. (2002). Values and professional identities in planning practice. In P. Allmendinger & M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds.), *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory* (pp. 93-109). London: Routledge.
- Forester, J. (1996). Argument, power and passion in planning practice. In S. Mandelbaum, L. Mazza, & R. W. Buchell (Eds.), *Explorations in Planning Theory* (pp. 204-225). New Brunswick, NJ: Centre for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.
- Glasmeyer, A. & Kahn, T. (1989). Planners in the 80s: Who We Are, Where We Work. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 9(1), 517. doi:10.1177/0739456X8900900101
- Grant, M. (1999). Planning as a learned profession. *Plans and Planners*, 1(1), 2126.
- Guzzetta, J. D. & Bollens, S. A. (2003). Urban planners skills and competencies. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 23(1), 96-106. doi:10.1177/0739456X03255426
- Harrison, P., Todes, A., & Watson, V. (2008). *Planning and Transformation: Learning from the Post-Apartheid Experience*. New York: Routledge.
- Healey, P. (1992). A planners day: Knowledge and action in communicative practice. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 58(1), 920. doi:10.1080/01944369208975531
- Healey, P. (1999). Sandercock: Expanding the language of planning. *European Planning Studies*, 7(5), 545-548.
- Healey, P. & Underwood, J. (1978). Professional ideals and planning practice. *Progress in Planning*, 9, 73-127. doi:10.1016/0305-9006(78)90005-3
- Johnson, S. D., Koh, H. C., & Killough, L. N. (2009). Organizational and occupational culture and the perception of managerial accounting terms: An exploratory study using perceptual mapping techniques. *Contemporary Management Research*, 5(4) 317-342.
- Mabin, A. & Oranje, M. (2014). The 1938 Johannesburg Town Planning Exhibition and Congress: Testament, monument and indictment. In R. Freestone & M. Amati (Eds.), *Planning Exhibitions and the Development of Modern Planning Culture* (pp. 97-110). London: Ashgate.
- Mabin, A. & Smit, D. (1992). *Reconstructing South Africa's Cities 1900-2000: A Prospectus (or a Cautionary Tale)*. Presented at the African Studies Seminar, Johannesburg, South Africa, 18 May 1992.
- Moonsammy, S. T. (2017). *An Insider-Outsiders Exploration of Planning Knowledge, Roles, Uses and Construction in a Post-1994 Metropolitan Setting: eThekweni Municipality* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). University of Pretoria, Town and Regional Planning, Pretoria.
- Muller, J. (1983). *Theory and Practice: The Janus Face of Planning* (Inaugural lecture presented on 2 September 1982). Johannesburg: Witwatersrand Press.
- National Youth Commission (1997). *National Youth Policy*. Pretoria: National Youth Commission.
- 87 National Youth Development Agency (2015). *National Youth Policy 2015-2020*. Pretoria: National Youth Development Agency.
- Oranje, M. (1998). *The Language Game of South African Urban and Regional Planning: A Cognitive Mapping from the Past into the Future* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). University of Pretoria, Town and Regional Planning, Pretoria.
- Oranje, M. (2012). Neoliberalism, shallow dreaming and the unyielding Apartheid City. In T. Taan-Kok & G. Baetens (Eds.), *Contradictions of Neoliberal Planning: Cities, Policies, and Politics* (pp. 173-204). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Oranje, M. & Berrisford, S. (2012). Planning law reform and change in post-apartheid South Africa. In T. Hartmann & B. Needham (Eds.), *Planning by Law and Property Rights Reconsidered* (pp. 55-70). London: Ashgate.
- Ozawa, C. P. & Seltzer, E. P. (1999). Taking our bearings: Mapping a relationship among planning practice, theory, and education. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 18(3), 257-266. doi:10.1177/0739456X9901800307
- Republic of South Africa (1996). *National Youth Commission Act, No. 19 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Seltzer, E. & Ozawa, C. P. (2002). Clear signals. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 22(1), 77-86. doi:10.1177/0739456X02200107
- Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2002). Personal dynamics, distinctive frames and communicative planning. In P. Allmendinger & M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds.), *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory* (pp. 65-92). London: Routledge.

Thomas, H. & Healey, P. (1991). *Dilemmas of Planning Practice: Ethics, Legitimacy and the Validation of Knowledge*. London: UCL Press.

Varkey Foundation (2017). *What the Worlds Young People Think and Feel*. London: Generation Z: Global Citizenship Survey.

Breakfast at Tiffanys

Aalbers, M. B. (2013). Neoliberalism is Dead Long Live Neoliberalism! *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(3), 10831090. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12065

Alfasi, N. , & Fenster, T. (2014). Between socio-spatial and urban justice: Rawls principles of justice in the 2011 Israeli Protest Movement. *Planning Theory*, 13(4), 407427. doi:10.1177/1473095214521105

Alfasi, N. , & Ganan, E. (2015). Jerusalem of (foreign) gold: Entrepreneurship and pattern-driven policy in a historic city. *Urban Geography*, 36(2), 157180. doi:10.1080/02723638.2014.977051

Allmendinger, P. , & Haughton, G. (2013). The evolution and trajectories of English spatial governance: Neoliberal episodes in planning. *Planning Practice & Research*, 28(1), 626. doi:10.1080/02697459.2012.699223

Alterman, R. (1990). From expropriations to development agreements: Developer obligations for public services in Israel. *Israel Law Review*, 24(1), 2981.

Alterman, R. (2012). Land use regulations and property values: The Windfalls Capture idea revisited. In N. Brooks , K. Donaghy , & G. Knaap (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Urban Economics and Planning* (pp. 755786). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blokland, T. , Hentschel, C. , Holm, A. , Lebuhn, H. , & Margalit, T. (2015). Urban citizenship and right to the city: The fragmentation of claims. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(4), 655665. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12259

Brenner, N. , & Theodore, N. (2005). Neoliberalism and the urban condition. *City*, 9(1), 101107. doi:10.1080/13604810500092106

Campbell, H. (2006). Just planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 26(1), 92106. doi:10.1177/0739456X06288090

Charney, I. (2013). The entrepreneurial turn in the context of a central state: Evasive planning regulation for IKEA in Israel. *Environment and Planning A*, 45(8), 18451857.

David, H. (2013). *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. New York: Verso Books.

Enright, T. E. (2014). Illuminating the path to Grand Pari(s): Architecture and urban transformation in an era of neoliberalization. *Antipode*, 46(2), 382403. doi:10.1111/anti.12048

Fainstein, S. (2008). Mega-projects in New York, London and Amsterdam. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(4), 768785. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2008.00826.x

Fainstein, S. (2010). *The Just City*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Fainstein, S. S. (2001). *The City Builders: Property Development in New York and London, 19802000*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Flyvbjerg, B. , & Richardson, T. (2002). Planning and Foucault: In search of the dark side of planning theory. In P. Allmendinger & M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds.), *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory* (pp. 4462). Aalborg, Denmark: Aalborg Universitetsforlag.

Forester, J. (1988). *Planning in the Face of Power*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Fox-Rogers, L. , & Murphy, E. (2015). Self-perceptions of the role of the planner. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 43(1), 7492. doi:10.1177/0265813515603860

Fox-Rogers, L. , & Murphy, E. (2016). Self-perceptions of the role of the planner. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 43, 7492.

Gielen, D. M. , & Taan-Kok, T. (2010). Flexibility in planning and the consequences for public-value capturing in UK, Spain and the Netherlands. *European Planning Studies*, 18(7), 10971131. doi:10.1080/09654311003744191

Grant, J. (2005). Rethinking the public interest as a planning concept. In J. Grant (Ed.), *A Reader in Canadian Planning: Linking Theory and Practice* (pp. 6871). Toronto, ON: Thomas Nelson.

Gunder, M. (2011). Commentary: Is urban design still urban planning? An exploration and response. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 31(2), 184195. doi:10.1177/0739456X10393358

Hananel, R. (2016). From central to marginal: The trajectory of Israels public-housing policy. *Urban Studies*, 1(16), 116. doi:10.1177/0042098016649323

- 105 Harvey, D. (2003). The right to the city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(4), 939941. doi:10.1111/j.0309-1317.2003.00492.x
- Holston, J. , & Caldeira, T. P. R. (2008). Urban peripheries and the invention of citizenship. *Harvard Design Magazine*, Spring/Summer(28), 1723.
- Kayden, J. S. (2001). Using and misusing zoning law to design cities: An empirical study of New York City's privately owned public spaces (Part 1). *Land Use Law & Zoning Digest*, 53(2), 310. doi:10.1080/00947598.2001.10394506
- Kemp, A. , Lebuhn, H. , & Rattner, G. (2015). Between neoliberal governance and the right to the city: Participatory politics in Berlin and Tel Aviv. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(4), 704725.
- Lefebvre, H. (1996). The right to the city. In E. Kofman & E. Lebas (Eds.), *Writings on Cities* (pp. 147159). New York: Blackwell.
- Marcuse, P. (2009). From critical urban theory to the right to the city. *City*, 13(23), 185197. doi:10.1080/13604810902982177
- Margalit, T. (2013). Land, politics and high-rise planning: Ongoing development practices in Tel Aviv/Jaffa. *Planning Perspectives*, 28(3), 373397. doi:10.1080/02665433.2013.73 7713
- Margalit, T. (2014). Multi-spot zoning: A chain of public/private development ventures in Tel Aviv. *Cities*, 37, 7381. doi:10.1016/j.cities.2013.12.001
- Margalit, T. , & Alfasi, N. (2016). The undercurrents of entrepreneurial development: Impressions from a globalizing city. *Environment and Planning A*, 48(10), 19671987.
- Margalit, T. , & Kemp, A. (2015). Justifying planning decisions: Institutional response to planning objections in Israel. In *Definite Space, Fuzzy Responsibility*, 29th Annual AESOP 2015 Congress, 1316 July 2015, Prague.
- Margalit, T. , & Vertes, E. (2015). Planning allocations and the stubborn north-south divide in Tel Aviv/Jaffa. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 16(2), 226247. doi:10.1080/14649357.2015.1026925
- Marom, N. (2014). Relating a city's history and geography with Bourdieu: One hundred years of spatial distinction in Tel Aviv. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(4), 13441362. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12027
- Mayer, M. , & Boudreau, J.-A. (2012). Social movements in urban politics: Trends in research and practice. In E. Clarke , P. John , & K. Mossberger (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook on Urban Politics* (pp. 273291). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Monterescu, D. (2009). To buy or not to be: Trespassing the gated community. *Public Culture*, 21, 24032430.
- Monterescu, D. , & Shaindinger, N. (2013). Situational radicalism: The Israeli Arab Spring and the (un)making of the Rebel City. *Constellations*, 20(2), 229253. doi:10.1111/ cons.12039
- Peck, J. , Theodore, N. , & Brenner, N. (2009). Neoliberal urbanism: Models, moments, mutations. *SAIS Review*, XXIX(1), 4866. doi:10.1353/sais.0.0028
- Peck, J. , Theodore, N. , & Brenner, N. (2013). Neoliberal urbanism redux? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(3), 10911099. doi:10.1111/14682427.12066
- Podobnik, B. (2011). Assessing the social and environmental achievements of New Urbanism: Evidence from Portland, Oregon. *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability*, 4(2), 105126. doi:10.1080/17549175.2011. 596271
- 106 Purcell, M. (2003). Citizenship and the right to the global city: Reimagining the capitalist world order. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(3), 564590. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.00467
- Rozen, G. (2016). Condo-ism and urban renewal: Insights from Toronto and Jerusalem. In A. Lehavi (Ed.), *Private Communities and Urban Governance* (pp. 7794). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Sagalyn, L. B. (2007). Public/private development. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 73(1), 722. doi:10.1080/01944360708976133
- Sager, T. (2009). Planners role: Torn between dialogical ideals and neo-liberal realities. *European Planning Studies*, 17(1), 6584.
- Sager, T. (2011). Neo-liberal urban planning policies: A literature survey 1990-2010. *Progress in Planning*, 76(4), 147199.
- Sandercock, L. , & Lyssiotis, P. (2003). *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities of the 21st Century*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Schipper, S. (2015). Urban social movements and the struggle for affordable housing in the globalizing city of Tel Aviv/Jaffa. *Environment and Planning A*, 47(3), 521536. doi:10.1068/a140249p
- Sklair, L. , & Gherardi, L. (2012). Iconic architecture as a hegemonic project of the transnational capitalist class. *City*, 16(12), 5773. doi:10.1080/13604813.2012.662366
- Talen, E. (2002). The social goals of new urbanism. *Housing Policy Debate*, 13(1), 165188.
- Taan-Kok, T. (2008). Changing interpretations of flexibility in the planning literature: From opportunism to creativity? *International Planning Studies*, 13(3), 183195.

doi:10.1080/13563470802521382

Taan-Kok, T. (2010). Entrepreneurial governance: Challenges of large-scale property-led urban regeneration projects. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 101(2), 126149.

doi:10.1111/j.1467-9663.2009.00521.x

Tayebi, A. (2013). Planning activism: Using social media to claim marginalized citizens right to the city. *Cities*, 32, 8893. doi:10.1016/j.cities.2013.03.011

Willis, C. (1995). *Form Follows Finance: Skyscrapers and Skylines in Chicago and New York*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Wolf-Powers, L. (2013). Teaching planners to deal. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 33(3), 348362. doi:10.1177/0739456X13482979

Yacobi, H. (2007). The NGOization of space: Dilemmas of social change, planning policy, and the Israeli public sphere. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 25(4), 745758. doi:10.1068/d459t

Confronted and Disappointed?

Bademli, R. (2005). *Kentsel Planlama İli Notlar [Notes from Urban Planning Workshop]*. Ankara: TMMOB PO Yayınlar.

Balaban, O. (2012). The negative effects of construction boom on urban planning and environment in Turkey: Unraveling the role of the public sector. *Habitat International*, 36(1), 2635. doi:10.1016/j.habitatint.2011.05.003

Bayirbag, M. , & Penpeciolu, M. (2014). *Urban Geography of Contestation: Dispossession, Exploitation, Commons and Representation in the Eastern/Southern Cities*. Paper presented at the City Futures Conference, Paris, 1820 June 2014.

Eraydin, A. , & Taan-Kok, T. (2014). State response to contemporary urban movements in Turkey: A critical overview of state entrepreneurialism and authoritarian interventions. *Antipode*, 46(1), 110129. doi:10.1111/anti.12042

Ersoy, M. (2011). *Some Observations and Recommendations on the Practice of Upper Level Urban Plans in Turkey in the Light of Sustainable Development*. Paper presented at the APSA (Asian Planning Schools Association) Congress, 1922 September 2011, Tokyo, Japan.

Fischler, R. (2011). Fifty theses on urban planning and urban planners. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 32(1), 107114. doi:10.1177/0739456X11420441

Forester, J. (1988). *Planning in the Face of Power*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Forester, J. (2013). *Planning in the Face of Conflict: The Surprising Possibilities of Facilitative Leadership*. Chicago & Washington, DC: APA Planners Press.

Gnay, B. (2012). *Planlama kuram ve kentsel planlama eitimi [Planning theory and urban planning education]*. In M. Ersoy (Ed.), *Kentsel Planlama Kuramlar* (pp. 319355). Ankara: Imge.

Gunder, M. (2010). Planning as the ideology of (neoliberal) space. *Planning Theory*, 9(4), 298314. doi:10.1177/1473095210368878

Keskinok, C. (2006). *Kentleme Siyasalar [Urban Policy]*. Ankara: Kaynak Yayınlar.

Kuyucu, T. (2014). Law, property and ambiguity: The uses and abuses of legal ambiguity in remaking Istanbul's informal settlements. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(2), 609627. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12026

Lennon, M. (2014). Finding purpose in planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 35(1), 6375. doi:10.1177/0739456X14560573

Lovering, J. , & Evren, Y. (2011). Urban development and planning in Istanbul. *International Planning Studies*, 16(1), 14. doi:10.1080/13563475.2011.552471

Penpeciolu, M. (2011). *Kapitalist kentleme dinamiklerinin Türkiye'deki son 10 yıl: Yapı çevre üretimi, devlet ve büyük ölçekli kentsel projeler [Last ten years of capitalist urbanization dynamics in Turkey: Production of built environment, state and large scale urban projects]*. *Birikim*, 270, 6273.

Penpeciolu, M. (2012). *Political Construction of Urban Development Projects: The Case of Turkey*. Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Penpeciolu, M. (2013). Urban development projects and the construction of neoliberal urban hegemony: The case of zmir. *METU Journal of Faculty of Architecture*, 30(1), 165189.

Penpeciolu, M. , & Taan-Kok, T. (2016). Alienated and politicized? Young planners confrontation with entrepreneurial and authoritarian state intervention in urban development in Turkey. *European Planning Studies*, 24, 10372016.

123 Sager, T. (2005). Communicative planners as naive mandarins of the neoliberal state? *European Journal of Spatial Development*, 15. Retrieved from www.nordregio.se/Global/EJSD/Debate/debate051208.pdf

Sager, T. (2009). Planners role: Torn between dialogical ideals and neo-liberal realities. *European Planning Studies*, 17(1), 6584.

engl, T. (2009). *Kentsel eliki ve Siyaset: Kapitalist Kentleme Srelerinin Eletirisi [Urban Conflict and Politics: Critique on Capitalist Urbanisation Processes]*. Ankara: Imge Yayinlari.

engl, T. (2015). Gezi bakaldrs ertesinde kent mekan ve siyasal alann yeni dinamikleri. *METU Journal of Faculty of Architecture*, 32(1), 120.

SPO (2012). *Gei Dnemi Mesleki Etik ve lkeler [Ethical Framework and Principles Prepared for the Transition Period for Urban Planning Profession]*. Ankara: ehir Planclar Odas. Retrieved 12 October 2015, from www.spo.org.tr/genel/bizden_detay.php?kod=4143#.Ur8CLvRdWSo

Tekeli, I. (2007). *Aklc Planlamadan Bir Demokrasi Projesi Olarak Planlamaya [From Rational Planning towards Democratic Planning]*. Ankara: Ihan Tekeli Toplu Eserler 7, Tarih Vakf Yurt Yaynlar.

In Search of a Place

Agyeman, J. (2005). *Sustainable Communities and the Challenge of Environmental Justice*. New York: New York University Press.

Angel, S. , Parent, J. , Civco, D. L. , & Blei, A. M. (2012). *Atlas of Urban Expansion*. Boston: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2015). *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 201617 Edition, Urban and Regional Planners*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from www.bls.gov/ooh/life-physical-and-social-science/urban-and-regional-planners.htm

City of Boston (2016). *Imagine Boston 2030: Expanding Opportunity (Draft Report)*. Boston: City of Boston. Retrieved from <http://20222-presscdn.pagely.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/lb2030-Vision-Report-WEB-2016-11-17-SPREADS.pdf>

Clavel, P. (2010). *Activists in City Hall: The Progressive Response to the Reagan Era in Boston and Chicago*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Dalton, L. C. (2007). Preparing planners for the breadth of practice. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 73(1), 3548. doi:10.1080/01944360708976135

Forester, J. (1999). *The Deliberative Practitioner: Encouraging Participatory Planning Processes*. Boston: MIT Press.

Gadringer, M. (2010). Urban hacking as a strategy for urban (re-)planning/designing. In G. Friesinger , J. Grenzforther , & T. Ballhausem (Eds.), *Urban Hacking: Cultural Jamming Strategies in the Risky Spaces of Modernity* (pp. 3545). Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers, Rutgers University.

Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. , & Straus, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

Glasmeyer, A. , & Kahn, T. (1989). Planners in the 80s: *Who we are, where we work*. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 9(1), 517. doi:10.1177/0739456X8900900101

Gutierrez, E. (2013). *Graduating into the Workplace: Perspectives from Recent Planning Grads*. Los Angeles: Planetizen. Retrieved 18 November 2016, from www.planetizen.com/node/63606

Healey, P. (1992). A planners day: Knowledge and action in communicative practice. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 58(1), 920. doi:10.1080/01944369208975531

Hoch, C. J. (1994). *What Planners Do: Power, Politics and Persuasion*. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association.

Innes, J. E. (1997). The planners century. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 16(3), 227228. doi:10.1177/0739456X9701600310

Taan-Kok, T. , & Oranje, A. M. (2017). *From Planning Student to Urban Planner: Young Practitioners Reflections on Contemporary Ethical Challenges*. New York: Routledge.

United Nations (2014). *Worlds Population Increasingly Urban with More than Half Living in Urban Areas*. New York: United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. Retrieved from www.un.org/en/development/desa/news/population/world-urbanization-prospects-2014.html

Wadley, D. , & Smith, P. (1998). If planning is about anything, what is it about? *International Journal of Social Economics*, 25(6/7/8), 10051029. doi:10.1108/03068299810212414

Things Can Only Get Better?

- Allmendinger, P. (2009). *Planning Theory*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How It Can Succeed Again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox-Rogers, L. , & Murphy, E. (2016). Self-perceptions of the role of the planner. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 43, 7492.
- Giddens, A. (2010). The rise and fall of new labour. *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 27(3), 3237. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5842.2010.01179.x
- Glasson, J. , & Marshall, T. (2007). *Regional Planning*. Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Haughton, G. , Allmendinger, P. , Counsell, D. , & Vigar, G. (2010). *The New Spatial Planning: Territorial Management with Soft Spaces and Fuzzy Boundaries*. London: Routledge.
- Hutton, W. , & Wintour, P. (1997). Goodbye xenophobia. *The Guardian*, 4 May 1997. Retrieved from www.theguardian.com/politics/1997/may/04/uk.patrickwintour
- Maconie, S. (2013). *The Peoples Songs: The Story of Modern Britain in 50 Records*. London: Random House.
- RTPI (2016a). *Code of Professional Conduct: As Last Amended by the Board of Trustees. Effective from 10 February 2016*. London: Royal Town Planning Institute. Retrieved from www.rtpi.org.uk/media/1736907/rtpi_code_of_professional_conduct_-_feb_2016.pdf
- RTPI (2016b). *Ethics and Professional Standards: Advice for RTPI Members April 2016*. London: Royal Town Planning Institute. Retrieved from www.rtpi.org.uk/media/1781432/ethics_and_professional_standards.pdf
- Taan-Kok, T. , Bertolini, L. , Oliveira e Costa, S. , Lothan, H. , Carvalho, H. , Desmet, M. , DeBlust, S. , Devos, T. , Kimyon, D. , Zoete, J. A. , & Ahmad, P. (2016). Float like a butterfly, sting like a bee: Giving voice to planning practitioners. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 621651. doi:10.1080/14649357.2016.1225711
- Taylor, N. (2010). What is this thing called spatial planning? An analysis of the British governments view. *The Town Planning Review*, 81(2), 193208.
- Urban Task Force (1999). *Towards an Urban Renaissance*. London: Spon Press.

The Door Is Now Half Open

- Campbell, H. , & Marshall, R. (2000). Moral obligations, planning, and the public interest: A commentary on current British practice. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 27(2), 297312.
- Campbell, H. , Tait, M. , & Watkins, C. (2013). Is there space for better planning in a neoliberal world? Implications for planning practice and theory. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 34(1), 4559. doi:10.1177/0739456X13514614
- Coiacetto, E. (2004). The value of a structured planning practicum program: Insights from experience. *Australian Planner*, 41(2), 7482.
- Coiacetto, E. J. , Jones, M. , & Jackson, J. T. (2011). How best to assess students learning in work placements: Moving beyond current practice. *Australian Planner*, 48(4), 270280. doi:10.1080/07293682.2011.593530
- Freestone, R. , Thompson, S. , & Williams, P. (2006). Student experiences of work-based learning in planning education. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 26(2), 237249. doi:10.1177/0739456X06295027
- Harvey, D. (1989). From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: The transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, 71(1), 317. doi:10.2307/490503
- Hurlimann, A. C. (2009). Responding to environmental challenges: An initial assessment of higher education curricula needs by Australian planning professionals. *Environmental Education Research*, 15(6), 643659. doi:10.1080/135046209032244159
- Jackson, J. , & Siggers, B. (2011). What RMIT Planners Do: An Exploration of the Careers of Planning Graduates from an Australian University over the Last 30 Years. Paper presented at the World Planning Schools Congress, Perth, West Australia, 48 July 2011.
- Jones, M. , Coiacetto, E. , Jackson, J. , Coote, M. , Steele, W. , Budge, T. , & Gall, S. (2009). *Generating Academic Standards in Planning Practice Education (Final Report to Australian*

Learning and Teaching Council). Canberra: Australian Department of Education and Training.

McLoughlin, J. B. (1969). *Urban and Regional Planning: A Systems Approach*. London: Faber Publishers.

McLoughlin, J. B. (1992). *Shaping Melbourne's Future? Town Planning, the State and Civil Society*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Minnery, J. (2000). Go, and do thou likewise? Planning practice in planning education. *Australian Planner*, 37(1), 3946.

White, S. S. , & Mayo, J. M. (2005). Environmental education in graduate professional degrees: The case of urban planning. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 36(3), 3138. doi:10.3200/JOEE.36.3.31-38

Yergin, D. , & Stanislaw, J. (1998). *The Commanding Heights: The Battle Between Government and the Marketplace That Is Remaking the Modern World*. New York: Free Press.

Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish*. New York: Guilford Press.

Planning for Rights

Baer, W. (2001). *The Brazilian Economy: Growth and Development*. London: Praeger.

Brazil Federal Government (2001). *Estatuto da cidade: Guia para implementao pelos municpios e cidades*. Brasilia: Federal Senate/Ministerio das Cidades/Instituto Polis/CEF.

Coelho, V. S. P. , Pozzoni, B. , & Montoya, M. C. (2005). Participation and public policies in Brazil. In J. Gastil & P. Levine (Eds.), *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century* (pp. 174184). San Francisco, CA: Wiley.

IBGE (2014). *Características Gerais da Populao [General Characteristics of the Population]*. Brasilia: Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística.

Knutsson, B. (2009). The intellectual history of development: Towards a widening potential repertoire. *Perspectives*, 13(April), 246.

Lamarca, M. G. (2011). Implementing the right to the city in Brazil. *Polis Blog [Online resource.]* Retrieved 20 February 2015, from www.thepolisblog.org/2011/10/implementing-right-to-city-in-brazil.html

Leahy, J. (2014). Brazil: Loss of faith. *Financial Times*, 24 February 2014. Retrieved from www.ft.com/content/9ea67d80-9d3f-11e3-a599-00144feab7de

Macedo, A. R. de , Trevisan, L. M. V. , Trevisan, P. , & Macedo, C. S. de (2005). Educao superior no sculo XXI e a Reforma Universitaria Brasileira [Higher education in the 21st century and the Brazilian University Reform]. *Avaliacao de Políticas Públicas Educacionais*, 13(47), 127148.

Maricato, E. (2010). *The Statute of the Peripheral City*. So Paulo: Cities Alliance and The Ministry of Cities. Retrieved from www.citiesalliance.org/sites/citiesalliance.org/files/CA_Images/CityStatuteofBrazil_English_Ch1.pdf

Martine, G. , & McGranahan, G. (2010). *Brazils Early Urban Transition: What Can It Teach Urbanizing Countries? (Vol. 4)*. London: International Institute for Environment and Development. Retrieved from [http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=3hR2DGR01toC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=%22G.+a nd+G.+McGranahan+\(2010\).+Brazil%E2%80%99s+early+urban+transition:+what+can+it%22+%22FEB,+2015,+from%22+%22countries%3F+London,+Human+Settlements+Group,+International+Institute%22+%22urbano.+Vitruvius+074\(05\):%22+%ots=L6jjBHDN5q&sig=h0BiHbBkXRi9Ra6uRYPpl1ztv8U](http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=3hR2DGR01toC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=%22G.+a nd+G.+McGranahan+(2010).+Brazil%E2%80%99s+early+urban+transition:+what+can+it%22+%22FEB,+2015,+from%22+%22countries%3F+London,+Human+Settlements+Group,+International+Institute%22+%22urbano.+Vitruvius+074(05):%22+%ots=L6jjBHDN5q&sig=h0BiHbBkXRi9Ra6uRYPpl1ztv8U)

Nadin, V. , & Stead, D. (2008). European spatial planning systems, social models and learning. *disP - The Planning Review*, 44(172), 3547. doi:10.1080/02513625.2008.10557001

Rio, V. del , & Gallo, H. (2000). The legacy of modern urbanism in Brazil: Paradigm turned reality or unfinished project? *Docomomo Journal*, 23, 2327.

Rolnik, R. (2014). Heranas da ditadura nas cidades [Inheritance of dictatorship in cities]. Blog da Raquel Rolnik [Online resource.] Retrieved 12 February 2015, from <https://raquelrolnik.wordpress.com/2014/04/07/herancas-da-ditadura-nas-cidades/>

Saboya, R. (2006). Planos diretores como instrumento de orientao das aes de desenvolvimento urbano [Master plans as an instrument for guiding urban development actions]. *Vitruvius*, 74(5), 338342.

Saboya, R. (2008). *Urbanismo e planejamento urbano no Brasil 1875 a 1992 [Urbanism and urban planning in Brazil 1875 to 1992]*. Urbanidades [Online resource.] Retrieved 10 February 2015, from <http://urbanidades.arq.br/2008/11/urbanismo-e-planejamento-urbano-no-brasil->

1875-a-1992/

- Sadaike, P. (2004). 1964: Os impactos do golpe militar na carreira academica e artistica do arquiteto Vilanova Artigas. *Projeto Historia*, 29(1), 257266.
- Tasca, L. (2011). *Instrumentos de Planejamento Urbano e Legislacao Urbanistica [Instruments of Urban Planning and Urban Planning Legislation]*. Juiz de Fora: Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora.
- Villaa, F. (1999). Um breve historico do planejamento urbano no Brasil [A brief history of urban planning in Brazil]. In C. Dek & S. R. Schiffer (Eds.), *O Processo de Urbanizacao no Brasil [The Process of Urbanization in Brazil]* (pp. 169243). So Paulo: Editora da Universidade de So Paulo. Retrieved from http://sinop.unemat.br/site_antigo/prof/foto_p_downloads/fot_12285abtigo_hist_plan_by_pdf_artigo_hist_plan_BR.pdf
- Wampler, B. (2007). *Participatory Budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, Cooperation, and Accountability*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- World Bank (2006). *Brazil Inputs for a Strategy for Cities: A Contribution with a Focus on Cities and Municipalities* (Report no. 35749-BR). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Facing up to Finnish Planning Pathologies

- Argyris, C. (1993). *Knowledge for Action: A Guide to Overcoming Barriers to Organizational Change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Argyris, C. , & Schn, D. A. (1997). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. *Reis*, (77/78), 345348.
- Bakker, A. B. , & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209223. doi:10.1108/13620430810870476
- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Casey Boland, W. (2015). Barbezat, D. P., & Bush, M. *Contemplative Practices in Higher Education: Powerful Methods to Transform Teaching and Learning [Book review]*. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 19(1), 112117. doi:10.1177/1521025115611404
- Etelpelto, A. , Vhsantanen, K. , Hkk, P., & Paloniemi, S. (2013). What is agency? Conceptualizing professional agency at work. *Educational Research Review*, 10, 4565. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2013.05.001
- Fisher, T. (2003). Whos minding the mediator? *Mindfulness in mediation*. *ADR Bulletin*, 5(10), 1.
- Forester, J. (1980). *Critical theory and planning practice*. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 46(3), 275286. doi:10.1080/01944368008977043
- Forester, J. (1988). *Planning in the Face of Power*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Forester, J. (1993). *Critical Theory, Public Policy, and Planning Practice*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Forester, J. (1999). *The Deliberative Practitioner: Encouraging Participatory Planning Processes*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.
- Forester, J. (2009). *Dealing with Differences: Dramas of Mediating Public Disputes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Forester, J. (2013). *Planning in the Face of Conflict: The Surprising Possibilities of Facilitative Leadership*. Chicago & Washington, DC: APA Planners Press.
- Germer, C. K. , & Neff, K. D. (2013). Self-compassion in clinical practice. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 69(8), 856867.
- Grange, K. (2016). *Planners A silenced profession? The politicisation of planning and the need for fearless speech*. *Planning Theory*, 16(3), 275295. doi:10.1177/1473095215 626465
- Grnlund, K. , & Setl, M. (2011). In honest officials we trust. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 42(5), 523542. doi:10.1177/0275074011412946
- Gunder, M. (2010). *Planning as the ideology of (neoliberal) space*. *Planning Theory*, 9(4), 298314. doi:10.1177/1473095210368878
- Habermas, J. (1981). *The Theory of Communicative Action (Vols. 12)*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hkli, J. (2002). *Kansalaisosallistuminen ja kaupunkisuunnittelun tiedonpolitiikka. Osalliset Ja Osaajat. Kansalaiset Kaupungin Suunnittelussa*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 110124.

- Hillier, J. (2003). Agonizing over consensus: Why Habermasian ideals cannot be real. *Planning Theory*, 2(1), 3759.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States* (Vol. 25). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Huxley, M. (2000). The limits to communicative planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 19(4), 369377. doi:10.1177/0739456X0001900406
- Hytnen, J. (2016). The problematic relationship of communicative planning theory and the Finnish legal culture. *Planning Theory*, 15(3), 223238. doi:10.1177/1473095214 549618
- Hytnen, J. , Mntysalo, R. , Akkila, I. , Kanninen, V. , & Niemi, P. (2012). *Kaupunkiseutujen kasvukivut II (Growth Zones in Urban Areas II) (Paras-ARTTU-ohjelman tutkimuksia nro 22)*. Helsinki: Kuntaliitto.
- Kangasoja, J. (2010). Kylm kyyti kunnissa [Tough ride in the municipalities]. *Arkkitehtiutiset*, 62(5), 89.
- 196 Kangasoja, J. , Mlkki, M. , Puustinen, S. , Hirvonen, J. , & Mntysalo, R. (2010). Architectural education as a basis for planning work: The pros and cons of professional enculturation. *Journal for Education in the Built Environment*, 5(2), 2538.
- Kouvo, A. (2011). The sources of generalized trust and institutional confidence in Europe. *Research on Finnish Society*, 4, 2940.
- Mntysalo, R. (2000). *Land-use Planning as Inter-Organizational Learning*. Oulu: Oulun yliopisto & Oulu University Press.
- Mntysalo, R. , Balducci, A. , & Kangasoja, J. (2011). Planning as agonistic communication in a trading zone: Re-examining Lindbloms partisan mutual adjustment. *Planning Theory*, 10(3), 257272. doi:10.1177/1473095210397147
- Mntysalo, R. , Kangasoja, J. , & Kanninen, V. (2015). The paradox of strategic spatial planning: A theoretical outline with a view on Finland. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 16(2), 169183. doi:10.1080/14649357.2015.1016548
- Mntysalo, R. , & Nyman, K. (2001). *Kaavoitus-suunnittelua?: suunnittelun patologioita maankyttaja rakennuslain sovelluksissa*. Oulu: Oulun yliopisto.
- Mntysalo, R. , & Saglie, I.-L. (2010). Private influence preceding public involvement: Strategies for legitimizing preliminary partnership arrangements in urban housing planning in Norway and Finland. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 11(3), 317338.
- Mntysalo, R. , Saglie, I.-L. , & Cars, G. (2011). Between input legitimacy and output efficiency: Defensive routines and agonistic reflectivity in Nordic land-use planning. *European Planning Studies*, 19(12), 21092126.
- March, A. (2016). *The Democratic Plan: Analysis and Diagnosis*. London: Routledge.
- March, A. , & Low, N. (2004). Knowing and steering: Mediatization, planning and democracy in Victoria, Australia. *Planning Theory*, 3(1), 4169.
- 197 Mattila, H. (2003). Vuorovaikutteinen suunnittelu ja kaupunkisuunnittelijan esteettinen asiantuntemus [Communicative planning and the aesthetic expertise of planners]. *Yhdyskuntasuunnittelu*, 2, 5571.
- Mattila, H. (2009). Nelj vuosikymment yhdyskuntasuunnittelijoiden akateemista tydenskoulutusta Miten tst eteenpin? [Four decades of academic professional development programmes for planners How to move forward?]. *Yhdyskuntasuunnittelu*, 4, 2529.
- Mattila, H. (2013). Akateemista maankytn suunnittelun tutkintokoulutusta viimein Suomeen. Uuden paineen suunnittelu ja kynnistminen Aalto-yliopistossa [Academic planning degrees finally in Finland Designing and launching a new major at Aalto University]. In M. Lampinen (Ed.), *Opettajan muuttuvat roolit yhdess yhteislliseen opetuksen kehittmiseen [Changing Roles of a Teacher On the Way to Collaborative Development of Education]* (pp. 151168). Aalto: Aalto University Publishing Series.
- Mattila, H. (2016). Can collaborative planning go beyond locally focused notions of the public interest? The potential of Habermas concept of generalizable interest in pluralist and trans-scalar planning discourses. *Planning Theory*, 15(4), 344365.
- Mattila, H. , & Myntinen, E. (2011). Akateemista alue ja yhdyskuntasuunnittelun tydenskoulutusta muuttuvissa tympmistiss [Learning planning through academic apprenticeship programme in face of changing contexts of planning work]. In I. Grhn (Ed.), *Oppisopimustyyppisen tydenskoulutuksen mallia etsimss, Turun yliopiston koulutus ja kehittmiskeskuksen julkaisuja [In Search of a Model for Apprenticeship-Based Continuous Education]* (pp. 2432). Turku: University of Turku, Brahea Training and Development Center.
- Mattila, H. , Myntinen, E. , & Mntysalo, R. (2012). Managing planning pathologies: An educational challenge of the new Apprenticeship Programme in Finland. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 13(3), 484488.
- Purcell, M. (2009). Resisting neoliberalization: Communicative planning or counter-hegemonic movements? *Planning Theory*, 8(2), 140165.

- Puustinen, S. , Hirvonen, J. , Niemi, P. , & Mntysalo, R. (2013). *Selvitys lueidenkytn suunnittelun ja ohjauksen voimavaroista* [Report on the Resources Available for Land Use Planning and Guidance] (Reports of the Ministry of the Environment 22/2013). Helsinki: Ministry of the Environment.
- Riskin, L. L. (2004). Mindfulness: Foundational training for dispute resolution. *Journal of Legal Education*, 54, 79.
- Sager, T. (2009). Planners role: Torn between dialogical ideals and neo-liberal realities. *European Planning Studies*, 17(1), 6584.
- Sager, T. (2012). *Reviving Critical Planning Theory*. London: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203104187
- Westley, F. , Tjornbo, O. , Schultz, L. , Olsson, P. , Folke, C. , Crona, B. , & Bodin, . (2013). A theory of transformative agency in linked social-ecological systems. *Ecology and Society*, 18(3), 27.
- Yli-Jama, K. (2011). Vaan duunissa? [Just doing my job]. *Yhdyskuntasuunnittelu*, 49(2), 5657.
- Yli-Jama, K. (2014). *Selvitystalous* [Assessment economy]. *Yhdyskuntasuunnittelu*, 52(3), 5051.

The Self-Conception of German Planners as Pioneers for Sustainability Transition

- Frank, A. , & Kurth, D. (2010). Planning Education in Germany: Impact of the Bologna Agreement. *disP - The Planning Review*, 46(182), 2535.
- Frantzeskaki, N. , Loorbach, D. , & Meadowcroft, J. (2012). Governing societal transitions to sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 15(12), 1936.
- Geels, F. W. (2002). Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: A multi-level perspective and a case-study. *Research Policy*, 31(8), 12571274.
- Geels, F. W. (2005). Processes and patterns in transitions and system innovations: Refining the co-evolutionary multi-level perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 72(6), 681696.
- Geels, F. W. , & Schot, J. (2007). Typology of sociotechnical transition pathways. *Research Policy*, 36(3), 399417. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2007.01.003
- Grin, J. , Rotmans, J. , & Schot, J. (2010). *Transitions to Sustainable Development: New Directions in the Study of Long Term Transformative Change*. London: Routledge.
- Gunder, M. (2010). Planning as the ideology of (neoliberal) space. *Planning Theory*, 9(4), 298314. doi:10.1177/1473095210368878
- Hoffman, J. (2013). Theorizing power in transition studies: The role of creativity and novel practices in structural change. *Policy Sciences*, 46(3), 257275.
- Jepson, Jr., E.J. (2001). Sustainability and planning: Diverse concepts and close associations. *CPL Bibliography*, 15(4), 499510.
- Krau, I. (2014). *Stadt-und Raumplanerzum Wandel eines Berufsbildes*. *Raumforschung Und Raumordnung*, 72(4), 309321.
- Kristof, K. (2010). Models of Change: Einfhrgung und Verbreitung sozialer Innovationen und gesellschaftlicher Vernderungen in transdisziplinrer Perspektive. Zurich: vdf Hochschulverlag AG.
- Loorbach, D. (2007). *Transition Management: New Mode of Governance for Sustainable Development*. Rotterdam: Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam.
- Pahl-Wostl, C. (2015). *Water Governance in the Face of Global Change: From Understanding to Transformation*. Berlin: Springer.
- Rees, W. E. (1995). Achieving sustainability: Reform or transformation? *Journal of Planning Literature*, 9(4), 343361.
- Rotmans, J. , Kemp, R. , & Van Asselt, M. (2001). More evolution than revolution: Transition management in public policy. *Foresight*, 3(1), 1531.
- Schubert, D. (2013). *Kontinuiteten und Reorganisationsen Stadtplanerausbildung zwischen Sparzwang und Neuorientierung*. In F. Roost , B. Schmidt-Lauber , C. Hannemann , F. Othengrafen , & J. Pohlen (Eds.), *Jahrbuch StadtRegion 2013/2014: Urbane Peripherie* [Yearbook of City Region 2013/2014: Urban Periphery] (pp. 157170). Leverkusen: Verlag Barbara Baudrich.
- WBGU (2011). *World in Transition. A Social Contract for Sustainability*. Berlin: WBGU.
- WBGU (2016). *Humanity on the Move: Unlocking the Transformative Power of Cities* (Summary). Berlin: WBGU.

I Shall Survive

- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Bazzi, A. (2012). *La Piazza Mia (The Square is Mine)*. Cosenza: Rubettino.
- Body-Gendrot, S. (2012). *Globalization, Fear and Insecurity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brenner, N. , & Wachsmuth, D. (2012). Territorial competitiveness: Lineages, practices, ideologies. In B. Sanyal , L. J. Vale , & C. D. Rosan (Eds.), *Planning Ideas that Matter: Livability, Territoriality, Governance and Reflective Practice* (pp. 179204). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Campbell, H. (2014). The academy and the planning profession: Planning to make the future together? *Planning Theory & Practice*, 15(1), 119122.
- Cremašchi, M. , & Coppo, M. (1994). *Strutture territoriali e questione abitativa*. Milan: FrancoAngeli.
- Cremašchi, M. (Ed.) (2010). Mafia e territorio, una priorit nazionale. *Urbanistica*, 142(INU Edizioni), 4144.
- Crosta, P. L. (1998). *La Politica del Piano [Planning Policy]*. Milan: FrancoAngeli.
- De Leo, D. (2008a). Luoghi e spazi delle eccezione [Places and spaces of the exception]. In M. Cremašchi (Ed.), *Tracce di Quartieri [Neighbourhood Tracks]* (pp. 3048). Milan: I Legame Sociale nella Citt che Cambia.
- De Leo, D. (2008b). Profili di Planner Nellinformazionale [Profile of Planners]. Roma: Aracne Editrice.
- De Leo, D. (2008c). The Urban-Italia Programme in Bagheria. Bagheria (Palermo): Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure, Bagheria Town Council, Bonds of Trust.
- De Leo, D. (2009). Forme periferiche del disordine. *TERRITORIO*, (49), 139143. doi:10.3280/TR2009-049021
- De Leo, D. (2010). Bagheria: Il territorio di Urban Bagheria [Bagheria: The urban territory]. Rome: Urbanistica, INU Edizioni.
- 227 De Leo, D. (2011). Public sphere and illegal settlements: A case from the Naples metro region. In M. Cremašchi & F. Eckardt (Eds.), *Changing Places, Urbanity, Citizenship, and Ideology in the New European Neighbourhoods* (pp. 199220). Amsterdam: Tekne.
- De Leo, D. (2012). Ricercando lurbanistica nei territori della Criminalit organizzata [Researching urbanism in the territories of the Organized Crime]. In A. Bazzi (Ed.), *La Piazza Mia [The Square is Mine]* (pp. 201213). Cosenza: Rubettino.
- De Leo, D. (2013a). Planner in Palestina. Milan: FrancoAngeli.
- De Leo, D. (2013b). Trading with enemies? The trading zone approach in successful planning processes in Sicily. In A. Balducci & R. Mntysalo (Eds.), *Urban Planning as a Trading Zone* (pp. 125142). Dordrecht: Springer.
- De Leo, D. (2016). *Mafie & Urbanistica [Mafia and Urbanism]*. Milan: FrancoAngeli.
- De Leo, D. (2017). Urban planning and criminal powers: Theoretical and practical implications. *Cities*, 60, Part A, 216220. doi:10.1016/j.cities.2016.09.002
- De Leo, D. , & Piccolo, F. (2015). Planning in the face of conflict in un-democratic contexts: Lessons from two Sicilian municipalities. In E. Gualini , J. M. Mourato , & M. Allegra (Eds.), *Conflict in the City* (pp. 8093). Berlin: Jovis.
- Forester, J. (1988). *Planning in the Face of Power*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Forester, J. (2013). *Planning in the Face of Conflict: The Surprising Possibilities of Facilitative Leadership*. Chicago & Washington, DC: APA Planners Press.
- Friedmann, J. (1987). *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Friedmann, J. (2002). City of Fear or Open City? *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 68(3), 237243. doi:10.1080/01944360208976270
- Friedmann, J. (2003). Why do planning theory? *Planning Theory*, 2(1), 710.
- Garapon, A. , & Sabato, R. (2012). *Lo Stato Minimo: Il Neoliberalismo e la Giustizia [The Minimum State: Neoliberalism and Justice]*. Milan: Raffaello Cortina.
- Granata, E. , & Savoldi, P. (2012). Gli habitat delle mafie nel Nord Italia. *Territorio*, 63, 5463.
- Lanzani, A. (2012). Unesperienza inaspettata. Indizi della Ndrangheta in Lombardia. *TERRITORIO*, (63), 5463. doi:10.3280/TR2012-063011
- Majone, G. (1992). *Evidence, Argument, and Persuasion in Policy Process*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Mirraftab, F. (2004). Public-private partnerships: The Trojan horse of neoliberal development? *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24(1), 89101.
- Moulaert, F. (2005). Institutional economics and planning theory: A partnership between ostriches? *Planning Theory*, 4(1), 2132.

Proto, B. (2010). Lizard City: Exploring the mafiosity of public policies in Chicago. *Urban Research & Practice*, 3(3), 313327. doi:10.1080/17535069.2010.524421

Sajja, L. , & Gravagno, F. (2009). Can participatory action research deal with the Mafia? A lesson from the field. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 10(4), 499518.

A New Generation of Professionals in Urban Planning A System Full of Limitations

Knieling, J. , & Othengrafen, F. (2009). Spatial planning and culturesymbiosis for a better understanding of cultural differences in planning systems, traditions and practices. In J. Knieling and F. Othengrafen (Eds.), *Planning Cultures in Europe: Decoding Cultural Phenomena in Urban and Regional Planning* (pp. xxixxxv). London: Ashgate.

Korompai, A. (1998). A területi szakkpzs irnyai: Az egyttmkds lehetsgei [The tendencies in experts for regional policy: Chances for cooperation]. *Tr s Trszadalom*, 12(4), 143160.

Nemes Nagy, J. (2006). Geografus terletfejlesztk: A kpzs tz eszttendeje sikersztori [Geographers as space makers: Ten years of success stories]. *Falu Vros Rgi*, 1, 7274.

Rechnitzer, J. (2011). Tkr ltal nem elhomlyostva a posztmodern, a paradigmk, a main stream s a csbts rdege a regionlis tudomnyban [Not being blurred by the mirror of the post-modern, the paradigm, the main stream and the evil of temptation in the science of regionalism]. *Tr s Trszadalom*, 19(34), 112.

Szabo, P. , Gyurkovics, J. , Jancso, T. , Lukovics, M. , & Schwertner, J. (2014). A terletfejlesztzi kpzs egyes jellemzi a hazai felsoktatsban a 2010-es vek elejn [Some features of education of regional policy in Hungarian higher education in the early 2010]. *Central European Journal of Regional Development and Tourism*, 6, 108120.

A New Role for Young Planners in the Netherlands

Albert, M. , & Gonenc, R. (1996). The future of Rhenish capitalism. *The Political Quarterly*, 67(3), 184193. doi:10.1111/j.1467-923X.1996.tb01583.x

Boelhouwer, P. , & Priemus, H. (2014). Demise of the Dutch social housing tradition: Impact of budget cuts and political changes. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 29(2), 221235.

Buitelaar, E. (2007). *The Costs of Land Use Decisions: Applying Transaction Cost Economics to Planning and Development*. Oxford: Blackwell.

CBS (2012). *Historie woningbouw [History of Housing]*. Retrieved 10 July 2015, from <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=71527NED&D1=5-7&D2=a&HD=151007-1309&HDR=T&STB=G1>

CBS (2015). *Gereedgamelde woningen; doorlooptijd, projectgrootte, regio [Ready-Made Homes, Duration, Size of the Project, Region]*. Retrieved 10 July 2015, from <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=82213ned&D1=0&D2=0&D3=0&D4=a&HD=151007-1319&HDR=T&STB=G2,G1,G3>

Ekistics (2013). *Jonge planologen zoeken nieuwe rol [Young planners are searching for a new role]*. Groninger Dispuut der Planologen Ekistics, Groningen. Retrieved 10 July 2015, from <http://gdpekistics.wordpress.com/2013/06/10/jonge-planologen-zoeken-nieuwe-rol>

Elzerman, K. , & Bontje, M. (2015). Urban shrinkage in Parkstad Limburg. *European Planning Studies*, 23(1), 87103. doi:10.1080/09654313.2013.820095

Fainstein, S. (2005). Planning theory and the city. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 25(2), 121130.

Faludi, A. (1996). Framing with images. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 23(1), 93108.

Faludi, A. , & van der Valk, A. (1994). *Rule and Order Dutch Planning Doctrine in the Twentieth Century*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Forester, J. (1982). Planning in the face of power. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 48(1), 6780.

Innes, J. E. , & Booher, D. E. (2014). A turning point for planning theory? Overcoming dividing discourses. *Planning Theory*, 14(2), 195213. doi:10.1177/1473095213519356

Korthals Altes, W. (2009). Taxing land for urban containment: Reflections on a Dutch debate. *Land Use Policy*, 26(2), 233241.

- Miller, R. E. , Murphy, R. P. , Neel, W. H. , Jr., Kiser, J. A. , Mucsi, K. , & OMara, M. (2013). ITEs bicycle tour of the Netherlands: Insights and perspectives. *Institute of Transportation Engineers: ITE Journal*, 83(3), 1623.
- Molotch, H. (1976). The city as a growth machine: Toward a political economy of place. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(2), 309332.
- NEPROM (2011). Gedragscode NEPROM-Vereniging van Nederlandse Projectontwikkeling Maatschappijen, Voorburg [NEPROM Code of Conduct]. Retrieved 14 October 2015, from www.neprom.nl/neprom/downloads/NEPROM-gedragscode.pdf
- Prak, M. , & van Zanden, J. L. (2014). The Netherlands and the Polder Model: A Response. *BMGN The Low Countries Historical Review*, 129(1), 125133.
- Priemus, H. (1995). How to abolish social housing? The Dutch case. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 19(1), 145155.
- Priemus, H. (2014). Is the landlord levy a threat to the rented housing sector? The case of the Netherlands. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 14(1), 98106.
- Rauws, W. S. (2015). Why Planning Needs Complexity: Towards an Adaptive Approach for Guiding Urban and Peri-urban Transformations. *Rijksuniversiteit Groningen*.
- Stead, D. , & Taan-Kok, T. (2013). Urban resilience, climate change and land-use planning in Rotterdam. In A. Eraydin & T. Taan-Kok (Eds.), *Resilience Thinking in Urban Planning* (pp. 211227). Dordrecht: Springer.

Deregulation of the Spatial Planners Profession in Poland and the New Inconsistent System

- Feltynowski, M. (2009). *Polityka Przestrzenna Obszarów Wiejskich: W Kierunku Wielofunkcyjnego Rozwoju* [Spatial Politics of Rural Areas: Towards Multifunctional Development]. Warsaw: CeDeWu.
- Gasido, K. (1998). *Problemy Przekształcania Terenów Poprzemysłowych* [Problems of Transformation of Post-Industrial Areas]. Gliwice: Silesian University of Technology.
- Gzell, S. (2008). *Miasto Jako Przedmiot Bada Urbanistyki* [City as a Research Object of Spatial Planning]. Warsaw: KAIU, 4.
- Izdebski, H. , Nelicki, A. , & Zachariasz, I. (2007). *Zagospodarowanie Przestrzenne: Polskie Prawo na tle Standardów Demokratycznego Państwa Prawnego* [Spatial Development: Polish Law against the Standards of the Democratic Rule]. Warsaw: Ernst & Young Sprawne Państwo.
- Jaowiecki, B. (2003). *Współczesne przekształcenia struktury osadniczej i przestrzeni miejskiej* [Modern transformations of settlement structure and urban space]. In J. Koodziejewski & P. Tomasz (Eds.), *Cywilizacja Informacyjna a Przekształcenia Przestrzeni: Zmiany Strukturalne Metropolii Polskich* [Civilization and Transformation of Space: Structural Changes of Polish Metropolises] (pp. 2776). Warsaw: Wydawn. Naukowe PWN.
- Jdraszko, A. (2005). *Zagospodarowanie Przestrzenne w Polsce: Drogi i Bezdroża Planowania Ustawowego* [Spatial Planning in Poland: On and Off Road Planning]. Warszawa: Unia Metropolii Polskich.
- Lijewski, T. (1993). *Zmiany Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Polski w Latach 1945-1989* [Changes in Spatial Development in Poland During 1945-1989]. *Studia, Polska Akademia Nauk, Komitet Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju*, 101.
- Niewiadomski, Z. (1995). *Samorząd terytorialny a planowanie przestrzenne: Nowe instytucje prawne* [Report of the Polish Ministry of Infrastructure of 2007]. *Samorząd Terytorialny*, (6), 4863.
- Niewiadomski, Z. (2003). *Planowanie Przestrzenne: Zarys Systemu* [Planning System: An Outline]. Warsaw: Wydaw.
- Niewiadomski, Z. (2015). *Planowanie i Zagospodarowanie Przestrzenne: Komentarz* [Planning and Spatial Development: A Commentary]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo CH Beck.
- Pichler-Milanovic, N. , Gutry-Korycka, M. , & Rink, D. (2007). *Sprawl in the post-socialist city: The changing economic and institutional context of central and eastern European cities*. In C. Couch , L. Leontidou , & H. Petschel (Eds.), *Urban Sprawl in Europe: Landscapes, Land-Use Change and Policy* (pp. 102135). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Pobocki, K. , Mergler, L. , & Wudarski, M. (2013). *Anty-Bezradnik Przestrzenny: Prawo do Miasta w Działaniu* [Spatial Defence: The Right to the City in Action]. Warsaw: Fundacja Res Publica.
- Ileszyski, P. , Baski, J. , Degrski, M. , Komornicki, T. , & Wickowski, M. (2007). *Stan Zaawansowania Planowania Przestrzennego w Gminach* [Progress of Urban Spatial Planning in Municipalities] (Vol. 211). Warsaw: IGI PAN.

leszyski, P. , Komornicki, T. , Solon, J. , & Wickowski, M. (2012). Planowanie Przestrzenne w Gminach [Spatial Planning in Municipalities]. Warsaw: IGI PAN.

Sodczyk, J. (2003). Przestrze Miasta i jej Przeobraenia [Transformations of Urban Space]. Opole: Studia i Monografie/Uniwersytet Opolski.

Wcawowicz, G. (2006). Przestrzenne Zagospodarowanie Polski na Pocztku XXI Wieku [Spatial Development of Poland at the Beginning of the 21st Century] (Vol. 6). Warsaw: PAN IGI PAN.

Wcawowicz, G. (2009). Charakterystyka Gwnych Trendw i Zmian w Rozwoju Obszarw Miejskich Polski [Characteristics of Major Trends and Changes in Urban Development in Poland] (No. 9). Warsaw: Przegląd OCDE Krajowej Polityki Miejskiej w Polsce.

Planning Pedagogy and Practices in Transition

Alexander, E. R. (2015). There is no planning only planning practices: Notes for spatial planning theories. *Planning Theory*, 15(1), 91103. doi:10.1177/1473095215594617

Binder, G. (2012). Theory(izing)/practice: The model of recursive cultural adaptation. *Planning Theory*, 11(3), 221241.

Bristow, R. (2010). *Planning in Taiwan: Spatial Planning in the Twenty-First Century*. London: Routledge.

Campbell, S. (1996). Green cities, growing cities, just cities? Urban planning and the contradictions of sustainable development. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 62(3), 296312. doi:10.1080/01944369608975696

Campbell, S. (forthcoming) Is progress no longer progressive? Reclaiming the ideology of progress in planning, manuscript solicited for the lead Longer View article in the *Journal of the American Planning Association (JAPA)*. Paper under second round of revisions

Chapin, F. S. (1965). *Urban Land-Use Planning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Chen, L.-C. (2015). Interview with Liang-Chuang Chen. In J.-Y. Hsu , Y.-H. Liao , & T.-Q. Lin (Eds.), *Towards the Ideal of a Generalist Professional: Interviews with Members of Building and Planning* (pp. 354357). Taipei: Taishe.

Chen, S.-C. (2011). [Historical research on the Urban Planning Act presented by Urban and Housing Development Committee (UHDC) and UN Advisor Group] (In Chinese only). *Journal of Environment & Art*, 9, 4767.

Chou, T.-L. (2010). Institutional evolution and the challenge of urban planning in post-industrial Taiwan. In R. Bristow (Ed.), *Planning in Taiwan: Spatial Planning in the Twenty-First Century* (pp. 7496). London & New York: Routledge.

Davidoff, P. (1965). Advocacy and pluralism in planning. *Journal of the American Institution of Planners*, 31(4), 544555.

Ferraro, G. (1996). Planning as creative interpretation. In S. J. Mandelbaum (Ed.), *Explorations in Planning Theory* (pp. 312327). Rutgers, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How It Can Succeed Again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Friedmann, J. (1987). *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hua, C.-I. (2010). Land problems, planning failure, and the pending National Land Planning Law. In R. Bristow (Ed.), *Planning in Taiwan: Spatial Planning in the Twenty-First Century* (pp. 5173). London & New York: Routledge.

Huang, J.-M. (2015). VtCbl [Five teachers, five sentences!]. In J.-Y. Hsu , Y.-H. Liao , & C.-K. Lin (Eds.), () [Interviews with members of the Graduate Institute of Building and Planning (1)] (Vol. 2, pp. 260266) (In Chinese only). Taipei: Tangshan.

Lennon, M. (2015). Finding purpose in planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 35(1), 6375.

Lin, S. , & Kao, C. (2015). [Planning the City: Post-War Development of Taipei City] (In Chinese only). Taipei: Garden City.

Liu, L.-W. (2007). Local connection and international participation: A teaching experiment and preliminary practice on real-world problem-solving, intercollegiate competition and collaboration and transnational interactive learning (In Chinese only). *Journal of City and Planning*, 34(4), 363383.

Perloff, H. S. (1957). *Education for Planning: City, State, and Regional*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sorensen, A. , & Funck, C. (2007). *Living Cities in Japan: Citizens Movements, Machizukuri and Local Environments*. London: Routledge.

- Tzeng, S.-J. (2015). [The end point, or starting point of new possibility]. In J.-Y. Hsu , Y.-H. Liao , & C.-K. Lin (Eds.), () [Interviews with Members of the Graduate Institute of Building and Planning (1)] (Vol. 2, pp. 244249) (In Chinese only). Taipei: Tangshan Publisher.
- Wang, H.-K. (2007). [Sustainable planning and professional design education in the context of transforming Taiwan] (In Chinese only). International Symposium on Planning and Design Education, 112.
- Wang, H.-K. (2011). [Sustainable planning and professional design education in the context of transforming Taiwan] (In Chinese only).Journal of Building and Planning, 17, 115.

A Quest for a Critical Debate and New Ideas

- Albrechts, L. (1991). Changing roles and position of planners. *Urban Studies*, 28(1), 141155.
- Albrechts, L. (1999). Planners as catalysts and initiators of change: The new structure plan for Flanders. *European Planning Studies*, 7(5), 587603. doi:10.1080/0965431 9908720540
- Albrechts, L. (2002). The planning community reflects on enhancing public involvement: Views from academics and reflective practitioners. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 3(3), 331347. doi:10.1080/1464935022000019563
- Albrechts, L. (2010). More of the same is not enough! How could strategic spatial planning be instrumental in dealing with the challenges ahead? *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 37(6), 11151127. doi:10.1068/b36068
- Albrechts, L. (2012). Reframing strategic spatial planning by using a coproduction perspective. *Planning Theory*, 12(1), 4663. doi:10.1177/1473095212452722
- Albrechts, L. (2015). Ingredients for a more radical strategic spatial planning. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 42(3), 510525. doi:10.1068/b130104p
- Albrechts, L. , & Lievois, G. (2004). The Flemish diamond: Urban network in the making? *European Planning Studies*, 12(3), 351370. doi:10.1080/0965431042000195038
- Allmendinger, P. , & Haughton, G. (2010). The future of spatial planning: Why less may be more. *Town & Country Planning*, July/August, 326328.
- Allmendinger, P. , & Haughton, G. (2015). Post-political regimes in English planning. In J. Metzger , P. Allmendinger , & S. Oosterlynyck (Eds.), *Planning against the Political: Democratic Deficits in European Territorial Governance* (pp. 2953). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Brand, R. , & Gaffikin, F. (2007). Collaborative Planning in an Uncollaborative World. *Planning Theory*, 6(3), 282313. doi:10.1177/1473095207082036
- Chia, R. (1999). A rhizomic model of organizational change and transformation: Perspective from a metaphysics of change. *British Journal of Management*, 10, 209227.
- Etzioni, A. (1971). *The Active Society: A Theory of Societal and Political Processes*. London: Collier Macmillan.
- Forester, J. (2010). Foreword. In M. Cerreta , G. Concilio , & V. Monno (Eds.), *Making Strategies in Spatial Planning* (pp. viii). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Friedmann, J. (1987). *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Friedmann, J. (1992). *Empowerment: The Politics of Alternative Development*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 294 Hajer, M. A. (1995). *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hamdi, N. (2004). *Small Change: About the Art of Practice and the Limits of Planning in Cities*. London: Earthscan.
- Harvey, D. (1973). *Social Justice and the City*. London: Arnold.
- Harvey, D. (1989). From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: The transformation in urban governance in Late Capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 71(1), 317. doi:10.2307/490503
- Healey, P. (1997). *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Healey, P. (2003). Collaborative planning in perspective. *Planning Theory*, 2(2), 101123. doi:10.1177/14730952030022002
- Healey, P. (2005). Network complexity and the imaginative power of strategic spatial planning. In L. Albrechts & S. Mandelbaum (Eds.), *The Network Society: A New Context for Planning?* (pp. 146160). New York: Routledge.
- Healey, P. (2006). Relational complexity and the imaginative power of strategic spatial planning. *European Planning Studies*, 14(4), 525546. doi:10.1080/09654310500421196

- Healey, P. (2010). *Making Better Places. The Planning Project for the Twenty-First Century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hillier, J. (2002). *Shadows of Power: An Allegory of Prudence in Land-Use Planning*. London: Routledge.
- Hutcheon, L. (1987). The politics of postmodernism: Parody and history. *Cultural Critique*, 5, 179207.
- Jencks, C. (1985). *Modern Movements in Architecture*. New York: Viking Press.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading Change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kotter, J. P. (2008). *A Sense of Urgency*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kotter, J. P. , & Rathgeber, H. (2005). *Our Iceberg Is Melting: Changing and Succeeding Under Any Conditions*. New York: St. Martins Press.
- Krumholz, N. , & Forester, J. (1990). *Making Equity Planning Work: Leadership in the Public Sector (Conflicts in Urban & Regional Development)*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Lipietz, A. (1977). *Le Capital et son Espace [Capital and Space]*. Paris: Maspro.
- Metzger, J. (2013). Placing the stakes: The enactment of territorial stakeholders in planning processes. *Environment and Planning A*, 45(4), 781796. doi:10.1068/a45116
- Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the Political: Thinking in Action*. New York: Routledge.
- Ogilvy, J. A. (2002). *Creating Better Futures: Scenario Planning as a Tool for a Better Tomorrow*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olesen, K. (2011). *Strategic Spatial Planning in Transition: Case Study of Denmark* (PhD dissertation). Aalborg University, Department of Development, Planning.
- Olesen, K. (2012). *The Neoliberalisation of Strategic Planning*. Paper presented at the AESOP 26th Annual Congress, Ankara, Turkey, 1115 July 2012.
- Olesen, K. , & Richardson, T. (2012). Strategic planning in transition: Contested rationalities and spatial logics in twenty-first century Danish planning experiments. *European Planning Studies*, 20(10), 16891706.
- Ozbekhan, H. (1969). Towards a general theory of planning. In E. Jantsch (Ed.), *Perspectives of Planning* (pp. 45155). Paris: OECD.
- 295 Peck, J. , & Tickell, A. (2002). Neoliberalizing space. *Antipode*, 34(3), 380404. doi:10.1111/1467-8330.00247
- Purcell, M. (2009). Resisting neoliberalization: Communicative planning or counter-hegemonic movements? *Planning Theory*, 8(2), 140165.
- Sager, T. (2012). *Reviving Critical Planning Theory: Dealing with Pressure, Neo-liberalism, and Responsibility in Communicative Planning*. London: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203104187
- Sandercock, L. (1998). *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Schn, D. (1971). *Beyond the Stable State: Public and Private Learning in a Changing Society*. London: Maurice Temple Smith.
- Swyngedouw, E. , Moulaert, F. , & Rodriguez, A. (2002). Neoliberal urbanization in Europe: Large-scale urban development projects and the new urban policy. *Antipode*, 34(3), 542577.
- Zizek, S. (1999). *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology*. London: Verso.

Editors Reflections and Conclusions

- Barr, D. A. (1972). The professional urban planner. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 38(3), 155159. doi:10.1080/01944367208977599
- Batuman, B. (2008). Organic intellectuals of urban politics? Turkish urban professionals as political agents, 196080. *Urban Studies*, 45(9), 19251946.
- Campbell, H. (2012). Planning ethics and rediscovering the idea of planning. *Planning Theory*, 11(4), 379399.
- Carvalho, H. (2016). Planning as a political tool for urban and social reforms. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 632635.
- Desmet, M. , De Blust, S. , & Devos, T. (2016). From activists to social entrepreneurs, and back? *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 635638.
- De Souza, M. L. (2006). Social movements as critical urban planning agents. *City*, 10(3), 327342.
- Forester, J. (1999). *The Deliberative Practitioner: Encouraging Participatory Planning Processes*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.

- Howe, E. , & Kaufman, J. (1979). The ethics of contemporary American planners. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 45(3), 243-255.
- Lauria, M. , & Long, M. (2017). Planning experience and planners ethics. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 83(2), 202-220. doi:10.1080/01944363.2017.1286946
- Lothan, H. (2016). The road taken. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 628-632.
- Ozdemir, E. , & Taan-Kok, T. (2018). Planners role in accommodating disagreements of citizens: The case of Dutch urban planning. *Urban Studies*, 119. doi: 10.1177/0042098017726738
- Penpeciolu, M. , & Taan-Kok, T. (2016). Alienated and politicized? Young planners confrontation with entrepreneurial and authoritarian state intervention in urban development in Turkey. *European Planning Studies*, 24, 1037-2016.
- Raco, M. , & Savini, F. (Eds.) (forthcoming). *A New Technocracy? Landscapes of Knowledge in Contemporary Cities*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Sager, T. (2009). Planners role: Torn between dialogical ideals and neo-liberal realities. *European Planning Studies*, 17(1), 65-84.
- Taan-Kok, T. , Bertolini, L. , Oliveira e Costa, S. , Lothan, H. , Carvalho, H. , Desmet, M. , Ahmad, P. (2016). Float like a butterfly, sting like a bee: Giving voice to planning practitioners. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 621-651. doi:10.1080/14649357.2016.1225711

Afterword

- Forester, J. (forthcoming). Deliberative democracy, not smothering invention. In A. Bachtiger , J. S. Dryzek , J. Mansbridge , & M. E. Warren (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Murdoch, I. (1970). *The Sovereignty of Good*. New York: Blackwell.
- Sacks, O. (2015). *On the Move: A Life*. London: Pan MacMillan.
- Schn, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.