

Is there still gender on the agenda for spatial planning theories?

Attempt to an integrative approach to generate gender-sensitive planning theories

Abstract:

The objective of this article is to emphasise the importance of integrating a gender perspective in the planning sciences to advance planning theories. We will first debate how gender issues are integrated into planning practice and theory. At the beginning we refer to the article of Sandercock and Forsyth 'A gender agenda – new directions for planning theory' (Sandercock, Forsyth 1992). We will deal with the question of how gender issues are received in the European mainstream of handbooks on planning theory. Furthermore, we will discuss why and how gender perspectives are to be integrated into planning to bridge the gap between gender-sensitive and mainstream approaches to planning theory. We outline why gender planning has to be an integrative planning approach by linking to the integrative approaches of Mitchell (2008, 2009) and Wilber (2001, 2011). In particular, we want to highlight that integrative thinking is a basic idea of gender planning. Furthermore, we describe how gender planning can be a catalyst for valuable integrative approaches in planning which, up to hitherto, have been less recognised than the mainstream approaches.

1. Introduction

The objective of this article is to promote the integration of a gender perspective in planning sciences¹ (gender planning) as a necessary approach to build up comprehensive spatial planning theories. Assuming gender planning to be an integral part of spatial development requires a more explicit consideration of gender [...] in both how planning is delivered and in its wider impact' (Burgess 2008:112). Especially, it means building an understanding of the different perspectives and interests of women and men as users and user groups, considering gender, as well as age, life situation and ethnic, cultural and social backgrounds, as an analytical tool to balance multiple differences and equality. In this regard, it focuses on the integration of gender equality as well as equity in all stages of the planning process reaching from the formulation of objectives via the planning of measures to their implementation and evaluation. In addition it is crucial to question the planning models and the values and attitudes underlying the planning philosophy and planning culture with

¹ The planning sciences are understood to be the following disciplines, which are usually separated from each other: architecture and urban design, civil engineering, environmental planning, geography, landscape architecture and planning, spatial planning, town and country planning, traffic planning, urban planning (definition according to Dörhöfer 1994).

regards to gender equality (Tummers, Zibell 2012, Damyanovic 2013). Historically, gender in planning sciences is a political desideratum based on a long history of emancipation starting with the women's progress during the French Revolution in 1789 and continuing with the beginnings of a socially-organised movement around 1848 until the rise and fall in the 20th century, the dawn of a new feminism after 1970 and the change of gender relations at the beginning of the 21st century (Gerhard 2012).

The key questions which determine the structure of this article are the following: To what extent the gender-perspective has been integrated in planning sciences, theory and practice so far? What approaches do authors like Mitchell and Wilber, who are seeking for an integrative conduct of research, suggest for integrating complex, cross-sectional topics like gender? And how can these approaches be applied in planning theory and practice?

Feminist theory and practice in particular have much to contribute to both planning theory and planning practice (e.g. Schneider 1989, 1998, Sandercock, Forsyth 1992, Ritzdorf 1992, Campbell, Fainstein 1996, Wotha 2000, Damyanovic 2007). On this basis, we will first debate² if and how feminist and gender issues are integrated into planning practice and theory. The starting point for the analysis is the article of Sandercock and Forsyth 'A gender agenda – new directions for planning theory' (Sandercock, Forsyth 1992). We will deal with the question of how gender issues are received in the European mainstream of handbooks on planning theory. In doing so, we will refer to 'Planning in Crisis? (Planung in der Krise?)' by Schönwandt (2008, 2002) and to 'Planning Theory' by Allmendinger (2002). Furthermore, we will discuss why gender perspectives are to be integrated into planning to bridge the gap between gender-sensitive and mainstream approaches to planning theory. In this process, we will create a context for the integrative approaches of Mitchell (2008, 2009) and Wilber (2001, 2011). Mitchell developed the cognitive method of an 'integrative pluralism', characterised by pluralism, pragmatism and dynamics of knowledge, which provide opportunities to develop the potential for innovative cognitive processes by widening the dialogue and superimposing different theoretical approaches. 'Complexity [...] is not beyond understanding; it requires new ways of understanding' (Mitchell 2009:13). Wilber, in his integrative approach, shows the strengths of various ideological and philosophical schools of thought and develops a theoretical framework encompassing various traditions in a comprehensive culture theory. It is intended to demonstrate that integrative thinking could be helpful to underpin a basic concept of gender planning and that gender planning offers important integrative theoretical approaches to spatial planning and development work so far dominated by the malestream.

²'Debate' is used in preference to 'argumentation' as a more collaborative and positive word (Healey 1992).

2. To what extent has the gender-perspective been integrated in planning sciences, theory and practice so far?

Since the 1970s, increased attention has been focused on gender in relation to planning practice and – with less effort, however, – to planning theory (Sandercock, Forsyth 1992). At the beginning of the 1990s, Sandercock and Forsyth already mentioned this fact in their article ‘A gender agenda – new directions for planning theory’. Furthermore, they postulate that gender-sensitive theories could contribute to research in planning practice and education. Finally, they claim to concentrate a gender research agenda for planning theory where feminist theory has had little influence: *practical and strategic gender interests, the balance between multiple differences and equality, case studies of planning practise, gender in the internal culture of planners and a gender-conscious reform of planning education* (ibid.). In the following paragraph, we focus on the first three important topics for a gender agenda introduced by Sandercock and Forsyth in order to give directions to planning sciences and on their importance to foster knowledge creation for gender-sensitive planning theories. ‘We therefore believe that theory can inform practice, it tries to make sense of the seemingly unrelated, contradictory aspects of urban development and to create a framework within which to compare and evaluate the merits of different planning ideas and strategies’ (Fainstein, Campbell 2012: 3).

Sandercock and Forsyth (1992) argued that ‘feminist theory, unlike more academic theories, is related to and grows out of feminist practice. We assume also that feminist and gender planning is related to and grows out of approaches to feminist and gender planning practice. ‘In this light – theory represents cumulative professional knowledge’, as Campbell and Fainstein (1996: 2) state. Furthermore, we agree with the authors that ‘an account of attempts to politicize gender issues in planning, followed by a theorizing of the successes and failures’ is necessary. ‘Theory allows for both professional and intellectual self-reflection’ (Campbell, Fainstein 1996: 3).

2.1. Practical (needs) and strategic gender interests as an analytical concept

The first topic concerns the **practical (needs) and strategic gender interests**. Firstly, feminist researchers in developing countries distinguished practical and strategic gender interests to discuss gender planning (Molyneux 1985, Moser, Levy 1989). From the gender perspective in the planning sciences, this distinction is supportive to bridge the practise - research gap. ‘The differentiation between meeting practical and strategic gender needs as the objective of gender planning provides a critical analytical tool for answering this question for gender planning methodology and practice’ (Moser, Levy 1986: 16)

Meeting practical gender needs is important for supporting the everyday life situations of everybody, women and men. Indeed, various feminist researchers in planning sciences identify that the Everyday Life approach (Lefèbvre 1961, 1971) is a useful bridging concept for the evaluation of the quality of built environment and open spaces, considering gender issues in spatial sciences (Horelli et al. 2000, Larsson 2006, Jarvis et al. 2009). The Everyday Life approach as it has been further developed for example by Scandinavian authors in the early 1980s) 'is more than a theory or a critique. It is also a vision of a more harmonious society in which people are at the centre of all concerns rather than the pursuit of the quick economic fix' (Horelli et al. 2000:9).

Meeting strategic gender needs will challenge the asymmetric power relationship between women and men in the sense of gender equality. Indeed, gender in planning sciences means also internalising the planning philosophies, which support a democratic relationship between women and men (Moser, Levy 1986, Zibell 2009). In particular, in order to understand the complexity of gender and planning, it is crucial to analyse the connectivity between the real and the imaginary/symbolic dimension (Harding 1986, 1991, Frank 2003, Damyanovic 2007). This means understanding the underlying values of guiding principles geared towards the image of hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1999).

These ideas – referring to the hegemonic masculinity in planning sciences – mostly exclude the holistic concept of the Everyday Life (e.g. Lefèbvre , 1961, 1971, Jarvis et al. 2009) or the Spatial Justice (Just City) approach (e.g. Soja 2010, Dufaux et al. 2008, Soja 2010, Marcuse et al. 2010, Fainstein 2012). 'The aim is to balance the production-centred mode of thinking and acting into one in which production serves the reproduction of human beings, nature and culture, and not vice versa' (Horelli, Wallin 2013: 233). This objective is also pursued in the feminist debate on sustainability. Biesecker and Hofmeister (2013), for example, introduce the category of (re)productivity in order to overcome the dividing structure of production and reproduction. This is accompanied not only by a deconstruction of power relationships, but also by a re-evaluation of domestic and care work regarded as marginal and inferior within capitalistic and patriarchal structures of society. This way care work – paid and unpaid – turns into an integral part of man-made economy. Therefore, a sustainable change towards gender equality in spatial planning must be rooted in the deconstruction and redefinition of values which produce inequality between women and men according to their conception of life, chosen respectively forced life style and actual life stage as well as social, cultural and ethnic background. Furthermore, this requires researchers, decision makers or planning administrative authorities to seek common normative certainties in planning and to recognise and identify the underlying symbolic dimension (Sandercock, Forsyth 1992, Wotha 2000, Damyanovic 2007, Sánchez de Madariaga 2013).

2.2. The balance between multiple differences and equality for gender-conscious planning

Women and men, young and older people have different requirements as regards space (Spitthöver 1989, Buchmüller, Zibell 1993, Flade, Kustor-Hüttl 1995, Nissen 1998, Dörhöfer, Terlinden 1998, Löw 2001, 2008, Damyanovic et al. 2013). 'Taking account of the systematic differences among women, as well as the systematic differences among women and the men in their various communities, is an important task for gender-conscious planning' (Sandercock, Forsyth 1992: 55). An important aspect of the integration of gender in planning theory is to build an understanding of the different needs of users, considering their sex, age and way of life as well as their ethnic, cultural and social backgrounds (e.g. Ritzdorf 1992, Zibell 2006). The varying needs depend on the respective working situation and living conditions of people. Alongside the traditional 'normal family' of father, mother and two children, within the last 25 years there have evolved households where persons are living alone, childless couples, same-sex couples, single parents and patchwork families, *LAT* (living apart together) *couples* and *families* with several places of residence and commuting family members, as well as living communities of every age. This diversification in ways of living is also producing diversification in work, residential, leisure as well as consumer needs and habits. Users of space differ in terms of sex, age, time budget, state of mobility and group-specific activities. These are, at the same time, the indicators that define the time management and mobility potentials for women and men (e.g. Studer 2002, Knoll 2008, Sánchez de Madariaga 2013). The role ascriptions in society and the traditional distribution of labour in families still have a decisive impact on the needs of women and men as regards spatial structures. However, demographic change will also exert a major influence on this development. Mostly women still have to combine housework, family work and paid work. They look after children or persons in need of care, manage the household, are gainfully employed and undertake all the trips related to these duties. If planning efforts are to succeed in providing a better quality of life for women and men, it is imperative to include the principles of gender and diversity awareness in planning theories.

2.3. Learning from case studies and practice

There are two main development lines of the feminist approach that have influenced the practical planning debate of the last 20 years. The first current is the 'promoting women-centred planning', the second is the 'gender-aware planning approach'. In this paragraph, we refer mostly to the experiences of the German-speaking countries. But we recognised similar experiences in other European countries like e.g. Finland, England, the Netherlands, Italy

(Horelli et al. 2000, Greed 1994, Libreria delle donne di Milano, 1989, 1996, Berglund et al. 2013).

2.3.1 Promoting women-centred planning – Planning for and by women

Public and semi-public spaces created to promote women's autonomy, such as women-only cafés, women-only libraries, women-only housing, women's refuges etc., have been the expression of the New Women's Movement since the 1960s. In this period, the planning debate in the German-speaking countries was characterised by women-specific planning (*frauenspezifische Planung*), later divided into planning fair to women (*frauengerechte*) and women-friendly planning (*frauenfreundliche Planung*), the first one with a pretension of emancipation and optionality for women as how to live their lives, the second one with the idea of facilitating female everyday life as housewife and mother (e.g Becker 1997, Grüger 2000, Protze 2009).

The results and products of this approach have been criteria for women-centred planning in housing, transport planning, open space planning, participatory planning as well as safety in public space (e.g. Schröder, Zibell 2004, Sailer 2004, Zibell, Schröder 2007, Kail, Irschik 2013, Roberts 2013). At the same time, there was also fundamental criticism of planning explicitly for women. It was argued that it contributes to a consolidation of existing gender relations instead of changing them in the sense of gender equality and optional conduct of living for both sexes (Becker 1997).

Indeed, the question remains whether women-centred planning is only just as good as conventional planning or whether it has also a wider emancipatory impact. There is still gender inequality concerning the distribution of paid and unpaid work between women and men as well as equal payment for equal work. In their research, Pascall and Lewis (2004) demonstrated that equal treatment across the five levels of political intervention (voice, paid work, incomes, care work, time) has not been achieved in any of the European countries studied. Sanchez de Madariaga (2013: 329) argues that 'recognizing and making visible unpaid work in the city, giving and effectively improving the physical environment in which it is performed, can be a powerful means for transforming gender relations in the longer term, above and beyond providing short term improvement to women's lives'.

We conclude that this practical approach contributes significantly to define and analyse practical needs and strategic interests as well as to analyse the balance between multiple differences and equality to create a framework of gender planning theories. These practical debates differentiate between women and men as concerns their different life situations, needs and requirements. Furthermore, these practical experiences make the complexity of differences visible and lead to the intersectionality discourse which introduces further

categories such as age, race, class, ethnic background and sexual orientation (e.g. Knapp et al. 2007, Bauriedl et al. 2010). However, gender is still to be considered a key factor for discrimination (Ritzdorf 1992). 'And it has proved to be, among the many possible factors for these reasons for discrimination, the most resistant to change across time and space' (Sanchez de Madariaga 2013:330).

2.3.2 Gender-aware/sensitive planning – Gender mainstreaming in planning

The Europe-wide introduction of gender mainstreaming by the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1998 had an important influence on gender issues in planning. Referring to this Treaty, the new approach to gender planning is subsequently more characterised by a top-down strategy than the women-centered approach described previously, which had been formed spontaneously and dynamically – backed by the critical feminist theory and as bottom-up movement based on subjective experience and concern.

Suddenly there was a legal requirement calling for action respectively for an extended course of action from a gender perspective. Especially for the planning practice this was an incisive change; just like the women's representatives increasingly turned into equal opportunity commissioners, in critical feminist planning sciences the gender approach had to be integrated into practice and the concepts of planning theory (Grüger, Zibell 2005).

Strategies such as gender mainstreaming remain necessary in order to give expression to the political aims of equality and equal treatment. The implementation of gender mainstreaming as a governmental strategy has somewhat advanced the consideration of gender issues in spatial planning (e.g. Wotha 2000, Larsson 2006, Zibell 2006, Damyanovic 2007, Schröder 2009). The gender perspective in planning means to define and evaluate gender differences which are always born out of a specific societal and cultural context.

In principle, the introduction of gender mainstreaming on a European Union level has led to a new rise of questions on planning culture; as can be seen in all international and transnational projects (e.g. Interreg Project GenderAlp!), a differentiated approach from the individual national contexts is important in order to understand planning (in theory and practice) and to be able to make comparisons between the countries (and regions).

2.4. How is the current knowledge on gender reflected in planning theory?

Two popular books on planning theories in Europe are Allmendinger (2002) planning theory and Schönwandt (2002, 2008) planning in crisis. They describe the current landscape of planning theory and develop a similar typology of different kinds of theories (i.e. rational,

marxist, neo-liberal, communicative, collaborative, equity and advocate planning). Although they discuss similar planning issues in similar contexts it becomes evident that the thought pattern behind the argumentations are not the same due to different planning systems and culture. First of all, this means that planning theories are context-specific and context-dependent, i.e. embedded in various social, legal, normative conditions. Furthermore, planning theories have to be thought about, developed and written on the basis of the national cultural contexts prior to a possible integration.

Secondly, not only planning systems and planning cultures are context-dependent; also the matter of planning itself shows a lack of transferability. Rittel (1972) already came to the conclusion that planning problems are unique and – unlike problems in natural sciences – cannot easily be transferred to other problem cases. Consequently, there is neither an ‘objective description of a problem’ nor are there ‘optimal solutions’ (Rittel 1972, Rittel, Webber 1973, Schönwandt 2002). Rittel mainly criticises the technocratic planning models used in the 1960s/1970s, which did not include sociopolitically-oriented planning methods (Schönwandt 2002). Schönwandt argues that Rittel’s planning model brought a fundamental turnaround for planning sciences. For the first time, planning is placed on a philosophical-scientific footing. This turnaround was an expression of the former paradigm shift, which also did not exclude the new planning discipline and which revealed the importance of values in planning (Schönwandt 2002). Gender respectively women’s issues, however, remained disregarded in this context although they already found their way into scientific thinking at the same time. In his analysis of different planning approaches, which he identifies as a basis for different theoretical approaches in planning, Schönwandt concludes that planning theory/theories has/have to be further developed in order to be able to integrate the many existing approaches described by him as coherently as possible and to put them in a systematic context. In order to develop such a systematic overview of planning theory/theories, he establishes an extended model of thought. Compared to the planning models mentioned previously, this model – developed on the basis of the Uexküllian functional circle³ – is founded on two perspectives: the world of planning and the world of everyday life. Schönwandt defines the world of planning as the organisational conditions and the approaches which form the conceptual background of developing a planning task. The world of everyday life is defined as the world in which the world of planning is embedded. To conclude, this approach intends to show that planning stakeholders who act in organisations form together with their respective intellectual world (methods, terms, theories, world views etc.) a so-called world of planning, which is placed in the context of everyday life and is able

³ The Uexküll model is a biological theory, which describes a system – environment (“Umwelt”) paradigm. (Uexküll 1928/1973). This paradigm is the fundament of what Jakob von Uexküll called “function-circle”, a feedback loop. Schönwandt developed this model further and translated it into a planning model (Schönwandt 2002).

to perceive only specific problems as planning issues (Schönwandt 2002). This model of thought would be ideally suited for drawing conclusions from the (structural) presence or absence of stakeholders in the world of planning also with regard to gender-sensitive planning approaches.

Both authors of the planning handbooks cited above come to the conclusion that there are different theoretical approaches to planning, which are likewise applied in the world of the planners (Allmendinger 2002, Schönwandt 2002). 'We can see how theories are not homogeneous, perform different roles and come in different shapes and sizes' (Allmendinger 2002: 11). Both planning handbooks, however, do not contain any statement on gender issues in their context of planning theory and also do not perceive them as a relevant perspective, although urban planning academics in fact already dealt with this topic at that time.

In 'Readings of Planning' Campbell and Fainstein (1996) debate that gender has emerged as a powerful and transforming theme in urban planning in the recent years. The topics include the differing use of urban space, the safety aspect in the city or the increasing number of women entering the labour force. The selected articles in this book examine how feminist approaches could an important influence on changing planning theory and theories. From the 1980s onwards, feminist academics in the Western world have claimed the inclusion of gender issues in urban planning, and feminist planning has called for the non-sexist city (e.g. Hayden 1981, Rodenstein 1994) or the gendered city (e.g. Roberts 1991, Greed 1994, Massey 1994). However, these new approaches had no or only little impact on the mainstream of planning theory debate.

Later, in 2005, Fainstein and Servon brought together the most important writings on gender planning of the last twenty-five years. The book offers practical consideration as well as theoretical perspectives on gender issues in planning. Fainstein (2005), for example, describes the correlation between feminism and planning in her article 'Feminism and Planning. Theoretical Issues'. She discusses the feminist planning and the difficulties raised by the critique for feminism and for planning. Her proposed solution is to integrate the concept into a mainstream discussion by means of the Just City concept, which is based on the equity planning concept presented in both planning handbooks cited above as an approach to planning theory, which, however, is not linked to gender-sensitive concepts there. This link, though, has already been created by Christine Bauhardt (2003), political scientist, in introducing for the first time essential planning theory elements of the gender debate of the English-speaking countries also into the German-speaking context. The theoretical and methodological reflections on the practical experiences gained from the implementation of gender mainstreaming were subsequently published in the German-

speaking countries (e.g. Damyanovic 2007, Schröder 2009) as well as in the English-speaking countries (e.g. Greed 2005, Burgess 2008). Especially the new book 'Fair Shared Cities' summarises a variety of different articles on the implementation of the gender mainstreaming policies in several European countries with a focus on urban and spatial planning (Sánchez de Madariaga; Roberts 2013). Considering this, the question arises how these innovative discourses based on feminist tradition can successfully be used for the creation of new approaches to planning theory and be integrated into the mainstream of planning theory.

3. What approaches do authors like Mitchell and Wilber, who are seeking for an integrative conduct of research, suggest for integrating complex, cross-sectional topics like gender?

There is obviously a wide (research and thinking / perception) gap between theory and practice. Gender as a specific concept, in science and in political practice as well as in spatial planning in general, is not yet an integral part of scientific theories or planning practice. The question is, how the various directions of thought can be brought together. Possible concepts, which generally rely on an equality of the many existing approaches, are independently introduced – in completely different contexts and against the background of different scientific traditions of thought – by Sandra D. Mitchell (2008), natural scientist, and Ken Wilber (2011), cultural theoretician. These two concepts are summarised below in order to finally be able to identify some ways out of the dilemma and to contribute to overcome the gap between gender knowledge and perception.

The integrative pluralism of S. D. Mitchell results from the strengths and the inadequacies of more rigid, unitary and simple models of science (Mitchell 2008, 2009), which does not take into account the complexity of the world. From the fact that the traditional perspectives of Newtonian science that have predominated up to now – and thus also the complexities of the natural world – were called into question by the physics of the 20th century, she deduces the necessity of extending and reconsidering our epistemological framework (Mitchell 2008, 2009). Even if she does this as a scientist from the specific epistemological perspective, her approach is also of relevance to solution-oriented (technology and engineering sciences) or impulse-driven (art and architecture) or action-oriented (planning and social sciences) disciplines as these are certainly all frequently based on specific modes of understanding and – in planning and political practice – are used without being consciously thought out.

The epistemological method of integrative pluralism developed by Mitchell (2008, 2009) is characterised by three features: pluralism, pragmatism and dynamic. Pluralism here means

the assumption that there are not several worlds, but several correct ways of analysing the world, in which a distinction must be made between diverse subjects and processes which reflect both the causal structures and the interests of those involved. Pragmatism relates to the standards through which one of the many truths about the world finds its way into scientific knowledge. As one and the same aspect of a causal structure can accurately be described by several representations, according to Mitchell it depends on 'pragmatic' interests, i.e. on the question as to which objectives can be achieved by the use of a representation, whether a certain representation is accepted for a particular inquiry or action (Mitchell 2008, 2009). And the dynamic (of knowledge advancement) relates ultimately to the gradually developing nature of each piece of knowledge which takes the place of immovable universality: While the universe developed and life on earth evolved, new causal structures arose, too. Therefore, according to Mitchell, there is good reason to accept that the division of labour, a key element of social development, originally occurred by interaction and advanced further through natural selection onto ever higher organisational levels (Mitchell 2008, 2009).

This thought is also expressed by Wilber (2001, 2011) in the form of the nesting of ever-more comprehensive holons⁴ resulting from the 'Great Chain of Being'. Wilber assumes that the consciousness of humanity unfolds in an evolutionary process characterised by an increase in wholeness and integrity. Each more comprehensive link in the great chain of existence represents an increase in unity and supreme identity of Spirit at least (Wilber 2001, 2011). In this way, according to Wilber, all known development and evolution processes are accomplished hierarchically and asymmetrically, i.e. irreversibly or by a sequence of increasingly holistic steps, for example, from molecules through cells, organs, systems of organs and organisms to societies. This applies to both cognitive as well as moral development, in both male and female (Wilber 2001, 2011). Individuals and societies are characterised by this form of evolutionary expansion of knowledge; in the healthy organism previous consciousness is not separated off, but integrated into the more recent consciousness in each case. Each new way of thinking, each new concept is in this sense tested and incorporated into the world of knowledge. Of course, objectives and interests of human beings or cultures are in this context also of relevance to the direction in which consciousness can develop.

Wilber develops his 'integration by differentiation' approach by using the systems of knowledge which have emerged over centuries in the wake of predominantly patriarchally-

⁴ "Holons": the word was coined by Arthur Koestler to indicate wholes that are simultaneously parts of other wholes: a whole quark is part of a whole atom; a whole atom is part of whole molecule; a whole molecule is part of the whole cell; a whole cell is part of a whole organism. (...) In other words, we live in a universe that consists neither of wholes nor of parts, but of whole/parts, or holons' (Wilber, 2011: 90).

structured societies. Here, the knowledge of feminist science is not taken into account. Wilber, however, proposes to make use of the integrative approach also in respect to the various movements of feminist perception with the objective of an integral feminism combining the various traditions of thought which can strike a chord with male and female theoreticians equally (Wilber 2001).

If we consider, against the background of these two approaches, the integration of the feminist perspective into sciences – or here: into planning theory and practice –, which has not been completed yet, we touch upon the equivalence or hierarchy of concepts by which these are treated in the science system. Accepting the feminist perspective as an integral component of available knowledge could contribute to increased insight and an enhanced progress of history. The feminist perspective strives towards the equal relationship of individuals who are principally all of equal value. The consideration of the feminine as the second, other sex has been overtaken by social developments. The unfolding of democratic systems in a service- and knowledge-based society requires cooperation based on partnership in the formation of future worlds. Systematically dispensing with the integration of the 'other' point of view is equivalent to dispensing with a greater insight. Evolution is retarded and impeded whereas development and the unfolding of new states of consciousness, the integration of an entire cluster of knowledge, for example of integral feminism, would be judicious. This could indeed be an interesting and innovative perspective, which actually questions the self-perception of planners and planning as the authors find essential.

4. What does this mean for planning theory and practice?

Regarding the ideas of Mitchell (2008, 2009) and Wilber (2001, 2011), we can draw the following conclusions with consideration of the three topics from the Sandercock & Forsyth (1992) gender agenda in order to embed them in a first approach to create an integrated planning theory in respect to gender (and diversity) equality: practical needs and strategic interests, balance between multiple differences and equality and learning from case studies and practice.

4.1 Practical needs and strategic interests as analytical and conceptual planning tools

The first topic concerns the conceptual framework composed of practical needs and strategic interests. In this context, we use the term 'needs' for all needs for goods and services ensuring the survival in the sense of what is vital for existence and the term 'interests' for all

interests beyond which are desirable for a good life in the sense of a peaceful cooperation of societies, communities and partnerships. As to the practical needs, we refer to the Everyday Life approach by Lefèbvre (1961, 1971), further developed by e.g. Horelli et al (2000) or Jarvis et al (2009). With regard to the strategic interests, the spatial justice concept has been used the way it was developed by Soja (2010), Marcuse et al. (2010) and Fainstein (2012).

Whereas the first part of the concept provides the difference approach as prerequisite for planning as required, the second part presents the objectives and values which allow an integration of theoretical portions separated off so far. Because every integrative approach – like the ones described by Mitchell and Wilber as well – needs an attitude of openness and tolerance towards the ‘other’, which is alien to the system. Referring to the planning system an appropriate political will in the respective community is necessary. The communication of objectives and values is a central prerequisite in order to implement a concept of practical needs, i.e. to be able to derive the strategic interests required.

4.2 Monitoring the balance between multiple differences and equality

The second topic refers to the concrete space-related acting in everyday life of planning, to the permanent controlling and monitoring within the framework of the theoretically-based and politically-communicated concept of Everyday Life and Spatial Justice. It is about keeping an eye on the balance between stakeholders and target groups and consistently establishing this balance with proper means, which is a central task of every spatial planning activity. Gender in this context serves as a key category, which is able to integrate also the requirements of the diversity and inter-sectionality concept in the sense of an extended gender+ approach⁵ (Quing 2011, Horelli 2012). The advancement of theoretical approaches also takes place by the means of the planning practice and their evaluation; the integration of new findings into concepts and theories is fed by experiences of the everyday life of planning.

In this context, Schönwandt's (2002, 2008) considerations, which are based on the Uexküllian functional circle and distinguish systems of stakeholders involved in planning processes according to world of thought (Denkwelt), world of perception (Merkwelt) and world of action (Wirkwelt), could be helpful. The balance or the equation between considered needs and interests, between target groups and stakeholders, between different parts and quarters of the city or region etc. could systemically be conceived and at best also be regulated in these different partial worlds of thought, perception and action.

⁵ Gender+ includes knowledge about the complexity of gender as intersected with other structural inequalities (Quing 2011).

4.3 Learning from case studies: research to practice – practice for research

The third topic, finally, is the consequence of both topics mentioned above and outlines the research approach to an integrative planning science, which is appropriate in our opinion: Based on the conclusion that planning cultures are relative and individual, and the realisation that planning problems are unique and consistently new, i.e. also different, learning from case studies – by practice-oriented research as well as by researching practice – is an indispensable desideratum.

This does not only imply careful documentation and preparation of individual special planning cases and processes, but systematic analysis and interpretation of planning examples, which illustrate e.g. the planning approaches to collaborative, postmodern, equity planning or pragmatism identified by Allmendinger (2002) and Schönwandt (2002, 2008) and which could help to better understand planning cultures according to their similarities and differences. As long as such a systematic preparation has not taken place, an integration of the different theoretical and practical approaches – also beyond cultural boundaries of thought and action – will hardly be possible. In our opinion, such a concentrated research activity – especially within the framework of international and transnational European projects – would be a creditable step towards an integrative planning theory. Precondition is another threefold integration – out of systematic, social and spatial aspects - as described as a model of integration by Zibell (Zibell 2013: 84).

5. Conclusion

Overall integration of a gender perspective can, of course, only be achieved when a distinction no longer needs to be made between masculine and feminine thought traditions per se. In this context, gender may serve as a key category in analyses. As a socially-constructed variable arising in the process or in daily social interaction between women and men ('doing gender'), it also promotes change and innovation. The 'gendered view' also enables deconstruction and reconstruction of habitual ways of thinking. A condition for this – in line with the view of Wilber – is individual freedom (of thought and action), not a herd mentality (Wilber 2011), openness and tolerance in respect to the creation of new spaces of opportunity.

To implement the holistic approach to the gender perspective into spatial sciences, it takes a common will to integrate the variety of planning concepts and produce an integrating line of action in the formation of theory. Without equ(al)ity there is no difference, without difference

no gender. And vice versa, the concepts of Mitchell and Wilber support autonomy of thought and the handling of complexity such as is to be encountered in planning. A precondition for their implementation is the recognition that the picture of necessary universal laws 'must be replaced by expanded understandings of both the world and our representatives of it as a rich, a variegated, interdependent fabric of many levels and kinds, of explanations that are integrated with one another to ground effective prediction and action' (Mitchell 2009:18f).

Another precondition is the common aim to achieve a society that is based on partnership made up of equal individuals and structures (policy) as well as access to the integrative approach (formation of knowledge). In this case, this approach means to become aware of the feminist and gender perspectives in spatial planning as well as the theoretical and practical approaches derived from them and to integrate them into planning theory and practice as lines of development which are given treatment equivalent to the malestream. One challenge in this context is a corresponding widening of the European discourse on planning theories, not only as the basis for transnational research, but also for the innovativeness, i.e. sustainable viability of the systems.

Literature

Allmendinger, P. (2002): *Planning Theory*. New York: Plagrave

Bauhardt, C. (Ed.) (2003): *Equity and Geschlechtergerechtigkeit. Gender Mainstreaming aus der Sicht kritischer Planungstheorie*. In *SRL Planerin* 1/03: 39-41

Bauriedl, S.; Schier, M. et al. (2010): *Geschlechterverhältnisse, Raumstrukturen, Ortsbeziehungen: Erkundungen von Vielfalt und Differenz im spatial turn. (Gender relations, spatial structures, local contexts: explorations of diversity and difference in the spatial turn)* Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Becker, R. (1997): *Frauenforschung in der Raumplanung (Women's studies in spatial planning)*. In Bauhardt, C.; Becker, R. (Eds.): *Durch die Wand (Through the wall)*. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus, 11-32.

Biesecker, A.; Hofmeister, S. (2013): *(Re)Produktivität als Kategorie Vorsorgenden Wirtschaftens ((Re)Productivity as a Category of Caring Economy)*. In *Netzwerk Vorsorgendes Wirtschaftens (Hrsg.): Wege Vorsorgenden Wirtschaftens (In Network Caring Economy (Ed.): Ways of Caring Economy)*. Marburg: Metropolis: 137-159.

Buchmüller, L.; Zibell, B. (Eds.) (1993): *Weibliche und männliche Aspekte in der Stadtplanung (Feminine and masculine aspects in city planning)*, ORL-Bericht(report) 86, ETH Zürich.

Burgess, G. (2008): *Planning and Gender Equality Duty – why does gender matter?* In *People, place & policy online*, 2/3: 122-131.

Campbell, S.; Fainstein, S. (eds. 1996): *Readings in Planning Theory*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Connell, R. W. (1999): *Der gemachte Mann: Konstruktion und Krise von Männlichkeiten (The made man: construction and crisis of masculinity)*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Damyanovic, D.; Reinwald, F.; Weikmann, A. (2013): *Gender Mainstreaming in Urban Planning and Urban Development*. Wien: Werkstattbericht der Stadt Wien.

Damyanovic, D. (2013): *Gender Mainstreaming as a Strategy for Sustainable Urban Planning*. In Sánchez de Madariaga, Roberts (Eds.): *Fair Shared Cities. The Impact of Gender Planning in Europe*. Ashgate: Farnham: 177-192.

Damyanovic, D. (2007): Landschaftsplanung als Qualitätssicherung zur Umsetzung der Strategie des Gender Mainstreaming (Landscape architecture as quality assurance for the implementation of the strategy of gender mainstreaming). Vienna: Guthmann-Peterson.

Dörhöfer, K. (1994): Raumplanung für Frauen: Theoretische Positionen und praktische Konzepte in Deutschland (Spatial planning for women: theoretical positions and practical concepts in Germany). In PERSPEKTIVEN (Perspectives), 1/2: 19-23.

Dörhöfer, K. (1999): Feministische Ansätze in der Architekturausbildung (Feminist approaches in architectural training). In Burmester, H.; Cissek, G. et al. (Eds.): Feministische Ansätze in der Architekturlehre, Documentation of Frauen-AG Architektur HdK, TU Berlin dated 6.2.1989. 6-25.

Dörhöfer, K.; Flecken, U.; Zibell, B. (1998): Frauenforschung und Gender Studies in der Stadt- und Regionalplanung (Women's studies and gender studies in city and regional planning). In Vereinigung für Stadt-, Regional- und Landesplanung e.V. (SRL) (Ed.): Stadtplanung und Städtebau. Positionen finden – Überzeugungen vermitteln. Eine Festschrift für Dieter Frick (Urban planning and urban construction. Finding positions – communicating convictions. A commemorative publication for Dieter Frick). Berlin. 43-57.

Dörhöfer, K.; Terlinden, U. (1998): Verortungen: Geschlechterverhältnisse und Raumstrukturen (Contextualisations: gender relations and spatial structures). Basel: Birkhäuser.

Dufaux, F.; Lehmann-Frisch, S.; Moreau, S.; Gervais-Labony, P. (eds): Birth announcement. Paris: Self-published.

Fainstein, S (2012): The Just City. Cornell University Press: Ithaca and London.

Fainstein, S; Campbell, S. (eds. 2012): Readings in Planning Theory. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Fainstein, S. (2005): Feminism and Planning: Theoretical Issues. In Fainstein, S.; Servon, L. (Eds): Gender and Planning: A Reader. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Fainstein, S.; Servon, L. (2005): Gender and Planning: A Reader. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Fenster, T. (2005): The right to the Gendered City: Different formations of belonging in everyday life. Journal of Gender Studies, Vol. 14, No. 3 November: 217-231.

Flade, A.; Kustor-Hüttl, B. (Eds.) (1995): Mädchen und Jungen in der Stadt. Wiesbaden: Hess. Ministerium für Wirtschaft, Verkehr und Landesentwicklung (Girls and boys in the city. Wiesbaden: Hess. Ministry for the Economy, Transport and Regional Development).

Frank, S. (2003): Stadtplanung im Geschlechterkampf: Stadt und Geschlecht in der Großstadtentwicklung des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts. Stadt, Raum und Gesellschaft (Urban planning in the battle between the sexes: city and gender in the development of major cities in the 19th and 20th centuries. City, space and society), Volume 20. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Gerhard, U. (2012): Frauenbewegung und Feminismus. Eine Geschichte seit 1789 (The Women's Movement and Feminism. A History since 1789). Munich: Beck.

Grüger, C.; Zibell, B. (2005): Von der frauengerechten Stadtplanung zum Gender Mainstreaming in der Stadtentwicklung. Einblicke in die Planungspraxis. (From Women-Friendly Urban Planning to Gender Mainstreaming in Urban Development. Insights into Planning Practice). In Städtetag (Hrsg.): Frauen verändern ihre Stadt. Arbeitshilfe 4: Indikatoren und Gender Mainstreaming in der räumlichen Planung (In Städtetag (Ed.): Women Transform Their City. Work tool 4: Indicators and Gender Mainstreaming in Spatial Planning). Cologne: 63-82.

Greed, C. (1994): Women and Planning creating gendered realities. London: Routledge.

Harding, S. (1986/1991): Feministische Wissenschaftstheorie: Zum Verhältnis von Wissenschaft und sozialem Geschlecht (Feminist scientific theory: on the relationship between science and social gender). Hamburg: Argument.

Hayden, D. (1981): The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Approach for American Homes, Neighbourhoods and Cities. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Pr.

Healey, P. (1992): Planning thought debate. The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory. Town Planning Review 63/2: 143-162

Horelli, L. (2012): Signs of gender-aware urban planning in the finnish context. In: gender_archland 2012/1. Theorizing and practising gender-sensitive planning in European discourse. Documentation of the scientific conference with integrated meeting of the European network „Gender, Diversity and Urban Sustainability (GDUS)“ in Hanover 2012: 53-56.

Horelli, L.; Booth, C.; Gilroy, R. (2000): The EuroFem Toolkit for Mobilizing Women into Local and Regional Development. Helsinki: Self-published.

Horelli, L.; Wallin, S. (2013): Gender aware e-planning for sustaining everyday life. In Sánchez de Madariaga, I.; Roberts, M.; (Eds.): Fair shared cities. London: Ashgate. 231-248

Jarvis, H.; Kantor, P.; Cloke, J. (2009): Cities and Gender. London: Routledge.

Kail, E.; Irschik, E. (2013): Vienna: Progress Towards a Fair Shared City. In Sánchez de Madariaga, Roberts (Eds.): Fair Shared Cities. The Impact of Gender Planning in Europe. Ashgate: Farnham.

Kail, E.; Irschik, E. (2008): Fair Shared City: Gender Mainstreaming Planning Strategy in Vienna. Presented at the Congress Women's World 2008; Madrid.

Knapp, G.-A.; Wetterer, A. (Eds.) (2007): Achsen der Differenz. Gesellschaftstheorie und Feministische Kritik (Axes of difference. Social theory and feminist critique). Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Knoll, B. (2008): Gender Planning. Grundlagen für Verkehrs- und Mobilitätshebungen (Principles of traffic and mobility surveys). Saarbrücken: vdm Verlag Dr. Müller.

Larsson, A. (2006): From equal opportunities to gender awareness in strategic spatial planning. Reflections based on Swedish experiences. TPR, 77 (5): 507-530.

Lefèbvre, H. (1961): Critique de la Vie quotidienne. Fondements d`une sociologie de la quotidienneté (Critique of Everyday Life. Foundations of a Sociology of teh Everyday). Paris : L`Arche.

Lefèbvre, H. (1971): Everyday Life in the Modern World. New York. Harper & Row.

Moser, C.; Levy, C.; (1986): A Theory and Methodology of Gender Planning: Meeting women's practical and strategic needs. DPU Gender and Planning Working Paper No. 11, Development Planning Unit, Bartlett School of Architecture and Planning University College London.

Libreria delle donne di Milano (1989): Wie weibliche Freiheit entsteht – Eine neue politische Praxis (How feminine freedom arises – a new political practice). Berlin: Orlanda-Frauenverlag.

Löw, M. (2001): Raumsoziologie (Spatial sociology). Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Löw, M. (2008): The constitution of space. In European Journal of Social Theory 2008, 11/1: 25-49.

Marcuse, P.; James, C.; Novy, J.; Olivo, I.; Potter, C.; Steil, J. (Eds.) (2009): Searching for the Just City. London, New York: Routledge.

Massey, D. B. (1994): *Space, Place and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Mitchell, S. D. (2008): *Komplexitäten: Warum wir erst anfangen, die Welt zu verstehen (Complexities: why we are only just starting to understand the world)*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Mitchell, S. D. (2009): *Unsimple Truths: Science, Complexity, and Policy*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Nissen, U. (1998): *Kindheit, Geschlecht und Raum: Sozialisationstheoretische Zusammenhänge geschlechtsspezifischer Raumeignung (Childhood, gender and space: interrelationships in socialisation theory regarding gender-specific spatial suitability)*. Weinheim und München: Juventa Verlag.

Quing (2011): *Advancing Gender+ Training in Theory and Practise. An International Event for Practitioners, Experts and Commissioners in Gender-Training*, Madrid.

Pascall, G.; Lewis, J. (2004): *Emerging Gender Regimes and Policies for Gender Equality in a Wider Europe*. In *Journal of Social Politics*, 33, 3: 373–394.

Protze, K. (2009): *Hausen statt Wohnen: Von der Hartnäckigkeit gesellschaftlicher Wertvorstellungen in wechselnden Leitbildern – Vorschlag für einen Blickwechsel. (Housing instead of living: of the stubbornness of social values in the face of changing roles – proposal for a change of perspective)* In *Arbeitsgemeinschaft Freiraum und Vegetation (Working group on space and vegetation)* (Ed.). Kassel.

Rittel, H. (1972): *On the Planning Crisis: Systems Analysis of the 'First and Second Generations'*. In *Bedriftsokonomer*, 8: 390-396

Rittel, H.; Webber, M. (1973): *Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning*. In *Policy Sciences* 4/2: 155-169

Ritzdorf, M. (1992): *Feminist Thoughts on the Theory and Practice of Planning*. In *Planning Theory* 7/8: 13-19

Roberts, M.; Eldrige, A. (2009): *Planning the Night-time City*. London: Routledge.

Roberts, M. (1991): *Living in a Man-Made World: Gender Assumptions in Modern Housing Design*. London: Routledge.

Rodenstein, M. (1994): Wege zur nicht-sexistischen Stadt. Architektinnen und Planerinnen in den USA (Ways to a non-sexist city. Architects and planners in the USA). Freiburg i. Br.: Kore.

Sailer, K. (2004): Raum beißt nicht! Neue Perspektiven zur Sicherheit von Frauen im öffentlichen Raum (Space does not bite! New Perspectives on security for women in public spaces). Peter Lang: Frankfurt

Sánchez de Madariaga, I. (2013): Mobility of Care: Introducing New Concepts in Urban Transport. In Sánchez de Madariaga, I., Roberts, M. (Eds.): Fair Shared Cities. The Impact of Gender Planning in Europe. Ashgate: Farnham. 33-48

Sánchez de Madariaga, I. (2013): Looking Forward, Moving Beyond Trade offs. In Sánchez de Madariaga, I., Roberts, M. (Eds.): Fair Shared Cities. The Impact of Gender Planning in Europe. Ashgate: Farnham. 325-334

Sánchez de Madariaga, I.; Roberts, M. (Eds. 2013): Fair Shared Cities. The Impact of Gender Planning in Europe. Ashgate: Farnham.

Sandercock, L.; Forsyth, A. (1992): A Gender Agenda: New Directions for Planning Theory. In Journal of the American Planning Association, 58, 1: 49-59.

Schneider, G. (1989/1998): Die Liebe zur Macht – Über die Reproduktion der Enteignung in der Landschaftspflege (The love of power – concerning reproduction of dispossession in landscape conservation). In Univ. f. Bodenkultur Wien, Inst. f. Landschaftsplanung u. Ingenieurbiologie, AB Landschaftsplanung (University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna, Institute for Landscape Planning and Bioengineering, Department of Landscape Planning (Ed.): Landschaftsplanung in Praxis und Theorie (Landscape planning in practice and theory), 1. Wien: Eigenverlag.

Schönwandt, W. L. (2002): Planung in der Krise? (Planning in Crisis) . Theoretische Orientierungen für Architektur, Stadt- und Raumplanung. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer

Schönwandt, W. L. (2008): Planning in Crisis? Theoretical Orientations for Architecture and Planning). Hampshire: Ashgate

Schröder, A. (2009): Gender Mainstreaming als Instrument bedarfsgerechter Wohnraumversorgung. Prozesse, Strukturen und Projekte anhand ausgewählter Kommunen (Gender Mainstreaming as Instrument of Housing Provision as Required. Processes, Structures and Projects on the Basis of Selected Municipalities). Hamburg: Kovac.

- Schröder, A.; Zibell, B. (2004): Auf den zweiten Blick. Städtebauliche Frauenprojekte im Vergleich (At second glance. Urban women's projects in comparison). Frankfurt a. M.: Lang.
- Soja, E. W. (2010): Seeking Spatial Justice. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Spitthöver, M. (1989): Frauen in städtischen Freiräumen (Women in urban open spaces). Köln: Pahl-Rugenstein.
- Stadtbaudirektion Wien (2009): 10+1 Jahre. Alltags- und frauengerechtes Planen und Bauen (10+1 years. Everyday and women-fair planning and building). Wien: Stadt Wien.
- Studer, H. (2002): Mobilität und Geschlechterpositionen (Mobility and gender positions). In Bauer, I.; Neissl, J. (Eds.): Gender Studies, Denkachsen und Perspektiven der Geschlechterforschung (Pivotal thinking and perspectives of gender studies). Innsbruck, Vienna: Studien Verlag.
- Tummers, L.; Zibell, B. (2012): What can spatial planners do to create the 'Connected City'? A gendered reading of the Charters of Athens. In Built Environment 38/4:524-539
- West, C.; Zimmerman, D. H. (1987): Doing gender. Gender and Society, 1: 125-151.
- Wilber, K. (2001): The Eye of Spirit. An Integral Vision for a world gone slightly mad. 3rd ed. expanded. Boston & London: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (2011): Das Wahre, Gute, Schöne: Geist und Kultur im 3. Jahrtausend (The True, Good and Beautiful: Spirit and Culture in the 3rd Millennium). Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Wotha, B. (2000): Gender Planning und Verwaltungshandeln. Umsetzung von Genderbelangen in räumliche Planung – unter Berücksichtigung von Verwaltungsmodernisierung und neuerer Tendenzen im Planungsbereich (Gender planning and administrative action. Implementation of gender requirements in spatial planning – taking into account administration modernisation and new trends in the planning sector). Kiel: KielerArbeitspapiere zur Landeskunde und Raumordnung.
- Zibell, B. (2006): Requirement-Oriented Spatial Planning: Gender Practice and Criteria in Spatial Planning. Salzburg: Self-published.
- Zibell, B. (Ed.) (2009): Gender Building. Sozialräumliche Qualitäten im öffentlichen Hochbau (Social spatial qualities in public structural engineering). Frankfurt a. M.: Lang.
- Zibell, B. (2012): Planungstheorie und Gender. Geschlechterverhältnisse und Androzentrismen (Planning theory and gender. Gender relations and androcentrism). In May,

R.; Zibell, B. (Eds.): Gender Kompetenz in Architektur Landschaft Planung. Ideen Impulse Initiativen (Gender competency in architecture and landscape planning. Ideas, incentives, initiatives). Volume 3 in the series weiter_denken (thinking_beyond). Hannover: Internationalismus, 84-86.

Zibell, B. (2013): The Model of the European City in the Light of Gender Planning and Sustainable Development. In: Sánchez de Madariaga, Roberts (Eds.): Fair Shared Cities. The Impact of Gender Planning in Europe. Ashgate: Farnham: 75-88.

Zibell, B.; Schröder, A. (2007): Frauen mischen mit. Qualitätskriterien für die Stadt- und Bauleitplanung (Women get involved. Quality criteria for urban and land-use planning). Frankfurt a. M.: Lang.

Autorinnen:

Assistenzprofessorin Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Doris Damyanovic, Peter-Jordan Straße 65, A 1180 Wien, Institut für Landschaftsplanung, Department für Raum, Landschaft und Infrastruktur, Universität für Bodenkultur Wien, e-mail: doris.damyanovic@boku.ac.at, Telefon: 00431476547255.

Universitätsprofessorin Dr. sc. techn. Dipl.-Ing. Barbara Zibell, Herrenhäuser Straße 8, D 30419 Hannover, Abteilung Planungs- und Architektursoziologie, Institut für Geschichte und Theorie, Fakultät Architektur und Landschaft, Leibniz Universität Hannover, e-mail: b.zibell@igt-arch.uni-hannover.de, Telefon: 00495117623270.