

Planners as Leaders: Finding their Comfort Zone

Bonnie J. Johnson, PhD, AICP

Associate Professor, Urban Planning Program,

School of Public Affairs and Administration, University of Kansas

1460 Jayhawk Blvd.

Snow Hall, Room 207

Lawrence, KS 66045

Phone 785-864-7147

bojjohn@ku.edu

Abstract

Planners are expected to leave leadership to elected officials. Yet, they are often asked to do more. Should planners lead? This article examines how leadership is seen in the profession then outlines major theories of leadership and of planning. Using content analysis, those theories and descriptions of what planners do from professional planning codes of ethics from around the world are compared. Results indicate that new ways of thinking about leadership (group, servant, adaptive, authentic, spiritual, followership, and place-based) can help planners find leadership styles that fit their comfort zones better than old leadership definitions emphasizing heroic or coercive individuals. Results also show that shared/team based leadership is being overlooked by academia and practitioners.

In 2015, the major professional organization for planning in the United States, the American Planning Association (APA), issued the “Planning Office of the Future Task Force Report” (Horwedel et al., 2015) recommending, among other things, that planning offices “exercise leadership”. Planners often find the role of leader disquieting, and the closest they get to leadership is perhaps “creating an environment for success and unleashing the power of others” (Riggs, 2015, p. 60) or “focusing attention on the vision” (Drinan, 2015, p. 3). Since the emergence of the profession in the early 1900’s, city planners around the world have grappled with the complexities of public service planning, asking, how can seemingly apolitical, rational, neutral technicians also lead? (Brooks, 2002, Benveniste, 1989) How far can public sector planners stretch their discretion? (Forsythe, 1999, Lindquist et al., 2004) Major theories of “how-to” plan are veritable treatises on how planners deal with having little to no power and that what power they do have has to be cobbled together through rationality, communication, facilitation, collaboration, and the opportune social movement (Brooks, 2002, Krumholz and Forester, 1990, Friedmann, 1973, Baum, 1983a, Fahmi et al., 2016, Allmendinger, 2009, Allmendinger, 2017, Flyvberg and Richardson, 2002, Hoch, 1994). City planners working directly for the public sector, or indirectly via contract, negotiate tough terrain if they try to be “technician/leaders,” “facilitative leaders” (Forester, 2013), or “public servant/leaders”. Schön asked of professionals (1983, p. 42), “Do you stay on the high ground where you can exercise technical rigor but have little social impact? Or do you descend to the swampy lowlands where you can make a difference but you must muddle through?” and perhaps lead?

How can planners pursue leadership when they have obligations as administrators, educators, facilitators, advisors, technicians, and are subject to the limitations associated with being unelected, public service providers? To answer this question, the article starts with a brief

overview of the roots of the angst planners feel about leadership, planners' roles, and typical outlets for planners to lead. Next, strategies are presented for thinking about leadership and the evolution of leadership theories over time. Based on reviews of the literatures, tables are created listing the major theories of leadership and the major theories of "how-to" plan. Using content analysis, answers to the question, "what do planners do?" are taken from the codes of ethics of professional planning associations in: New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the United Kingdom, United States, and the European Council of Urban Planners. Looking for evidence of leadership in planning, major leadership theories were compared to the type of leadership described in APA's "Planning Office of the Future Task Force Report" (Horwedel et al., 2015), the planning processes described in the major theories of "how-to" plan, and the planning processes in professional planning associations' codes of ethics from around the world.

The results of the analyses indicate that new ways of thinking about leadership can help planners find leadership styles that are a better fit for their roles than the old definition of leadership, which emphasized the heroic individual endowed with certain personality traits. Group leadership theories such as Complexity and Relational theories and procedural leadership called Substitutes for leadership seem to ring true for the APA "Planning Office of the Future Report" and for theories of "how-to" plan. Individual leadership theories match planning processes described in the international codes of ethics put together by practitioner organizations, particularly Servant, Adaptive/Empowering, and Authentic leadership. Surprisingly, the codes of ethics indicate practitioners should be Spiritual leaders as well.

By looking at how planning theorists and practitioners describe what planners do and matching those descriptions to leadership theories, it is apparent that there is a "comfort zone" for planners as leaders, but when they get out of that zone, they can find leadership roles

untenable or too disquieting. The practitioners are leaning toward strategies individual planners can pursue for leadership while established planning theories are open to group leadership and substitutes for leadership. There are a few gaps where none of the established leadership theories seem to match what planners say they do. An even newer leadership theory called “place-based leadership” (Hambleton, 2015, Hambleton and Howard, 2013) appears to fill those gaps opening more doors for planners as leaders and playing into a strength of planning which is place-making. By linking planning processes with leadership processes, leadership strategies planners can comfortably use in practice are revealed.

Leadership and Planning

In the beginning, the planning profession did not shy away from leadership as it borrowed from architecture the notion of a “master builder”, mixed in engineering’s “problem solver,” and then drew on the moral high ground of social reformers (Baer, 1977, p. 672). In the 1910s, planners took on corrupt boss governments in cities ushering in planning commissions, comprehensive plans, and capital improvement budgets (Gerckens, 2000). Planners Lewis Mumford and Edmund Bacon were on the covers of Time magazine in 1938 and 1964 respectively. U.S. postage stamps, “plan for better cities,” commemorated the 50th anniversary of the American Institute of Planners in 1967. In 1977, Baer noted that after many years of struggle, U.S. planners were seeing their agendas become the public’s agenda with courts upholding the legitimacy of planning. Yet, planners were in a malaise worried about rational processes subverted for ignoble causes and social reforms not yielding equitable results. People were questioning the role of government and whether experts really knew what they were doing (Farmer, 1994, Hollinger, 1994). Baer (1977, p. 676) notes, “While seeing themselves (planners) as the main gears in the urban machinery, other observers see them as the lubricants, alleviating

the squeaks and lessening the friction of urban processes, but rarely acting as important cogs themselves.” When people started questioning expertise and the inevitability of progress, planners became just another set of “fallible advisors who operate like everybody else, in a complex world where there are no ‘answers’ only diverse and indeterminate options” (Allmendinger, 2002, p. 88).

Adding to planners’ discomfort with leadership is that the majority of them work directly for governments as public servants or indirectly as consultants hired by governments on contract. In the public sector, leadership by public servants is often associated with the “‘pathologies’ of public bureaucracies” (Getha-Taylor et al., 2011, p. 85). These pathologies include public servants overstepping the boundary between elected officials setting policy and public servants merely implementing policies, abusing their discretion, or going rogue and no one knowing it until it is too late (Fairholm, 2004). Discretion has its own distinctive pitfalls for public servants: “lack of accountability, manipulation, unpredictability, intrusiveness, and poor decision making” (Forsythe, 1999, p. 5). “Guerillas in the bureaucracy” (Needleman and Needleman, 1974) push the boundaries of their discretion, but as they seek to build trust with citizens and neighbors, they can lose trust with colleagues back at city hall and eventually burn out. Some see bureaucracies being buffeted by forces beyond their control making leadership a moot point (Van Wart, 2003). Abram (2004, p. 23) explains that it is one thing to outline a theoretical model where planners know when to switch their loyalties from elected officials to the public interest or to citizens and it is still yet another to practice planning in this “uncomfortable zone”.

Today, planners are not seen as leaders. “(T)he feeling expressed by professionals is that planning generally has not received the media and public recognition deserved for its role in addressing urgent planning problems. The planning effort to rebuild the World Trade Center

complex in New York is a case in point. While the architects, developers, Port Authority, and politicians are in the limelight, the planners involved in the project, like good stagehands, remain behind the wings and generally invisible. In a culture of hero worshipping, the planner remains a stoic antihero” (Myers and Banerjee, 2005, p. 122). Planning agencies are “rarely independent in their views, but serve those who have appointed them” with boards and commissions overseeing their work (Talvitie, 2012, p. 265). Fahmi et al. (2016, p. 310) note that planners often have to look for a “champion” from the outside for their ideas because “their power is not stronger than others”. Also, as planners seek consensus and stakeholder participation, they undermine their very own claims to expertise and superior knowledge (Hoch, 1994, Flyvberg and Richardson, 2002).

Roles of Planners

A list of the many roles suggested for planners over the years, “master designer, rational analyst, social change agent, visionary, negotiator, monitor of communication flows, story teller, advocate, social interventionist, political strategist, specialist in comprehensiveness, customer service specialist, deal maker, designer of social institutions, group process facilitator” (Brooks, 2002, p. 136) does not include the role of leader. The roles merely hint at planners doing things that could include leadership like being a “master” of a skill, “making a deal,” or having “vision”. In 1977, Baer described roles for planners as “midwives” instead of “doctors” (1977). The most extensive work on the roles of planners divides them into three groups, technical, political, and a hybrid of the other two with the hybrid role being most common in the 1970s (Howe, 1980, Howe and Kaufman, 1979). An updating of the Howe and Kaufman study found more of today’s planners identifying with the technical role over the political or hybrid roles (Lauria and Long, 2017). The technical planners find “power” in being known for their

objectivity and neutrality, while the political planners are direct about their desire to influence policy. Even though the political planners seek to influence policy, they are “influencers” and not leaders, plus planners seem to be shying away from this role even more at the present time. Planners in Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Scotland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom (Sager, 2009, Campbell and Marshall, 1999, Bäcklund et al., 2014, Mäntysalo et al., 2011, Waterhout et al., 2013, Jackson, 2009, Gunn and Vigar, 2012) are facing changing styles of public management called New Public Management which are placing them in more legal-procedural roles (Sager, 2009). Christensen (1985) explains that when there are clear goals and technical solutions to problems, planners can easily navigate political processes with their usual roles (regulator, analyst, advocate, mediator, experimenter, facilitator), but when there are unknowns for both goals and technology, then leadership is necessary. She explains that a “charismatic leader” is needed in those situations but that “(r)egrettably, charisma is hard to learn” (Christensen, 1985, p. 68), thus rendering planners (unless they happen to be charismatic) impotent.

Leading is often seen as entering the political realm and planners tend to shy away from politics. They shy away not only at the macro level involving elected officials, but also at the micro level involving internal, organizational politics (Gondim, 1988, Mayo, 1982, Baum, 1983b, Brooks, 2002). Innes and Gruber (2005) find planning styles (technical/bureaucratic, political influence, social movement, and collaborative) come into conflict due to different approaches to politics. Even the political influence style of planning described by Innes and Gruber (2005) is more about making sure resources are distributed to every jurisdiction rather than influencing policy or leading. The technical/bureaucratic style of planning “leads” by following established policies and legislative guidance, but then those planners are often

disappointed when politicians do not rely on their studies or do not even allow for analysis in the first place. Collaborative planning's style is one where stakeholders learn together, share information, and hope leadership occurs. When leadership in planning styles is alluded to, such as with the social movement planning style, leadership comes from "champions" outside public agencies.

Outlets for Leadership in Planning

Planners can use their "discretionary space" to exercise leadership although that process is "slow and limited" (Forsythe, 1999, p. 12). Planners are often able to define the boundaries of their work and that dynamic is what Norman Krumholz used to find sources of power in Cleveland in the 1970s, along with using the media, networking, swapping favors, and having a talented staff (Krumholz and Forester, 1990). Progressive planners emphasize knowing power dynamics and communication techniques well enough to be prepared to counter obfuscations and misinformation. They also understand and use mediation, negotiation techniques, and group decision-making processes (Forester, 2013). Forsythe (1999, p. 12) maintains that these kinds of processes, which operate within the realm of discretion, may not be enough to "make truly effective changes" but could be boosted when combined with other strategies "such as work outside of government." Those "outsider" planners, such as those in academia and non-profit sectors, can help out by taking on leadership roles when public sector planners cannot (Karki, 2017, Innes and Gruber, 2005). Clients regularly hire planning consultants for their particular expertise and task them with leading communities in new directions. However, this leadership is contingent upon amenable clients and bounded by contracts.

Some say the only way for planners to legitimately pursue leadership roles is to run for elected office (Karki, 2017, Talvitie, 2012, Fahmi et al., 2016, Malizia, 2006). "As long as

planners are taught to foster participation and be guided by what emerges from participatory processes, they may facilitate worthwhile development goals and objectives, but by definition they will never assume leadership positions” (Malizia, 2006, p. 408). Private sector planners must deliver for clients. Non-profit planners do not have much influence and public sector planners must beware of getting fired (Malizia, 2006). All the political skill in the world will not help planners lead, if they do not have political authority (Karki, 2017).

The 21st century is calling on planners to be leaders. APA’s “Planning Office of the Future Task Force Report” laid out five principles for effective planning. The second principle is “exercising leadership” and the first one is closely related, “thinking big” (Horwedel et al., 2015). Nelson (2006) argues for planners to be leaders and visionaries taking advantage of changing demographics and trends. Hurricane Katrina showcased why planners are needed as leaders (Olshansky, 2006). We know that sustainable development policies are more likely to move from policy to action if planning offices lead (Jepson, 2004). The lure of leadership and the potential to have a meaningful impact on societal problems draw students to planning (Myers and Banerjee, 2005, Brooks, 2002). The main accrediting body for schools of planning in the U.S., the Planning Accreditation Board, lists “leadership” as a required planning skill in their “Accreditation Standards and Criteria” (Planning Accreditation Board, 2017). There is much to do, such as, “lead local efforts to solve urban problems, lead the new dialogue about growth visions and futures, lead the building of collaborative partnerships, lead the partnerships fostering a new regionalism, lead international efforts for managing urban growth and development planning, and lead the campaign for urban sustainability” (Myers and Banerjee, 2005, p. 128). Innes (1997, p. 227) asserts, “(p)lanning has the potential in the 21st century to be a leader among professions with public interest missions.”

Leadership Theories

To reach their potential as leaders, planners must figure out how to successfully turn their discretionary space, which is presently an “uncomfortable zone” (Abram, 2004, p. 23), into their “comfort zone”. A greater understanding of leadership in its many forms and how power relates to leadership can assist planners. Leaders are “*persons who, by word and/or personal example, markedly influence the behavior, thoughts, and/or feelings of a significant number of their fellow human beings (here termed followers or audience members)*” (Gardner, 1995, pp. 8-9). This is perhaps what comes to mind when one hears the words “leader” and “leadership.” However, the very definition of “leadership” has evolved over time and has become more process oriented including organizational and social skills (Hosking, 1988). Table 1 shows the progression in leadership processes from no leaders/procedures, to groups of leaders, to single leaders. Leadership is now defined in more expansive terms as “a phenomenon focused on vision, challenge, collaboration, process, and product” (Sorenson et al., 2011, p. 33).

<<Table 1- About Here>>

Leadership is no longer just about a leader’s personal traits. Northhouse (2016) citing Rost (1991) takes us from the 1900s to today. From 1900 – 1929, leadership was the ability to get others to do what the leader wanted them to do, usually through power and domination, exemplified by Directive leadership (coercion) and Transactional leadership (using rewards) (see Table 1). In the 1930s, leadership was defined as influence, not domination, facilitated by the leader’s personality traits matching those of the group. Leadership as involving “groups” dominated the 1940s - 1960s with the emergence of persuasion as a tactic, defining shared goals, and leadership meaning group effectiveness. The 1970s brought a shift in thinking from focusing

on groups to focusing on organizations and leadership became a reciprocal process where people's motives and values are mobilized along with resources to accomplish a leader's and followers' mutual goals. Leadership theories flourished in the 1980s and saw the return of leadership as getting others to do what the leader wants, leadership as non-coercive influence, leaders possessing certain traits, but then a new variant emerges, leadership as transformation. Transformational/charismatic leadership emphasizes that leaders and their followers evolve together with leaders and followers becoming high achievers. Moving into the 21st century, leadership is defined as a "process" and there are multiple processes. A few of these new processes are Authentic leadership (being transparent and using one's own ethical behavior as exemplar), Spiritual leadership (creating a sense of meaning in people's lives), Servant leadership (attending to the needs of followers), and Adaptive/empowering leadership (emphasizing learning and self-development) (see Table 1 for details).

Leadership is no longer seen as simply being a leader directing followers, but has shifted to an emphasis on followers and on systems of leadership or shared leadership. For many years, followers and their actions were simply seen as the outcomes of leadership. Changing the leadership lens to focus on followers highlights that leaders depend on followers and they can influence each other's effectiveness (see Followership and Shared/team leadership in Table 1). The characteristics of followers affect who emerges as leaders (Avolio et al., 2009). Adding in the notion of Shared leadership points out that quality followers are ones who know when they should lead and when they should follow and are skilled at both (Pearce and Conger, 2003). There are even times when no leader is needed and Substitutes for leadership, such as, professional norms, routines, brainstorming techniques, and group-decision making processes, suffice (Pearce and Conger, 2003, Avolio et al., 2009).

Leadership processes with many leaders working together do not rely on the traits or characteristics of one top-down person. It manifests at the group-level occurring throughout the organization and rooted in social interactions and mutual learning (Avolio et al., 2009, Uhl-Bien et al., 2007, Fletcher and Käufer, 2003). Other variations of Shared leadership are Team leadership (small groups lead), Relational leadership (socially constructed relationships), and Complexity leadership (interdependent agents). Quick (2017) found planning processes can combine collective leadership and collective impact.

In addition to process, leadership can be viewed as “power.” Power and leadership are linked because as people influence others, they are seen as wielding power. In leadership studies, power as a variable has not garnered much attention (Northhouse, 2016). However, there is a framework for categorizing the types and bases of leaders’ power. There are two types of power, power in a person’s position or rank and personal power due to the person being a good role model, knowledgeable, and knowable. The bases of power are: referent (being likable), expert (being competent), legitimate (having status), reward (being able to give recompense), coercive (being able to penalize others), and information (having knowledge others want) (Northhouse, 2016, French and Raven, 1959, Raven, 1965, French and Raven, 1962, Kotter, 1990). It is the fear of information and expert power being in the hands of public servants that leads the public and elected officials to insist on accountability and transparency (Brehm and Gates, 1997). Today, the Internet greatly levels the information playing field giving followers more power (Northhouse, 2016). As leadership theories evolved over time, the notion of “power with” instead of “power over” emerged, and, thus, leaders do not wield power alone, the leaders and followers have power together (Follett, 1926/1987, Burns, 1978). The shift to “power with” highlights the need to understand power and be aware of judgements being impaired or

dominated by a leader's own or a group's viewpoint (Gordon, 2011, Barabas, 2004, Janis, 1982). A critique of leadership research is that it does not confront the problems associated with power (Gordon, 2011). Similarly, theories of "how-to" plan struggle with notions of power and often direct planners toward indirect sources of power.

Methodology

The primary question for this study is "Should planners lead?" which planning academics and practitioners have answered as, "Yes, well, sort of, there is a desire to do so, we probably should, but it is difficult, contingent, limited, problematic, and uncomfortable." The next question is, "Are there more viable routes to leadership for planners?" To answer that question, literature reviews and content analyses are used. The major theories of leadership are compared to how exercising leadership is described in APA's "Planning Office of the Future Task Force Report" (Horwedel et al., 2015), the planning processes (keywords/concepts) described in the major theories of "how-to" plan and the descriptions of planning processes (themes) contained in the codes of ethics from professional planning associations around the world.

Leadership Theories

The leadership theories in Table 1 were gathered from texts and articles summarizing and compiling established theories of leadership (Bryman et al., 2011, Avolio et al., 2009, Pearce et al., 2003, Northhouse, 2016). Theories common across the texts and articles were included and then definitions and lists of processes were based on those sources and supplemented by the leadership literature specific to each theory.

Planning Theories

The type of planning theories included in Table 2 were chosen based on Faludi's (1973) "theory of planning" focus on procedural theories of "how to" plan, supplemented by Yiftachel's

(1989) search for “What is a good planning process?”, Brook’s (2002) theories centered on helping practitioners decide what to do when, and Allmendinger’s (2017) indigenous planning theory which are theories that are “planning-specific”. The theories in Table 2 are recognizable as planning theories, perhaps with origins from other disciplines, but theories which planners have regularly espoused over time and now are presented, not as single, unified theories, but choices that practicing planners have as options depending on time, place, and politics (Brooks, 2002). For Table 2, theories from Allmendinger and Brooks are included and then definitions are augmented by sources specific to or using each theory. The leadership theories and planning theories are compared looking for matches in keywords and concepts described in the processes. This is the same procedure followed when matching the leadership processes described in the APA’s “Planning Office of the Future Task Force Report” with leadership theories and their processes.

<<Table 2 – About Here>>

Codes of Ethics

Codes of ethics from professional planning organizations are useful distillations of what practitioners think are “the norms that ought to govern professional behavior” (Frankel, 1989, p. 109). They outline what a profession sees as important in terms of knowledge, techniques, or what members “ought” to do and be like (Frankel, 1989, Davis, 2003, Freckelton, 1996) what are here called “processes”. Finding codes of ethics started with the list of 82 national planning associations from Algeria to Zimbabwe contained on the Royal Town Planning Institute’s webpage (Royal Town Planning Institute, 2011) and, when that webpage was no longer active, the membership lists from the Global Planners Network (Global Planners Network, 2017) and from the European Council of Spatial Planners (European Council of Spatial Planners / Conseil

Européen des Urbanistes, 2017b) were used. From those lists and using Google Translate when needed, each association's website was explored looking for a "code of ethics" or "code of conduct". Not all of them had codes of ethics on their websites. After the search, seven codes were selected from professional planning organizations in different parts of the world: New Zealand (New Zealand Planning Institute, 2017), Norway (Forum for Kommunal Planlegging, 2017), South Africa (South African Planning Institute, 2017), Sri Lanka (Institute of Town Planners Sri Lanka, 2017), United Kingdom (Royal Town Planning Institute, 2017), United States (American Planning Association, 2017), and the European Council of Urban Planners (European Council of Spatial Planners / Conseil Européen des Urbanistes, 2017a). All of these codes were in English on their websites. The codes were read looking for processes or "what do planners do?" particularly in relation to the public. Each process was listed only once and then matched to keywords, concepts, or themes from the leadership theories' processes.

Results

How planning leadership is described in APA's "Planning Office of the Future Task Force Report" (Horwedel et al., 2015), theories of "how-to" plan, and the descriptions of what planners do from professional planning organizations' codes of ethics were compared with the theories of leadership and their processes contained in Table 1.

The Planning Office of the Future

The "Planning Office of the Future Task Force Report" describes how planners should pursue "Exercising Leadership" by listing three strategies and seven actions. The three strategies are to: "get close to decision-makers, exercise different kinds of community leadership, and address emerging issues and trends" (Horwedel et al., 2015, p. 18). The actions are to: "define the planning agency's purpose and scope, develop informal networks, educate elected officials

and citizens, build consensus with other agencies, communicate through various news media, identify and assess trends as they emerge, and educate the community about issues and trends” (Horwedel et al., 2015, p. 18). Table 3 shows how the report’s list of how to exercise leadership compares to the theories of leadership. Seven out of the 10 planning processes related to the definition and leadership processes contained in Complexity leadership theory (dynamic networks). One of the other three most closely resembles Relational leadership (socially constructed relationships) and one, “Exercise different kinds of community leadership” does not match any of the theories. Another one, “Define the planning agency’s purpose and scope” aligns with the leadership theory of Substitutes for leadership which is simply procedures with no designated person or group as leaders. Setting the procedure in motion is intended to structure leadership or power. Both Complexity and Relational theories are Group theories of leadership, which seek “power with” others. This report’s description of leadership suggests planners rely on Groups or procedural Substitutes for leadership.

<<Table 3 – About Here>>

Theories of “How-to” Plan

The descriptions of planning processes from each of the planning theories in Table 2 were compared to the leadership theory definitions and processes in Table 1 and the results are shown in Table 4. There are 10 planning theories and they fall into 5 leadership theory categories. Of the five leadership theories matched with planning theories, two are Group leadership, one is a Substitute for leadership (no leaders), and two are leadership by Individuals. Of the leadership theories in Table 4, the most commonly occurring keywords from the planning theories are matched with Adaptive/Empowering leadership (learning and self-development,

Individual) (5 matches), then Complexity (dynamic networks, Group) (3 matches), Substitutes (procedures as leaders) (2 matches), Relational (socially constructed relationships, Group) (2 matches), and Authentic (leader is example, Individual) (1 match). The planning theories are showing an almost even split between Group leadership and Individual leadership theories. The Individual theories (Adaptive/Empowering and Authentic) are exercising power through empowering others or power through example. The Complexity and Relational theories find “power with” others.

<<Table 4 – About Here>>

Codes of Ethics

For the codes of ethics, each one was read looking for phrases that described what planners do (processes), then themes common to the codes of ethics and the various descriptions of leadership theories were found. In the American Institute of Certified Planners’ (AICP) code of ethics from the United States, processes most often coincided with Authentic leadership (leader is example, Individual) (5 matches) and Adaptive/Empowering leadership (learning and self-development, Individual) (5 matches) (see Table 5). The next most common matches between planning processes in the codes and leadership theories were Servant (attending to the needs of followers, Individual) (4 matches) and Complexity (dynamic networks, Group) (4 matches) then Spiritual (sense-making, Individual) and Followership (followers can make or break a leader, Individual) at three matches each. Five of the leadership theories are applicable to Individuals or Followers and one of the theories is a Group theory (Complexity), where there are many leaders acting together. In the AICP code, there is more reliance on Individual theories of leadership and less reliance on groups.

<<Table 5 – About Here>>

For the professional planning organization in the United Kingdom, the Royal Town Planning Institute, their code of ethics' planning processes most often coincided with Servant (attending to the needs of followers, Individual) and Authentic leadership (leader is example, Individual) (3 matches each) and then Spiritual (sense-making, Individual) (2 matches) and Adaptive/Empowering (learning and self-development, Individual) once (see Table 6). All of these leadership theories are Individual leadership theories.

<<Table 6 – About Here>>

In New Zealand the professional planning organization is the New Zealand Planning Institute. Their code of ethics' planning processes most often coincided with Authentic leadership (leader is example, Individual) (4 matches) then Complexity (dynamic networks, Group) (2 matches), Servant (attending to the needs of followers, Individual) (2 matches), Adaptive/empowering (learning and self-development, Individual) once, and Followership (followers can make or break a leader, Individual) once (see Table 7). All of these leadership theories are for Individuals or Followers except for one, Complexity, a Group theory.

<<Table 7 – About Here>>

In the South African Planning Institute's code of ethics, what planners do most often coincided with Authentic leadership (leader is example, Individual) (5 matches) then Followership (followers can make or break a leader, Individual) (4 matches), Spiritual (sense-making, Individual) (3 matches), and Servant (attending to the needs of followers, Individual), Adaptive/empowering (learning and self-development, Individual), Complexity leadership

(dynamic networks, Group) theories each occurred one time (see Table 8). Five of the leadership theories are applicable to Individuals or Followers and one of the theories is a Group theory (Complexity).

<<Table 8 – About Here>>

The Charter of Professional Conduct for the European Council of Spatial Planners / Conseil Européen des Urbanistes is short, although it refers to other parts of the charter, which would add more detail, and contains planning processes that can be matched to four different leadership theories. Two planning processes can be matched with Authentic leadership (leader is example, Individual) as well as two for Spiritual leadership (sense-making, Individual). Adaptive/empowering (learning and self-development, Individual) and Complexity leadership (dynamic networks, Group) are matched one each. Three of the four theories apply to Individuals and one (Complexity) to Groups.

<<Table 9 – About Here>>

The Code of Conduct for the Institute of Town Planners, Sri Lanka has planning processes that match with four different leadership theories with one match each, Servant (attending to the needs of followers, Individual), Authentic (leader is example, Individual), Spiritual (sense-making, Individual), and Adaptive/empowering (learning and self-development, Individual) (see Table 10). These are all theories of Individual leadership.

<<Table 10 – About Here>>

Norway's Forum for Municipal Planning Ethical Platform has planning processes that match with six leadership theories. Those theories and their number of matches from greatest to lowest are: Complexity (dynamic networks, Group) (4 matches), Authentic (leader is example, Individual) (3 matches), Followership (followers can make or break a leader, Individual) (3 matches), Servant (attending to the needs of followers, Individual) (2 matches), Spiritual (sense-making, Individual) (2 matches), and Adaptive/empowering (2 matches). All are Individual forms of leadership except for Complexity, which is a Group form of leadership.

<<Table 11 – About Here>>

Discussion

New ways of thinking about leadership give planners more tools to use (Substitutes for leadership, Followership, Group leadership, specific Individual leadership theories), other than their charisma, and they provide a roadmap for planners to find their leadership “comfort zone”. As they described how planners grapple with their discretion, Forsyth (1999) and Abram (2004), in particular, noted how planners operate from an “uncomfortable zone”. Matching what planners do, or would like to do, with leadership theories shows where planners can find their leadership “comfort zone” and see what other tools they have (see Table 12). Across all the sources of planning processes used in this study, APA's “Planning Office of the Future Task Force Report”, major theories of “how to” plan, and codes of ethics from professional planning associations internationally, there is a preference for one of the Group leadership theories – Complexity leadership. Complexity leadership relies on “power with” but also information flows and dynamic networks. Across planning theories and codes of ethics two Individual

leadership theories were found, Adaptive/empowering and Authentic leaderships. These two theories focus on being open, mutual learning, and empowering others. They also speak to being authentic, but not necessarily having to be charismatic.

<<Table 12 – About Here>>

The codes of ethics can perhaps give insights into what practitioners see as their comfort zone for leadership. Planning processes from the codes of ethics matched five different leadership theories: Servant, Adaptive/empowering, Spiritual, Authentic, and Followership. It is interesting to note that neither the APA report nor the planning theories noticed Servant leadership, but the practitioners did. Servant leadership fits well with the public servant role many planners play. This leadership theory turns what can seem like a limiting, servile role into an actionable, leadership role involving healing, empathy, community building, and inspiring commitment.

Just as the Servant leadership theory turns what could be a limiting role into an action role, the Followership leadership theory also turns the planner's role of "follower" into a role requiring skill and possessing agency. Followers have to know when to lead and when to follow and they can choose how to follow (or not).

Another role that matched codes but not the APA report or planning theories is the Spiritual leadership role. This is an area where planners might be stretching their discretion and getting into an "uncomfortable zone", but here are professional planning organizations asking practitioners to take the risk. The Spiritual leadership role is about creating meaning in people's lives and that closely aligns with planning goals related to quality of life and sense of

community. Planners have carved out these issue areas as being important to their work and they inherently place planners in a challenging, Spiritual leadership role.

Three of the codes of ethics from the United States, New Zealand, and South Africa (Tables 5, 7, and 8) listed planning processes that could not be matched with any of the well-established leadership theories from Table 1. An anonymous reviewer of an earlier version of this article noted that a new theory of leadership, place-based leadership, would be amenable to what planners do. Place-based leaders are “those exercising decision-making power (who) have a concern for the communities living in a particular ‘place’” (Hambleton and Howard, 2013, p. 54). Place-based leadership “prizes respect for the feelings and attitudes of others as well as a strong commitment to collaboration” (Hambleton and Howard, 2013, p. 55). This theory is a Group leadership theory, but is akin to the Individual theory of Spiritual leadership. They are both about sense-making but place-based leadership roots that sense-making in particular places, cultures, and landscapes. The planning processes that could not be matched to established planning theories all picked up on themes of the use of natural resources, development of people in the country, protecting the environment, and the integrity and heritage of natural and built environments.

The uncomfortable zone for planners clearly consists of the Individual leadership theories requiring particular personality traits, charisma, status, the ability to bestow rewards, and the ability to coerce (Transformation/charismatic, Leader-member exchange, Transactional, and Directive). However, another uncomfortable area is the Group theory of Shared/team leadership. None of the sources of planning processes studied here matched with the Shared/team leadership theory. This could be an area for planners to explore and bring into their role definitions. They are not taking advantage of a leadership strategy of small group empowerment. The codes of

ethics are also not taking advantage of Group leadership theories (Complexity and Relational) or Substitutes for leadership even though the “Planning Office of the Future” and planning theories mention them.

Planning theory and planning educators can learn from practitioners that Individual leadership theories are a part of planning practice. When “power with” or group processes are not working for planners, they can have agency in the form of Individual leadership theories: Followership, Servant, Adaptive/empowering, Spiritual, and Authentic. Practitioners should think back to their planning theory and remember they have Group leadership theories they can rely on: Complexity and Relational. They also should gain confidence that some of their processes are actually leadership strategies called Substitutes for leadership. APA’s “Planning Office of the Future Report” focuses on Group theories but misses out on useful Individual leadership strategies. A new theory, place-based leadership, is well within the realm of what planners do and it has the potential to make Spiritual leadership not as risky as or as difficult as it might appear on its face.

Finding their Comfort Zone

Perhaps those early rational, positivist planners flew too close to the sun and they had to be brought down to earth. However, does that mean planners cannot and should not be leaders? The definition of leadership has changed. It used to be based largely on the personal traits of individual leaders. It is now defined as “a phenomenon focused on vision, challenge, collaboration, process, and product” (Sorenson et al., 2011, p. 33). That definition sounds an awful lot like what planners do.

Group leadership, Substitutes for leadership, and well-chosen Individual leadership theories take us out of the heroic, personality or coercion driven kinds of leadership that may

have proven too uncomfortable for planners. By embracing Group leadership and Substitutes for leadership, being skilled Followers, branching out into Shared/team leadership, and paying attention to codes of ethics emphasizing Authentic, Adaptive/empowering, Spiritual, Servant, and place-based leadership processes, practicing planners can take action. Planners can be effective leaders, they just need to find their “place” or comfort zone.

References

- Abram, S. (2004), "Personality and Professionalism in a Norwegian District Council", *Planning Theory*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 21-40.
- Allmendinger, P. (2002), "Towards a Post-positivist Typology of Planning Theory", *Planning Theory*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 77-99.
- Allmendinger, P. (2009), *Planning Theory*, 2nd ed., Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, UK.
- Allmendinger, P. (2017), *Planning Theory*, 3rd ed., Palgrave, London.
- American Planning Association. (2017), "AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct", available at: <https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode/> (accessed August 27 2017).
- Avolio, B.J., Walumbwa, F.O. and Weber, T.J. (2009), "Leadership: Current Theories, Research, and Future Directions", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 60 No. 1, pp. 421-49.
- Bäcklund, P., Kallio, K.P. and Häkli, J. (2014), "Residents, customers or citizens? Tracing the idea of youthful participation in the context of administrative reforms in Finnish public administration", *Planning Theory & Practice*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 311-27.
- Baer, W.C. (1977), "Urban Planners: Doctors or Midwives?", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 37 No. 6, pp. 671-78.
- Barabas, J. (2004), "How Deliberation Affects Policy Opinions", *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 98 No. 4, pp. 687-701.
- Baum, H.S. (1983a), *Planners and Public Expectations*, Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., Cambridge, MA.
- Baum, H.S. (1983b), "Politics and Ambivalence in Planners' Practice", *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 13-22.
- Benveniste, G. (1989), *Mastering the Politics of Planning: Crafting Credible Plans and Policies*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Brehm, J. and Gates, S. (1997), *Working, Shirking, and Sabotage: Bureaucratic Response to a Democratic Public*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI.

- Brooks, M.P. (2002), *Planning Theory for Practitioners*, Planners Press, Chicago, IL.
- Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (2011), "The SAGE Handbook of Leadership", in, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Burns, J.M. (1978), *Leadership*, Harper & Row, New York.
- Campbell, H. and Marshall, R. (1999), "Ethical Frameworks and Planning Theory", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 464-78.
- Christensen, K.S. (1985), "Coping with Uncertainty in Planning", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 51 No. 1, pp. 63-73.
- Davis, M. (2003), "What can we learn by looking for the first code of professional ethics?", *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 433-54.
- Drinan, J.M. (2015), "Life, Water, and the Pursuit of Leadership", *Planning*, Vol. 81 No. 7, pp. 3.
- European Council of Spatial Planners / Conseil Européen des Urbanistes. (2017a), "Draft Principles of Professional Conduct", available at: <http://www.ectp-ceu.eu/images/stories/PDF-docs/DRAFT%20REVISED%20PRINCIPLES%20OF%20PROFESSIONAL%20CONDUCT%202013.pdf> (accessed August 27 2017).
- European Council of Spatial Planners / Conseil Européen des Urbanistes. (2017b), "Members", available at: <http://www.ectp-ceu.eu/index.php/en/members/full-members/vrp-2> (accessed August 27 2017).
- Fahmi, F.Z., Prawira, M.I., Hudalah, D. and Firman, T. (2016), "Leadership and collaborative planning: The case of Surakarta, Indonesia", *Planning Theory*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 294-315.
- Fairholm, M.R. (2004), "Different Perspectives on the Practice of Leadership", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 64 No. 5, pp. 577-90.
- Faludi, A. (1973), *Planning Theory*, Pergamon Press, Oxford.

- Farmer, D.J. (1994), *The Language of Public Administration: Bureaucracy, Modernity, and Postmodernity*, University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, AL.
- Fletcher, J.K. and Käufer, K. (2003), "Shared Leadership: Paradox and Possibility", in Pearce, C.L. and Cooper, J.A. (Eds.), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 21-47.
- Flyvberg, B. and Richardson, T. (2002), "Planning and Foucault", in Allmendinger, P. and Tewdwr-Jones, M. (Eds.), *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory*, Routledge, London, pp. 44-62.
- Follett, M.P. (1926/1987), "The Giving of Orders", in Shafritz, J.M. and Hyde, A.C. (Eds.), *Classics of Public Administration*, Second ed., Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., Pacific Grove, CA, pp. 65-74.
- Forester, J. (2013), *Planning in the Face of Conflict*, American Planning Association Planners Press, Chicago.
- Forsythe, A. (1999), "Administrative Discretion and Urban and Regional Planners' Values", *Journal of Planning Literature*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 5-15.
- Forum for Kommunal Planlegging. (2017), "Etisk-Plattform - - Engelsk", available at: <http://www.ks.no/globalassets/blokker-til-hvert-fagomrade/samfunn-og-demokrati/forum-for-kommunal-planlegging/etisk-plattform-fkp-forslag-17-08-2016---engelsk.pdf> (accessed August 27 2017).
- Frankel, M.S. (1989), "Professional Codes: Why, How, and with What Impact?", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 8 No. 2/3, pp. 109-15.
- Freckelton, I. (1996), "Enforcement of Ethics", in Coady, M. and Bloch, S. (Eds.), *Codes of Ethics and the Professions*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, Australia, pp. 130-65.
- French, J.R., Jr. and Raven, B. (1962), "The Bases of Social Power", in Cartwright, D. (Ed.) *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*, Harper & Row, New York.
- French, J.R., Jr. and Raven, B.H. (1959), "The Bases of Social Power", in Cartwright, D. (Ed.) *Studies in Social Power*, Institutue for Social Research, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Friedmann, J. (1973), *Retracking America*, Anchor Press/Doubleday, Garden City, NY.

- Gardner, H. (1995), *Leading Minds: An Anatomy of Leadership*, BasicBooks, New York.
- Gerckens, L.C. (2000), "Ten Successes that Shaped the 20th Century American City", *Planning Commissioners Journal*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 3-11.
- Getha-Taylor, H., Holmes, M.H., Jacobson, W.S., Morse, R.S. and Sowa, J.E. (2011), "Focusing the Public Leadership Lens: Research Propositions and Questions in the Minnowbrook Tradition", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART*, Vol. 21, pp. i83-i97.
- Global Planners Network. (2017), "Membership", available at: <http://www.globalplannersnetwork.org/membership/> (accessed August 27 2017).
- Gondim, L.M. (1988), "Planning Practice within Public Bureaucracy: A New Perspective on Roles of Planners", *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 163-72.
- Gordon, R. (2011), "Leadership and Power", in Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (Eds.), *The Safe Handbook of Leadership*, Sage, Los Angeles.
- Gunn, S. and Vigar, G. (2012), "Reform processes and discretionary acting space in English planning practice, 1997-2010", *TPR: Town Planning Review*, Vol. 83 No. 5, pp. 533-52.
- Hambleton, R. (2015), *Leading the Inclusive City: Place-Based Innovation for a Bounded Planet*, Policy Press, Bristol, UK.
- Hambleton, R. and Howard, J. (2013), "Place-based Leadership and Public Service Innovation", *Local Government Studies*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 47-70.
- Hoch, C. (1994), *What Planners Do: Power, Politics, and Persuasion*, Planners Press, Chicago, IL.
- Hollinger, R. (1994), *Postmodernism and the Social Sciences: A Thematic Approach*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Horwedel, J., Costa, F., Lindsey, L., Poppel, K., Silver, M., Stoll, G. and Zelinka, A. (2015), "Planning Office of the Future Task Force Report", in, American Planning Association, Chicago, IL.

- Hosking, D.M. (1988), "Organizing, Leadership and Skilful Process", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 147-66.
- Howe, E. (1980), "Role Choices of Urban Planners", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 398-409.
- Howe, E. and Kaufman, J. (1979), "The Ethics of Contemporary American Planners", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 45 No. 3, pp. 243-55.
- Innes, J.E. (1997), "The Planners' Century", *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 227-28.
- Innes, J.E. and Gruber, J. (2005), "Planning Styles in Conflict: The Metropolitan Transportation Commission", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 71 No. 2, pp. 177-88.
- Institute of Town Planners Sri Lanka. (2017), "Code of Conduct", available at: http://www.itpsl.lk/code_of_conduct/ (accessed August 27 2017).
- Jackson, J. (2009), "Neo-liberal or Third Way? What Planners from Glasgow, Melbourne and Toronto Say", *Urban Policy and Research*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 397-417.
- Janis, I.L. (1982), *Groupthink*, 2nd ed., Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, MA.
- Jepson, E.J., Jr. (2004), "Human Nature and Sustainable Development: A Strategic Challenge for Planners", *Journal of Planning Literature*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 3-15.
- Karki, T.K. (2017), "Should planners join politics? Would that help them make better cities?", *Planning Theory*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 186-202.
- Kotter, J.P. (1990), *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*, Free Press, New York.
- Krumholz, N. and Forester, J. (1990), *Making Equity Planning Work: Leadership in the Public Sector*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA.
- Lauria, M. and Long, M. (2017), "Planning Experience and Planners' Ethics", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 83 No. 2, pp. 202-20.

- Lindquist, S.A., Rainey, H.G. and Jarry, E. (2004), "Eternal Disquiet: Discretionary Action by Unelected Officials in the Administrative State", in *Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association*, Chicago, IL.
- Malizia, E. (2006), "Comment on "Planning Leadership in a New Era"", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 72 No. 4, pp. 407-09.
- Mäntysalo, R., Saglie, I.-L. and Cars, G. (2011), "Between Input Legitimacy and Output Efficiency: Defensive Routines and Agonistic Reflectivity in Nordic Land-Use Planning", *European Planning Studies*, Vol. 19 No. 12, pp. 2109-26.
- Mayo, J.M. (1982), "Sources of Job Dissatisfaction: Ideals Versus Realities in Planning", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 48 No. 4, pp. 481-95.
- Myers, D. and Banerjee, T. (2005), "Toward Greater Heights for Planning: Reconciling the Differences between Profession, Practice, and Academic Field", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 71 No. 2, pp. 121-29.
- Needleman, M.L. and Needleman, C.E. (1974), *Guerrillas in the Bureaucracy: The Community Planning Experiment in the United States*, John Wiley & Sons, New York City, NY.
- Nelson, A.C. (2006), "Leadership in a New Era", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 72 No. 4, pp. 393-407.
- New Zealand Planning Institute. (2017), "Code of Ethics", available at: https://www.planning.org.nz/Category?Action=View&Category_id=613 (accessed August 27 2017).
- Northhouse, P.G. (2016), *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, Seventh ed., Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Olshansky, R.B. (2006), "Planning After Hurricane Katrina", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 72 No. 2, pp. 147-53.
- Pearce, C.L. and Conger, J.A. (2003), "All Those Years Ago: The Historical Underpinnings of Shared Leadership", in Pearce, C.L. and Conger, J.A. (Eds.), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 1-18.
- Pearce, C.L., Sims, H.P., Cox, J.F., Ball, G., Schnell, E., Smith, K.A. and Trevino, L. (2003), "Transactors, transformers and beyond: A multi-method development of a theoretical

- typology of leadership", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 273-307.
- Planning Accreditation Board. (2017), "PAB Accreditation Standards and Criteria", in, Planning Accreditation Board, Chicago, IL.
- Quick, K.S. (2017), "Locating and building collective leadership and impact", *Leadership*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 445-71.
- Raven, B.H. (1965), "Social Influence and Power", in Steiner, I.D. and Fishbein, M. (Eds.), *Current Studies in Social Psychology*, Holt, Rinehar, & Winston, New York.
- Riggs, W. (2015), "Lessons in Leading", *Planning*, Vol. 81 No. 2, pp. 60.
- Rost, J.C. (1991), *Leadership for the Twenty-first Century*, Praeger, New York.
- Royal Town Planning Institute. (2011), "Planning Organisations World-Wide", available at: <http://www.rtpi.org.uk/item/1063/> (accessed February 3 2011).
- Royal Town Planning Institute. (2017), "Professional Standards", available at: <http://www.rtpi.org.uk/membership/professional-standards/> (accessed August 27 2017).
- Sager, T. (2009), "Planners' Role: Torn between Dialogical Ideals and Neo-liberal Realities", *European Planning Studies*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 65-84.
- Sorenson, G., Goethals, G.R. and Haber, P. (2011), "The Enduring and Elusive Quest for a General Theory of Leadership: Initial Efforts and New Horizons", in Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*, Sage, Los Angeles, pp. 29-36.
- South African Planning Institute. (2017), "Code of Conduct", available at: <http://sapi.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/The-South-African-Planning-Institute-Code-of-Conduct-July-2005.pdf> (accessed August 27 2017).
- Talvitie, A. (2012), "The problem of trust in planning", *Planning Theory*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 257-78.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R. and McKelvey, B. (2007), "Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 298-318.

Van Wart, M. (2003), "Public-Sector Leadership Theory: An Assessment", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 63 No. 2, pp. 214-28.

Waterhout, B., Othengrafen, F. and Sykes, O. (2013), "Neo-liberalization Processes and Spatial Planning in France, Germany, and the Netherlands: An Exploration", *Planning Practice & Research*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 141-59.

Yiftachel, O. (1989), "Towards a New Typology of Urban Planning Theories", *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, Vol. 16, pp. 23-39.

Table 1 – Leadership Theories

Leadership Theories			
Leadership in an organization is by: group, individuals, or none.	Definition – Leadership is . . .	Leadership Processes	Sources
None			
Substitutes for leadership	processes that organize, prioritize, and provide structure.	Rules, organizing charters, by-laws, moderated discussions, brainstorming, round robin recording of ideas, voting, etc.	(Avolio et al., 2009)
Group			
Complexity leadership	a dynamic network of interdependent agents joined by history and common knowledge	Exchange of information and knowledge, able to learn from feedback and adapt, adept at dealing with non-technical challenges, and highly interactive	(Uhl-Bien et al., 2007, Avolio et al., 2009)
Relational leadership	made up of socially constructed relationships in which change and order emerge and are coordinated throughout the organization	Sharing of responsibilities to keep the organization going through interaction, social systems, social bonds (weak ties and strong ties), sense-making, and structuration based on values, interests, dialogue, and stories	(Uhl-Bien, 2006, Hosking, 2011)
Shared/team leadership	processes by which teams or small groups lead themselves.	Based in social interactions and sharing roles of monitoring progress/effectiveness, staying on task, managing conflict and collaborations, buffering, sharing information, modeling, and networking along with mutual learning and shared understanding	(Northhouse, 2016, Avolio et al., 2009, Fletcher and Käufer, 2003)
Individuals			
Followership and leadership	dependent on followers who can make or break a leader.	The identities of followers intersect with the identities of leaders. Followers can be passive receivers of direction or action-oriented partners and leaders need to understand this dynamic and their own self-development/awareness	(Collinson, 2006, Bligh, 2011)
Servant leadership	service to followers and concentrating on followers' needs	Service oriented, caring, listening, empathy, healing, community building, shows appreciation for the service of others, role model, uses a service commitment to inspire trust and commitment, and orientation that the leader is a servant among servants	(Northhouse, 2016, van Dierendonck and Patterson, 2010, Avolio et al., 2009)
Adaptive/empowering leadership	mobilizing people to adapt, face change, and tackle problems encouraging learning and self-development.	Encourages and allows followers to develop opportunity thinking, teamwork, and self-leadership to address issues and constructively confront change	(Heifetz et al., 2009, Pearce et al., 2003)
Spiritual leadership	creating a sense of meaning in people's lives bringing together body, mind, heart, and spirit for a higher purpose	Respect, compassion, growth, vision, inspiration, personal and work values align around altruism and social responsibility	(Avolio et al., 2009, Fernando, 2011)
Authentic leadership	using transparency, open communication, acceptance of input from followers, and own ethical behavior for decision making.	Objective analysis of data, own behavior governed by morals, self-awareness, and shows authentic self	(Avolio et al., 2009)

Leadership Theories			
Leadership in an organization is by: group, individuals, or none.	Definition – Leadership is . . .	Leadership Processes	Sources
Transformational/charismatic leadership	connecting with the motives of followers and assesses their needs on the way to accomplishing long-term goals resulting in followers doing more than they thought possible.	Transforms people through values and goals, makes connections to followers on a human level, and unleashes the full potential of followers to do more	(Northhouse, 2016)
Leader-member exchange	connecting with each individual follower at different levels seeking mutual obligations and trust resulting in an in-group and an out-group where some people in the organization give and get more from the leader and others stick to contractual exchanges	Mutual dependence, respect, communication and trust, interactions for some go beyond job descriptions but not for others	(Northhouse, 2016, Avolio et al., 2009, Anand et al., 2011)
Transactional leadership	using rewards to condition performance.	Rewards for followers who perform their work well	(Pearce et al., 2003)
Directive leadership	using authority and coercion to direct follower behavior.	Assigns tasks, organizes activities, defines how to do the work, clear communication channels, looks for goal success, directs followers, coordinates activities	(Pearce et al., 2003)

Table 2 – Planning Theories

Planning Theory	Definition of Planning Process	Sources
Systems	Through models seeking to understand the complexity of places, cities, and regions as multi-purpose and interconnected with dynamic components that can self-organize and adapt.	(Brown, 2014, Allmendinger, 2009, Allmendinger, 2017)
Rational	Technical, value-neutral course of action proceeding through the identification of goals, alternatives, consequences of pursuing those alternatives, making a choice based on consequences, implementing the choice, and evaluating the choice.	(Brooks, 2002, Black, 1990, Allmendinger, 2009, Allmendinger, 2017)
Incrementalism	Practical decisions are made by evaluating only a few choices or alternatives, analyzing and evaluating as implementation occurs, small changes address present problems which are pursued over seeking an ideal future.	(Lindblom, 1959/1987, Brooks, 2002, Allmendinger, 2009, Allmendinger, 2017)
Mixed Scanning	Combined rational in incremental processes by pursuing rationality when there is time and resources or when setting policy but using incremental tactics at most other times.	(Brooks, 2002, Etzioni, 1967, Allmendinger, 2009, Allmendinger, 2017)
Transactive	Knowledge is connected to action and change occurs through a chain of interpersonal relations with experts providing analysis and citizens contributing on-the-ground knowledge that builds on authentic relationships, mutual obligations, mutual learning, and common trust.	(Whittemore, 2014, Friedmann, 1973, Allmendinger, 2009, Allmendinger, 2017)
Advocacy	Values guide course of action bringing rational planning to non-experts and underrepresented groups to create their own plans to compete with establishment plans, also includes seeking equity through redistribution of resources.	(Davidoff, 1965/2003, Davidoff and Reiner, 1962, Brooks, 2002, Susskind et al., 2003, Allmendinger, 2009, Allmendinger, 2017)
Progressive	Attention to power dynamics, communication, listening, and Marxian critiques along with valuing equality, social and environmental justice spur action in drawing on groups outside of government and social movements to exert political pressure on elected officials.	(Forester, 1989, Krumholz and Forester, 1990, Forsythe, 1999, Allmendinger, 2017)
Communicative	Awareness of how information represents power, values, and collective sense-making and allowing for the equal dissemination of information to fairly compete for attention and action.	(Brooks, 2002, Healey, 1996/2003, Susskind et al., 2003, Allmendinger, 2001, Allmendinger, 2009, Allmendinger, 2017)
Collaborative	Relies on the creation of networks of stakeholders to facilitate the sharing of information and resources, along with mediations, negotiations, consensus building, and the construction of social capital.	(Brooks, 2002, Innes, 1996, Innes, 1997, Allmendinger, 2017)

Agonism	Sees conflict not as irreconcilable views of enemies but as disagreements between adversaries who can communicate and find solutions that all agree to or at least continue to respect each other and work together in the future.	(Allmendinger, 2001, Mouffe, 2000, Pløger, 2004)
---------	--	--

Table 3 Comparing Planning Office of the Future Report and Leadership Theories

Planning Processes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
Get close to decision-makers	Relational	Group
Exercise different kinds of community leadership	- -	
Address emerging issues and trends	Complexity	Group
Define the planning agency's purpose and scope	Substitutes	None
Develop informal networks	Complexity	Group
Educate elected officials and citizens	Complexity	Group
Build consensus with other agencies	Complexity	Group
Communicate through various news media	Complexity	Group
Identify and assess trends as they emerge	Complexity	Group
Educate the community about issues and trends	Complexity	Group

Table 4 Comparing Planning Theories and Leadership Theories

Planning Theories	Keyword/Concept Matches	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
Systems	complexity, interconnected, self-organize, adapt	Complexity	Group
Rational	course of action	Substitutes	None
Incrementalism	evaluate, adapt	Adaptive/ Empowering	Individual
Mixed Scanning	evaluate, adapt	Adaptive/Empowering	Individual
Transactive	interpersonal relations, mutual learning/obligations, trust	Complexity, Relational, Adaptive/Empowering	Group, Group, Individual
Advocacy	taking expertise to underrepresented groups	Adaptive/Empowering	Individual
Progressive	communication, listening, social movements	Adaptive/Empowering, Authentic	Individual, Individual
Communicative	information, collective sense-making	Complexity	Group
Collaborative	networks, social capital	Relational	Group
Agonism	constructive view of conflict	Substitutes	None

Table 5 Comparing American Institute of Certified Planners Code of Ethics, United States and Leadership Theories

Code of Ethics from the American Institute of Certified Planners, United States (American Planning Association, 2017)			
What do planners do?	Common Themes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
Serve the public interest	service	Servant	Individual
Continuous and open debate	sense-making	Adaptive/Empowering	Individual
Conscious of the rights of others	respect, social responsibility	Spiritual	Individual
Concern for the long-range consequences of present actions	adapt, vision	Adaptive/Empowering, Spiritual	Individual, Individual
Attention to the interrelatedness of decisions	dynamic network	Complexity	Group
Provide timely, adequate, clear, and accurate information on planning issues to all affected persons and to governmental decision makers.	interactive	Complexity	Group
Give people the opportunity to have a meaningful impact on the development of plans and programs that may affect them. Participation should be broad enough to include those who lack formal organization or influence.	self-leadership, develop teamwork	Adaptive/Empowering	Individual
Seek social justice by working to expand choice and opportunity for all persons, recognizing a special responsibility to plan for the needs of the disadvantaged and to promote racial and economic integration. We shall urge the alteration of policies, institutions, and decisions that oppose such needs.	social responsibility, transforms people	Spiritual, Adaptive/Empowering	Individual, Individual
Promote excellence of design and endeavor to conserve and preserve the	--	--	--

Code of Ethics from the American Institute of Certified Planners, United States (American Planning Association, 2017)			
What do planners do?	Common Themes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
integrity and heritage of the natural and built environment.			
Deal fairly with all participants in the planning process.	transparency, open communication	Authentic	Individual
Exercise independent professional judgment on behalf of our clients and employers.	objective analysis	Authentic	Individual
Accept the decisions of our client or employer concerning the objectives and nature of the professional services we perform unless the course of action is illegal or plainly inconsistent with our primary obligation to the public interest.	leader and followers intersect	Followership	Individual
Avoid a conflict of interest or even the appearance of a conflict of interest in accepting assignments from clients or employers.	trust, transparency	Servant, Authentic	Individual, Individual
Improving knowledge and techniques, making work relevant to solutions of community problems, and increasing public understanding of planning activities.	interactive, education, mutual learning	Complexity, Adaptive/Empowering	Group, Individual
Shall examine the applicability of planning theories, methods, research and practice and standards to the facts and analysis of each particular situation and shall not accept the applicability of a customary solution without first establishing its appropriateness to the situation.	objective analysis	Authentic	Individual

Code of Ethics from the American Institute of Certified Planners, United States (American Planning Association, 2017)			
What do planners do?	Common Themes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
Systematically and critically analyze ethical issues in the practice of planning	own ethical behavior	Authentic	Individual
Contribute time and effort to groups lacking in adequate planning resources and to voluntary professional activities.	service	Servant	Individual
Shall not, as public officials or employees, engage in private communications with planning process participants if the discussions relate to a matter over which we have authority to make a binding, final determination if such private communications are prohibited by law or by agency rules, procedures, or custom.	laws, rules	Followership	Individual
Shall not use the power of any office to seek or obtain a special advantage that is not a matter of public knowledge or is not in the public interest.	trust	Servant	Individual
Shall not direct or coerce other professionals to make analyses or reach findings not supported by available evidence.	interactive, interdependent agents	Complexity	Group
Shall not unlawfully discriminate against another person.	law	Followership	Individual

Table 6 Comparing Royal Town Planning Institute Code of Ethics, United Kingdom and Leadership Theories

Code of Ethics from the Royal Town Planning Institute, United Kingdom (Royal Town Planning Institute, 2017)			
What do planners do?	Common Themes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
Conduct themselves in a way that inspires trust and confidence in the profession	trust	Servant	Individual
Act with honesty and integrity throughout their career.	transparency, ethical	Authentic	Individual
Take all reasonable steps to ensure that their private, personal, political and financial interests do not conflict with their professional duties.	trust, transparency	Servant, Authentic	Individual, Individual
Must not disclose or use to the advantage of themselves, their employers or clients information acquired in confidence in the course of their work.	trust	Servant	Individual
Must exercise fearlessly and impartially their independent professional judgement to the best of their skill and understanding.	objective analysis	Authentic	Individual
Must not discriminate on grounds including but not limited to race, nationality, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability or age.	social responsibility	Spiritual	Individual
Must seek to eliminate discrimination by others and promote equality of opportunity throughout their professional activities.	social responsibility, transforms people	Spiritual, Adaptive/Empowering	Individual, Individual

Table 7 Comparing New Zealand Planning Institute Code of Ethics, New Zealand and Leadership Theories

Code of Ethics from the New Zealand Planning Institute, New Zealand (New Zealand Planning Institute, 2017)			
What do planners do?	Common Themes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
Shall maintain an appropriate professional awareness of issues related to the Treaty of Waitangi and to the needs and interests of Tangata Whenua.	joined by history, law	Complexity, Followership	Many, Individual
Shall, subject to respecting a client's or employer's right of confidentiality, endeavor to ensure that full, clear and accurate information is available	trust, transparency	Servant, Authentic	Individual, Individual
Are meaningful opportunities for public input and participation.	self-leadership, develop teamwork	Adaptive/Empowering	Individual
Ensure that special attention is paid to the inter-relatedness of decisions and the environmental, social and economic consequences of planning actions	dynamic network	Complexity	Group
Recognise the need to maintain and promote high environmental standards and outcomes.	--	--	--
Carry out all professional work with integrity, and in a spirit of fairness, fidelity and objectivity	transparency, open communication	Authentic	Individual
Shall not make any misleading claims, or attempt to influence any decisions by improper means.	trust, transparency	Servant, Authentic	Individual, Individual
Shall strive to ascertain the appropriate factual situation, and maintain unbiased and object judgement, and shall not give	objective analysis	Authentic	Individual

Code of Ethics from the New Zealand Planning Institute, New Zealand (New Zealand Planning Institute, 2017)			
What do planners do?	Common Themes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
professional advice or evidence which is other than their true professional opinion.			

Table 8 Comparing South African Planning Institute Code of Conduct, South Africa and Leadership Theories

Code of Conduct from the South African Planning Institute, South Africa (South African Planning Institute, 2017)			
What do planners do?	Common Themes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
Shall endeavor to deepen the values espoused in the South African Bill of Rights at all times, including specifically – its democratic spirit, humanistic spirit, and environmental spirit	sense of meaning in people’s lives, law	Spiritual, Followership	Individual, Individual
Shall not discriminate in any way	social responsibility	Spiritual	Individual
Be conscious of the ethical dimension of the recommendations and representations offered to clients, communities and decision-makers.	own ethical behavior	Authentic	Individual
Uphold the interests of the public	community building	Servant	Individual
Act with competence, honesty and integrity in their professional activities.	transparency, ethical	Authentic	Individual
Shall exercise their independent professional judgement to the best of their skill and understanding.	objective analysis	Authentic	Individual
Shall be accountable to the public and shall ensure the public shall be consulted appropriately as required by the relevant legislation.	law, self-awareness	Followership, Authentic	Individual, Individual
Will be exercising independent and specialist judgement, such judgement on major decisions should be exercised only after the necessary consultation with	exchange of information	Complexity	Group

Code of Conduct from the South African Planning Institute, South Africa (South African Planning Institute, 2017)			
What do planners do?	Common Themes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
beneficiaries, affected parties and / or the public at large.			
Respect the rights of others and in particular the rights of the public.	respect, social responsibility	Spiritual	Individual
Shall approach their responsibilities in a way that seeks to promote the profession through capacity-building, and to promote informed decision-making where relevant with respect to affected parties.	transforms people, skills of followers	Adaptive/Empowering, Followership	Individual, Individual
All persons have the right to a healthy and ecologically balanced environment. In order to secure this right, members shall strive to foster and promote balanced and appropriate social and economic growth and development of the country and its people.	--	--	--
Strive to promote the rational use of natural resources with regard to local, regional and national planning in the maintenance or creation of both balanced and sustainable ecological and biological areas.	--	--	--
Be familiar with all the relevant legislation that relates both directly and indirectly to planning and the environment.	law	Followership	Individual
Subscribe to, honest, fair and just governance measures in all their affairs and activities that promote the meaningful	transparency, ethical	Authentic	Individual

Code of Conduct from the South African Planning Institute, South Africa (South African Planning Institute, 2017)			
What do planners do?	Common Themes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
involvement and participation of all relevant stakeholders.			

Table 9 Comparing European Council of Spatial Planners / Conseil Européen des Urbanistes Charter of Professional Conduct and Leadership Theories

Charter of Professional Conduct from the European Council of Spatial Planners / Conseil Européen des Urbanistes (European Council of Spatial Planners / Conseil Européen des Urbanistes, 2017a)			
What do planners do?	Common Themes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
Shall act with integrity and honesty with the interests of the community being their paramount consideration	transparency, ethical	Authentic	Individual
Exercise their independent professional judgement to the best of their skill and understanding	objective analysis	Authentic	Individual
Not discriminate on the grounds of race, sex, sexual orientation, creed, religion, disability or age	social responsibility	Spiritual	Individual
Shall seek to promote equality of opportunity	social responsibility, transforms people	Spiritual, Adaptive/Empowering	Individual, Individual
Respect other related professions and shall collaborate with them and seek their expertise whenever appropriate to the nature of the task.	dynamic network	Complexity	Group

**Table 10 Comparing the Institute of Town Planners, Sri Lanka Code of Conduct,
Sri Lanka and Leadership Theories**

Code of Conduct from the Institute of Town Planners, Sri Lanka (Institute of Town Planners Sri Lanka, 2017)			
What do planners do?	Common Themes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
Must not hold, assume, accept or retain a position in which his interest is in conflict with his professional duty.	trust, transparency	Servant, Authentic	Individual, Individual
Shall seek to eliminate discrimination on the ground of race, sex, creed and religion and in particular shall seek to promote equality of opportunity between people of different groups and good race relations.	social responsibility, transform people	Spiritual, Adaptive/Empowering	Individual, Individual

Table 11 Comparing the Forum for Municipal Planning Forum for Kommunal Planlegging, Ethical Platform, Norway and Leadership Theories

Ethical Platform from Forum for Municipal Planning Forum for Kommunal Planlegging, Norway (Forum for Kommunal Planlegging, 2017)			
What do planners do?	Common Themes	Leadership Theories	Number of Leaders
Promote sustainable development to the best for individuals, society and future generations, based on transparency, predictability and participation for all private and public parties involved.	Adapt, interactive, transparent, trust, predictability	Servant, Authentic, Complexity	Individual, Individual, Group
Conscious their social responsibility, and encourage that it is expressed through action.	social responsibility	Spiritual	Individual
Based on the Norwegian democracy's fundamental principles of equality, openness, rule of law and rights to participation.	Law, participation, transparency	Followership, Authentic, Adaptive/Empowering	Individual, Individual, Individual
Based on best accessible and updated knowledge	Knowledge	Complexity	Group
Show respect to the elected officials' tasks and roles, within the framework of the planner's own professional integrity and the mission of planning.	Rules, laws	Followership	Individual
Shall assist in making clear the range of opportunities within the framework of national policy, law and regulations, and accessible resources	Service, laws	Servant, Followership	Individual, Individual
Separate the person from the problem and build trust between parties.	Objective, trust	Authentic	Individual
Meet everyone with openness, understanding and guidance, and facilitate good planning processes that promote involvement and participation.	Facilitate, open, involvement	Complexity, Adaptive/Empowering	Group, Individual
Assist disadvantaged groups participating and advocate that no groups or interests are discriminated.	advocacy	Spiritual	Individual
Shall demonstrate openness and respect to other professional methods and contributions, and commit to innovation and holistic solutions through cooperation with fellow planners and other professional	Dynamic networks, interdependent agents	Complexity	Group

Table 12: Planners' Leadership Comfort Zone (C's) and Uncomfortable (Gray) Zone

	Leadership Theories													
	None	Group				Individual								
Sources of Planning Processes	Substitutes	Complexity	Relational	Shared /team	Place-based	Followership	Servant	Adaptive/empowering	Spiritual	Authentic	Transformation /charismatic	Leader-member exchange	Transactional	Directive
Planning Office of the Future Report	C	C	C											
Planning Theories	C	C	C					C		C				
American Institute of Certified Planners (U.S.)		C			C	C	C	C	C	C				
Royal Town Planning Institute							C	C	C	C				
New Zealand Planning Institute		C			C	C	C	C		C				
South African Planning Institute		C			C	C	C	C	C	C				
European Council of Spatial Planners / Conseil Européen des Urbanistes		C						C	C	C				
Institute of Town Planners, Sri Lanka							C	C	C	C				
Forum for Municipal Planning, Norway		C				C	C	C	C	C				

