

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236538284>

Planning and Policy Analysis Converging or Diverging Trends?

Article in *Journal of the American Planning Association* · June 1983

DOI: 10.1080/01944368308977064

CITATIONS

22

READS

89

2 authors, including:



Rachelle Alterman

Technion - Israel Institute of Technology

160 PUBLICATIONS 1,110 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Mare Nostrum Project [View project](#)



renewable energy - land-related regulatory aspects [View project](#)

Converging or Diverging Trends?

Rachelle Alterman and Duncan MacRae, Jr.

Ever since policy analysis appeared on the scene as a field of higher education and practice, planners have been concerned about their relationship with it, at times claiming that planning and policy analysis are one and the same, at other times viewing the two as different fields. This article examines the relationship between the two fields in terms of their underlying assumptions and prevailing modes of practice, comparing them along eight dimensions. The conclusions show that some significant differences between the fields do exist, and there are trends both of convergence and divergence. Some directions for the future relations between planning and policy analysis are outlined.

In the field of planning, which dates back to the turn of the twentieth century, there has been an increased awareness of possible overlap with a relative newcomer, the field of public policy analysis. The question arises whether this overlap suggests cooperation, or the drawing of clearer boundaries between these two fields; or more generally, whether other related fields should also clarify their interrelations with these two fields. With jobs and resources becoming more scarce in both practice and teaching, the time is ripe to take a closer look at the relationship between these two fields and to consider options for their future. For planners, such a look is especially pertinent. Notorious for their ambivalence about their identity, planners have found that their relationship with the new, self-assured and clearly defined enterprise of policy analysis poses major dilemmas. Taking upon themselves the roles of representatives of planning and policy analysis, the authors wish here to explore the relations between these two fields in view of their possible future developments.

The similarity between planning and policy analysis can be shown by illustrative definitions that have been

proposed for each. Friedmann and Hudson (1974, p. 2) define planning as "the linkage between knowledge and organized action." Quade (1975, p. 4), for comparison, defines policy analysis as "any type of analysis that generates and presents information in such a way as to improve the basis for policy-makers to exercise their judgment." The general, inclusive character of these definitions makes them applicable to any provision of knowledge or information to aid public action, and sometimes private as well.

If these and other similar definitions were to be taken literally, either of these fields would be extremely inclusive and they would coincide to a great extent. Yet, if this wide expanse of intellectual territory is claimed, it may be hard to hold. Wildavsky (1973) once contended (to the displeasure of planners), "If Planning is Everything, Maybe It's Nothing." A claim that overlaps with the activities of all the applied sciences, as well as important features of the professions, may be seen as really nothing new. Therefore the assumptions that planners and policy analysts bring to bear in their work and their modes of practice must be explored more specifically.

An overlap between two fields such as planning and policy analysis raises several problems.

- a. Competition. In the job market for graduates and on some university campuses (Mann 1978, p. 119), two such fields may compete for scarce resources. Positions for both are scarce in the present shrinking governmental job market in the United States. On campuses there may be questions as to who gets the next tenure-track position; or more acutely, which department is folded into which other. Similar re-

Rachelle Alterman is Chairperson of the Program in Urban and Regional Planning, Technion, Haifa, Israel, and in 1981-82 was a visiting associate professor at the Department of City and Regional Planning of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Duncan MacRae, Jr., is William Rand Kenan, Jr., Professor of Political Science and Sociology, and Chairman of the Curriculum in Public Policy Analysis, at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

lations have existed between public administration and policy analysis, with some policy schools having replaced schools of public administration.

- b. Internal heterogeneity. It must be noted that there may be several modes or schools of thought within either field; this is especially characteristic of planning, but there is some diversity within policy analysis as well. Any judgments regarding the convergence or divergence of these two fields must therefore distinguish these various tendencies.
- c. Possible misperceptions. When people from two fields consider one another's work, they are often selective. They may, indeed, not perceive the other's work as relevant at all. Thus policy analysts have often ignored the relevant contributions of planning¹ or regarded it as having strictly urban concerns rather than generic aspects. They seem in general to be much less concerned than planners with what the relationship between the two fields should be. Planners, on the other hand, may tend to exaggerate the degree of "rationality" in policy analysis, even though the craft of policy analysis (Wildavsky 1979; Lynn 1980) involves political sensitivity and some subtlety in the definition of problems.
- d. Vested interests. When there is overlap of this sort one could conclude that the two fields in question should divide the territory and each pursue a separate course; this would serve the prior interest of each in remaining distinct. However, one might also conclude that there is a need for change in the definition of one or both, or for cooperation; if so, the interests of practitioners and teachers might hinder such changes. The inertia of departments may be sustained by a similar inertia of national disciplinary or professional associations.

The emergence of policy analysis

Before a detailed comparison of planning and public policy analysis is provided, a description of policy analysis and its emergence and intellectual origins must be given. It is assumed that the reader can provide a parallel account for the origins of planning in the United States.

Policy analysis as a self-conscious field called by this name dates only from about 1970 in the development of a set of major institutions funded by the Ford Foundation (graduate schools at Berkeley, Carnegie-Mellon, Duke, Harvard, Michigan, Stanford, and Texas, and the Rand Corporation), and from 1979 in the establishment of a national organization, the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM). A major ingredient of the field has been public economics, which developed during the previous two decades within economics. Added to this has been a combination of political science (especially organizational politics), operations research, statistics, the ethics of the

analyst's role, and contributions from other disciplines (which vary from one campus or research center to another). The use of analytic techniques is central; but political insight, creativity, and the understanding of particular situations join them in the craft aspect of the field. Practical experience and case studies connect these ingredients and shape them so as to be useful. This new field is more homogeneous than planning; it has escaped the reforms of the 1960s, having no radical wing, and thus is more like an organization than a community.

The earlier development of public economics has been described by Haveman and Margolis (1977, Introduction). The theory of the perfect market as an optimizer of efficiency led to the identification of a set of market failure conditions (externalities, collective goods, natural monopolies, etc.) in which a *prima facie* case for public intervention in the market can be made. Alternative types and degrees of such intervention (public policies) may then often be evaluated with the aid of benefit-cost analysis, which uses the same criterion as is used in measurement of the output in the economy, the national income (Haveman and Weisbrod 1975, p. 176). The theoretical aspect of this field is taught in economics; the more applied aspects have been taught in planning in connection with public investment, and more recently in graduate schools of policy analysis.

In the major graduate schools of policy analysis, material drawn from political science is used to supplement the economic and analytical approach. This material mainly concerns the feasibility of enactment and implementation of policies. Allison's *Essence of Decision* (1971) was a pioneering work in this area, examining the organizational complexities of the Cuban missile crisis. As a more recent illustrative work, Lynn and Whitman (1981) have analyzed failures of leadership and tactics in the Carter administration. In addition, an extensive literature comprising case studies and empirical generalizations has been concerned with policy implementation. Thus analysts learn to shape policies that will be not only desirable (if put into effect) but also politically and administratively feasible.

The actual field of policy analysis can be defined not only by its component principles and techniques adapted from the disciplines, and by the topics it treats, but also by what it does not do. Its abstract definition implies that its approach is applicable to any problem of policy choice. In actuality, defense policy is treated at some but not all of the major graduate schools. Urban spatial problems are not emphasized. Foreign policy, in the sense of diplomacy and international economics, is rarely dealt with; the latter, like macroeconomic policy, is usually left to economists. The design of political institutions—constitutions, electoral laws, and legislative procedures—is usually left to political scientists. Population policy is left to demographers

and sociologists. The evaluation of public programs that are already in place, as contrasted with prospective analysis, is sometimes done; but a separate interdisciplinary research role, whose practitioners are organized in the Evaluation Research Society of America, specializes in this aspect.

The growth of the policy analysis graduate schools and of APPAM in the 1970s has placed increased emphasis on the disciplinary aspect of the field, in contrast with its professional aspect.² Even though the great majority of the graduates of policy analysis schools receive only the master's degree and move into governmental practice, the major schools tend to be judged largely by the research undertaken by the faculty and the small number of doctoral students. However, the earlier development of the field, dating to the years just after World War II, took the form of practice rather than academic teaching and publication. The practitioners of policy analysis, though originally trained in academic disciplines, applied their knowledge to practical tasks of governmental choice. They worked in interdisciplinary teams and developed an informal recognition of high quality analysis which, though not organized as a profession, was a forerunner of the present field with its greater representation in the universities.

The most visible beginning of the field occurred with the establishment of the Rand Corporation in Santa Monica, California, in 1948. Designed to analyze problems of defense policy for the U.S. Air Force,³ it was placed at a distance from Washington and freed from civil service requirements as an independent contractor. Its analysts had been trained in economics, physical science, operations research, systems analysis, and mathematics; and later more came from political science, sociology, and other disciplines as its field of interest expanded toward domestic policies.

In 1961, when Robert McNamara became Secretary of Defense, he brought with him to Washington a team of technically trained defense analysts, many of whom came from Rand. Their approach to budgeting became the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS) and was recommended by President Johnson for use throughout the federal government. Although this ambitious approach was never fully realized, its encouragement led to the proliferation of analytic teams both in the armed services and in departments dealing with domestic affairs such as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with its Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (Meltsner 1980, p. 239).

In 1967, a series of experiments was launched to test the effects of a proposed negative income tax to cope with poverty. Funded by the federal Office of Economic Opportunity, they involved in execution and analysis both the Institute for Research on Poverty of the University of Wisconsin, and Mathematica Inc., a private

research organization in Princeton, New Jersey. In 1968 the Urban Institute was founded in Washington, D.C., as an independent contractor for several government departments concerned with domestic policy. By 1970, when Meltsner (1976), who had earlier worked at Rand, began his interviewing for *Policy Analysts in the Bureaucracy*, he could draw his sample on the basis of personal recommendations (p. 15) of "respected analysts" (p. 297), indicating the existence of informal groups who recognized one another.

At the same time that policy analysis was spreading throughout Washington, it also spread in a more modest way in the nation's cities. In 1968, Rand established a New York office under Mayor Lindsay, beginning work on problems concerning the police, fire protection, housing, health, water pollution, correctional institutions, welfare, and the New York labor market. It had mixed successes, and was terminated in 1975 (Szanton 1981, pp. 81-98).

In the founding of APPAM, therefore, a group of experienced government analysts and leaders of private consulting organizations joined with heads of graduate university programs. Their doctrines and practices had no official or central statement; the diversity of analytical practice is in fact reported by Meltsner (1976), who distinguishes three types of analysts—technician, politician, and entrepreneur. In addition, a variety of persons and groups not affiliated with APPAM have marshalled information for policy choice and reflected on the nature of the field. The journal *Policy Sciences* antedates APPAM and is independent of it. The Policy Studies Organization, closely associated with political science, sponsors two journals, the *Policy Studies Journal* and the *Policy Studies Review*. A number of research organizations conduct policy analysis without close association with APPAM; these include the Brookings Institution, Abt Associates, and American Enterprise Institute. The generalizations below about policy analysis must thus be qualified by this lack of codification of the field.⁴

Dimensions for comparison

The question of the degree of similarity between planning and policy analysis seems to concern planners more than policy analysts. It often comes up in planning schools, when planners find that policy analysts are applying for similar jobs, or in discussion of planning theory. Usually, the comparison of the two fields is made in a general, holistic fashion. One often hears statements such as "planning and policy analysis are one and the same thing," or statements to the contrary. The authors feel, however, that a fruitful investigation of the relationship between the two fields must look at particular attributes of them and compare the fields in terms of these attributes. Furthermore, it has been

recognized that both planning and policy analysis involve multiple tendencies or approaches—sometimes combined, but at other times reflected in separate schools of thought. Particular tendencies in one field may correspond closely to matching tendencies in the other.

To show the differences and similarities that exist, and to help choose among possible options, the authors propose a set of dimensions for comparing the two fields. The comparison is summarized in Table 1. In this table, the rows correspond to the dimensions for comparison and the columns to planning and policy analysis. In addition, a third column is included which looks at possible emerging trends of convergence or divergence between the two fields. The following discussion will amplify and explain the row comparisons in the table.

It should be emphasized that the comparison presented below may hold true only or mainly in the American context. In the discussion of this table the two fields are considered not on the normative level, as perhaps they should be, but rather in terms of how they have emerged within the particular socioeconomic and political context of the United States. In other countries, both planning and policy analysis may take different forms or may not exist as separate professional or disciplinary areas at all.

Dimension 1: generic versus substantive focus

Planning started from a substantive definition as a field specialized in urban problems with a spatial common denominator (Susskind 1974; Sawicki 1979; Catanese 1979). Beginning in the early 1950s with the Chicago School view of planning (Perloff 1957; Sarbib, n.d.), planning underwent what may be called the “generic explosion,” whereby it defined itself as being not just a substantive specialty but also a field with a common process and set of tools that can apply to any policy area. The generic view of planning, centered around a broadly applicable planning process, has been gaining much popularity since the 1960s, to the extent that by the end of that decade the American Institute of Planners saw fit to change the wording of its constitution, dropping the description of planning as concerned particularly with land uses and the physical environment (Wetmore 1970). Many planning schools have since become more and more similar to today’s policy analysis schools, tending to focus more on analytic tools and generic concerns and less on substantive problems. They have offered courses in such diverse areas as health planning and criminal justice planning, in addition to the more traditional topics dealing with human settlements and spatial aspects. Graduates from planning schools have in fact entered many policy areas, and those affiliated with the American Planning Association cover a wide range of areas of substantive expertise.

Today the generic view of planning is still prevalent in planning education and planning practice, with planning currently being defined in a dual mode as both a generic field and a specialized one. This duality is sometimes confusing, as indicated by the oft-heard question, “Do you mean planning with a capital P or a small p?” No direct challenge to this dual view seems to be emerging in the United States. However, some lessons may be drawn from the recent attack voiced by a prominent group of planning educators and theorists in the United Kingdom⁵ who have called for the desertion of what they call the “contextless and contentless” view of planning, and a return to a clear focus on the theory and practice of urban and regional planning (Healey, MacDougall, and Thomas 1982).

Policy analysis, in contrast, has defined itself as intrinsically generic, with some policy schools priding themselves on the capacity of their graduates to move into any substantive field without prior training in it and to contribute analytic insight (Wildavsky 1979, p. 414). Policy analysts apply their skills to many domestic, national, international, or defense problems, whereas even under the broader view of planning, planners have tended to apply their skills mostly to domestic matters.

The overlap between planning and policy analysis is thus largely restricted to the generic view of planning, and does not cover the substantive aspect. When policy analysis emerged as a distinct field in the 1970s, planning had already espoused the dual view of itself. It is no wonder, therefore, that the overlap is viewed by many planners as a threat. Until the relationship between the dual modes within planning itself is resolved, there is likely to be a continued ambivalence of planners toward policy analysis.

Dimension 2: stage in the planning/policy making process

With its historic roots in the design professions, planning has traditionally been concerned with the design of alternative solutions; planners have prided themselves on innovation and on their capacity to enlarge the range of options available (Sawicki 1982; Perloff 1980, pp. 271–98). In recent years these capacities have declined somewhat, but calls have been made for their rejuvenation (Alexander 1981; Perloff 1980, p. 274). As planning became more “scientific” and rational, there was greater emphasis on the analysis and comparison of alternative solutions rather than on their development, and much of planning practice still focuses on analysis. In recent years there has also been a growing focus on the implementation process (Alterman 1982a). Not only have planners been more and more concerned with analyzing the likelihood of implementation, but in addition planners have espoused several roles that call for direct involvement in implementation, as through coordination, mediation, and service delivery.

Table 1. Planning and policy analysis: Dimensions for comparison

Dimension	Planning	Public policy analysis	Trends of convergence/divergence
1. Generic vs. substantive focus	<p>Historic roots in urban physical planning: in '50s-'60s—"generic explosion." Today, concurrent mixture of generic and substantive views of the profession.</p>	<p>Claims to be generic, applying to any domestic, national, foreign or defense problem. Problem of extent of emphasis on training in some substantive area.</p>	<p>Trend toward convergence as planning became more generic ('70s). Possible crossroads in '80s—some calls for rejection of "contentless" planning.</p>
2. Stage in the planning/policy making process	<p>Traditional emphasis on design of solutions, innovation. Later, emphasis on analysis and comparison of alternatives. Recent added focus on implementation needs plus direct involvement in implementation.</p>	<p>Less emphasis on design. Emphasis on analysis and comparison of alternatives and impacts. Recent awareness of implementation needs; less direct involvement.</p>	<p>Some convergence with persisting difference.</p>
3. Complexity and time range	<p>Often deals with complex, multi-sectoral problems; "intangibles" and uncertainty. Tradition of long-range view. More concern recently also with sectoral policies, more middle- and short-range emphasis.</p>	<p>Tends to deal with simpler, uni-sectoral problems. Usually takes short or middle range view.</p>	<p>Some convergence with persisting difference.</p>
4. Rationality, analytic and quantitative techniques	<p>Rise and demise of, and ambivalence about, the rational-synoptic model. Considerable use of quantitative methods, scientific analysis. Yet recent questioning of positivist social science.</p>	<p>Rational approach is central to policy choice. Paramount emphasis on analytic and quantitative techniques (cost-benefit analysis, statistical decision models, some operations research).</p>	<p>Past convergence re: use of analytic techniques. Recent growing divergence (at least in "planning theory").</p>
5. Institutionalization, professionalization	<p>(a) Institutionalized at local and regional level; some national legislation in certain substantive areas (e.g., environment) (b) Professional tradition. Some current trends to deprofessionalize</p>	<p>(a) Activity exists in some agencies at federal and state level. A few beginnings at local level. (b) "Policy analyst" becoming a job title.</p>	<p>(a) Some convergence (competition) at local level. (b) Increasing competition.</p>
6. Range of roles	<p>Wide diversity of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adviser to governmental officials;-analyst • advocate for constituency • community organizer • coordinator & facilitator of communication • deliverer of goods/services • implementor of policies within agencies 	<p>More limited range of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • staff adviser to governmental officials • contractor for research • consultant <p>Possible additional roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • community consultant • citizen as leader 	<p>Only partial overlap; Possible convergence (increasing competition) since public policy analysis may include additional roles.</p>

Table 1. Continued

Dimension	Planning	Public policy analysis	Trends of convergence/divergence
7. Definition of client/constituency	Traditional normative responsibility to "ultimate client:" allegiance to "public interest." Commitment to direct participation. In many roles, direct interaction with local residents. Yet—growing recognition of need to respond directly to decision maker.	Client defined as employer, contractor, decision maker. Legitimacy of goals through market or representation. Little direct interaction with affected populations. Some recent calls for "analyst as advocate."	Increasing divergence re: some planning modes (learning, radical, critical, transactive). Some convergence re: other planning modes (analyst).
8. Ethics, ideologies, values	Value neutrality not promoted in many planning modes. Normative commitment to particular values (equity, opportunities for disadvantaged). In some planning modes—commitment to radical social change. Education in ethics takes important place.	Direct clients as source of values. Ethics as criterion for choice among alternatives (e.g., benefit-cost plus "equity"). No particular social philosophy or allegiance to particular values promoted. Growing awareness of ethics.	Divergence re: many planning modes (radical, critical, advocacy, transactive, even formalized ethics code). Possible partial convergence in future if public policy analysis expands view of ethics, social roles.

Public policy analysis, on the other hand, has tended to deemphasize the details of the design stage of the planning/policy making process, focusing on them even less than planning practice does currently. The technical aspect of public policy analysis has tended to stress the analysis and evaluation of alternative policies. In the craft aspect of their activity, analysts are concerned with the framing of alternatives (Quade 1975, pp. 20, 116–123). These alternatives, however, are usually formulated concisely so that most of the analytic effort can be spent on drawing out and comparing their consequences. Elaborate designs, including spatial design, details of organizational structure, or personnel recruitment tend to be deemphasized either because they are not expected to affect the results greatly, because their effects are thought to be intangible and thus difficult to analyze, or because they are less important for the type of problems chosen.

Although both fields share the growing awareness of the need to undertake implementation analysis so as to increase the chances that policies will work when applied, policy analysts, unlike planners, have not seen personal involvement in implementation as part of their role.

There are thus considerable similarities in the way that the two fields view the planning/policy making process and its various stages. Yet there are some significant differences as well that stem from traditions present in planning and absent in policy analysis, and from the wider range of roles for planners (to be described under Dimension 6 below). The similarities are

likely to persist and perhaps even grow stronger as planners become more concerned with *post hoc* evaluation, following in the footsteps of policy analysts who have recently become more interested in that area.⁶ However, the differences are also likely to persist, and may even grow if the recent calls for the re-strengthening of the design and innovation tradition in planning should have any marked effect.

Dimension 3: complexity and time range

Traditionally planners have taken the comprehensive approach, which involved them in the analysis of problems of great complexity pertaining to entire cities or regions, usually in a long-range perspective. This tradition has come under increasing attack since the mid-1960s as long-range plans were seen as being irrelevant for implementation. Calls were made for middle-range (Meyerson 1956; cf. Robinson 1965) and short-range planning (Rondinelli 1973; Sawicki 1982). Similar criticism has been directed at the comprehensive approach (Barr 1972), as many have called for the substitution of more limited and focused plans for the traditional comprehensive city plans (Rondinelli 1973; Krumholz, Cogger, and Linner 1975).

Sectoral planning, in contrast, might focus on transportation planning, industrial planning, housing, or another topic without attempting to link all these into an overall plan for a city or region. This approach, more like that of policy analysis, comes closer to proposing problems that can be tackled quantitatively. Any synthesis of the two fields must presumably recognize the

existence of both types of problems. Sectoral problems can be studied in a fashion that more nearly resembles academic research, but the more comprehensive problems that arise in a crowded "policy space" (Wildavsky 1979, pp. 64–67) are a feature of reality that cannot be ignored.

As planning has moved away from an exclusive concern with the long-range time span and comprehensive view toward sectoral problems, it has become much more akin to policy analysis. Yet the differences between the two fields are still likely to persist. The comprehensive long-range view of urban planning (called "advance planning" by Chapin and Kaiser, 1979, p. 60) is by no means dead, and much planning activity is still guided by it. In fact, some recent calls have been made (Perloff 1980, pp. 274–276) for planners to renew their long-range focus and to serve as agents for encouraging a look into alternative futures for a community.

Dimension 4: rationality, analytic and quantitative techniques

The rational (also called synoptic) mode of planning calls for the systematic development of alternatives, the use of precisely stated evaluation criteria, and often the formulation of quantitative models, in order to select the optimal course of action. Emerging at first at the University of Chicago in the 1940s as part and parcel of the generic explosion, the rational model achieved great popularity as planners defined themselves more scientifically and developed quantitative and analytic models and techniques. There have been many examples of attempts to develop elaborate techniques for planning—not only functional planning concerned with limited problems, but comprehensive urban or regional planning as well.⁷

However, over the past ten or fifteen years, this mode of planning has come under a growing barrage of criticism (noted by Hudson 1979; Hemmens 1980; Beauregard 1980). In planning more than in policy analysis, the difficulties of translating public problems into valid quantitative models, and the communicative problems in the relation between planners and the public, have been emphasized. One recent line of criticism of the rational synoptic model, arising from critical theory in planning, has even gone so far as to challenge the very positivist assumptions underlying the mainstream of the social sciences today, on which much of the rational and analytic models and tools used in planning are based (reviewed in Hemmens and Stiftel, 1980).

In policy analysis, in contrast, the rational model of analysis has a central place. A set of techniques derived from economics and operations research seem accepted as essential to the field (cf. Stokey and Zeckhauser 1978), even though questions of political feasibility and

social impact are also acknowledged as important. Especially when policy analysis "moves toward social experimentation and the validation and creation of policy knowledge, its practitioners . . . become part of a scientific [field]" (Meltsner 1980, p. 238), which is necessarily rational in its standards. MacRae (1976, ch. 9) has called this aspect of policy analysis an "applied social science discipline." To the extent that the rational model is still espoused in planning and that analytic techniques are being used (and that is probably a considerable extent), the two fields still overlap in practice to a great degree. However, the more recent modes of planning and their attack on the rational model may lead to growing divergence in practice, as well as in theory.

Dimension 5: Institutionalization and Professionalization

By institutionalization is meant the degree to which the activity has become a function recognized by government and the public. In that sense, urban and regional planning in the United States has been institutionalized for many decades. Government recognition has existed primarily at the local level, where planning functions have existed in almost every city and town since the 1930s. Recent years have also seen a growing body of federal legislation and federal programs pertaining to the planning of cities and regions, and planning functions have also appeared at the regional and state levels (Healy and Rosenberg 1979).

Public policy analysis, on the other hand, has been institutionalized to a much lesser degree. There are still few agencies or divisions of government whose titles include "policy analysis," and the work is often done "behind such titles as budget analyst, program analyst, manpower analyst or economist" (Meltsner 1980, p. 242). Nevertheless, the term "Policy Analyst" as a job description has become more widespread. It is probably true to say that policy analysis is done mostly at the federal government level, and to a lesser extent at the state level. Yet a few beginnings at the local level have also been documented (Sawicki 1982).

The differences between the two areas in terms of level of government are probably not a mere question of scale. The fact that most planners are oriented to the local level, while most policy analysts are oriented to the federal level, is significant. It probably underlies some further differences between the two fields, to be outlined in the dimensions below. In the future, one can expect this difference to persist, yet there may also be greater convergence (and thus competition) as policy analysts seek jobs with local governments and as local governments define their needs more in the terms cast for the skills of policy analysts.

A related question is degree of professionalization. To this point, there has been no distinction between

planning or policy analysis as a profession (i.e., as a service provided to clients by persons trained in a way recognized and regulated by a professional body) and policy analysis as a discipline (i.e., as an activity undertaken mainly within universities or research bodies concerned with the furtherance of knowledge in and about the field and controlled through peer review and academic journals). Here lies another difference between planning and policy analysis. Planning emerged first as a profession, and has in the past relied for disciplinary content on an assortment of fields—from the building sciences, through the social sciences, to the biological and physical sciences. Only relatively recently has it developed some aspects of a distinct discipline, as exemplified by the emerging planning theory. Yet it still relies on the other disciplines for content.

The newer field of policy analysis, on the other hand, from its inception as a distinct higher education program in the 1970s, seems to have placed considerable attention on the disciplinary side. This is perhaps indicated by the tendency of the major journals in the field to publish primarily accounts of actual analyses. Unlike planning,⁸ policy analysis still lacks official publications dealing with the self-examination of the field, its role in society, and the formulation of professional standards. Such self-questioning is more characteristic of a profession than a discipline.

Today, there are differences between the two fields in terms of degree of professionalization. Urban and regional planning in the United States has come a long way towards being a profession (Birch 1980). This is indicated by the existence of a professional literature, a job title—"planner"—recognized by others as that of a profession (though often with many misconceptions), a code of ethics in practice, and some degree of quality control by the profession such as through the accreditation of educational programs and the rudiments of peer judgment within the professional association. Although the content of what planners do has changed and evolved through time, and although not all planners belong to the American Planning Association, planners have continued for the most part to see themselves as professionals.

However, in more recent years some trends have emerged that imply an ambivalence toward the notion of the professional planner, sometimes constituting "thinly masked anti-professionalism" (Mann 1978, p. 115). Although deprofessionalization might not be the direct aim, it may be the outcome of the approaches adopted by newer modes of planning such as transactive planning, radical planning, and critical theory. Growing attack has been directed at many of the "scientific" tools, at professional jargon and the stance of expertise (cf. Forester 1980; Krieger 1981, pp. 14–16, 25–32), and at the social distance between professionals and clients (Friedmann 1973, pp. 171–193). How-

ever, despite these challenges, the mainstream of the profession is likely to persevere, responding to change with a flexibility that has characterized it since its inception.

Public policy analysis as yet lacks most of these marks of professionalization (Meltsner 1976, pp. 11–12). One of the major goals of the newly created Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM) has been to hold research conferences (as its meetings are termed), which are to provide opportunities for presentation and later publication of research and analysis. This goal suggests a "disciplinary" component of APPAM's activity, aimed at improving the quality of analysis through peer review. However, APPAM contains seeds of professionalism (Meltsner 1980, p. 246) and might in the future pursue this track. Even without the trappings of a profession, the fact that the job title "Policy Analyst" is increasingly coming to be used in the description of a range of government jobs may serve as an impetus to the definition of policy analysis in the future more as a profession than as a discipline. If this development should occur, one can anticipate increasing competition among the graduates of the two fields.

Dimension 6: range of roles

Planners see themselves as having a wide diversity of roles. In addition to the two more traditional roles of the planner as designer of physical plans and the planner as analyst and adviser in governmental, bureaucratic settings (Barr 1972), planners have over the past two decades been adopting many other roles (Susskind 1974). As the awareness of the relationship between planning and politics has grown, planners have been called upon to take the roles of broker, mediator among groups, and agent for mobilization of public support (Susskind 1974; Rabinovitz 1969, pp. 79–108). In addition, planners have been called upon to serve as advocates for particular groups in accordance with the concept of advocacy planning (Davidoff 1965), as community organizers, and, under the more radical views of planning, as agents for radical change (Grabow and Heskin 1973; Goldstein and Rosenberry 1978), and as "guerrillas" against bureaucratic decisions (Needleman and Needleman 1974). Recently, much emphasis is being placed on planners as facilitators of communication among groups and within agencies (Forester 1980, 1982), and as agents of mutual learning among small groups as in transactive planning (Friedmann 1973, pp. 171–222). The roles for planners even include the initiation and carrying out of physical planning projects (Alexander 1979) and the actual delivery of social services. Finally, it is often recommended that planners see themselves as implementers of policy or interventionists and not simply analysts (Susskind 1974, p. 158; Kaufman 1978).

The range of roles for policy analysts is much more limited. The major role is that of analyst and staff adviser to governmental officials (Meltsner 1976). In addition, private organizations act as consultants and as private contractors to government doing research or analysis. There may be signs that some additional roles may be emerging. Alumni of public policy programs have increasingly entered the private sector in recent years. MacRae (1981a) has proposed a "citizen scholar" role for policy analysts, which combines a valuative emphasis with scholarly standards. The scholar component involves the ingredient of quality control by peers' published criticism, somewhat as APPAM has emphasized. The citizen component involves the explicit statement of general values for analysis, applicable not only to the case at hand but to others as well. The clarity, consistency, and generality of valuative reasoning are also to be criticized in the scholarly discourse of citizen-scholars in addition to the empirical inferences in policy analysis (MacRae 1976, pp. 90-98). The combination of these two components would differ from the political discussion of the average citizen in that it would involve careful and sophisticated argument conducted in print; from the discourse of the basic empirical scientist in having a practical orientation and valuative foundation; and from the work of the practicing planner in more nearly resembling the role of an academic teacher of planning, who lays out in print the chain of reasoning underlying a proposed plan.

Some have also called for the adoption of an additional role—that of the policy analyst as advocate or as community consultant (Foster 1981). These may perhaps be initial signs of a process of diversification similar to that undergone by planning. However, at present and for the foreseeable future, it is clear that policy analysts see for themselves both in theory and in practice a much more limited range of roles than those seen and practiced by planners.

It is clear that at present the two fields overlap only partially, since any overlap must be limited to the role of analyst and adviser. All the other roles which planners see themselves as playing are outside the range from which policy analysts currently select. Although in the future there may be some degree of convergence as policy analysis develops a somewhat broader range of roles, a significant degree of difference among the two fields is likely to persevere, especially since planning literature and the various emerging streams in planning thought entail even greater diversification.

Dimension 7: definition of client and constituency

It has been the long-standing tradition in planning to claim that the planner should be responsible first and foremost to the "ultimate client" and to the public

good (Tugwell 1939 and 1940; Altshuler 1965). Many modifications have occurred in this view over the past two decades as planners have become more aware of the realities of implementation and politics. Planners are being urged to be more oriented to the needs and capacities of the immediate client (Sawicki 1982; Rondinelli 1973). The concept of the public interest has also come under considerable challenge, and planners have been realizing that there are usually many interests rather than one (Davidoff 1965; Wheaton and Wheaton 1970). Yet the notion of the allegiance of planners to the public interest, however defined, is by no means dead (Klosterman 1980).⁹ It has taken on a new form that seems to be here to stay. Planners usually see themselves as committed, at least normatively, to the direct participation of the ultimate clients in decision making and, through many of the roles mentioned above, undertake direct interaction with local residents. In fact, planners often see their source of legitimacy and the legitimacy of their recommendations as being determined by direct input from the affected publics and not solely from the elected representatives and appointed officials.

Many practicing policy analysts, on the other hand, see their primary commitment as being to the employer or client; Meltsner (1980, p. 238) sees this role as that of a consulting profession. They view the source of legitimacy for their activities as stemming from the market mechanism or the electoral representative system. There is very little direct interaction with affected publics, especially in the case of policy analysts for the federal government. Despite a few recent calls for the "analyst as advocate" noted above, this is still the prevailing view. An alternative view, held by some more technically oriented analysts, is that they are seeking the single correct answer to the problem.

This difference between the two fields may lie, at least in part, in the different levels at which the two tend to be practiced. Having been practiced mostly at the local level, planning may have developed a more direct relationship with the affected publics than policy analysis, which is practiced mostly at the federal level. Whatever the source of this difference may be, it is undoubtedly a significant and basic one. There are some signs of convergence between the two fields, but that is restricted mostly to the role of the planner as analyst. However, the commitment of planners to direct participation and their allegiance to the ultimate clients and the public interest, though in modified form, have influenced this role as well. As for the other roles, there may be a trend of increasing divergence as planning modes such as learning, critical theory, and transactive and radical planning have called for an even closer relationship between the planner and the ultimate clients, and have sought to minimize institutional intermediaries as much as possible.

Dimension 8: ethics, ideologies and values

Under many of the modes of planning, excepting perhaps the increasingly attacked mode of rational scientific planning, value neutrality is neither assumed nor promoted (Howe and Kaufman 1981). Planners have been called "value technicians" (Reiner 1967), and planners are called upon to take a normative role (Klosterman 1978). The notion of the public interest noted above, which has been reinterpreted as the "interest of publics," immediately raises questions about the values which are to be incorporated into planning. Furthermore, not only are planners aware of values, but the planning ethic to which planners are often professionally socialized tends to encourage a commitment to a particular set of values (Alterman and Page 1973). These have found their way into the official code of ethics of the American Planning Association where planners are said to be responsible for the expansion of choice and opportunity for disadvantaged groups.¹⁰ Many have promoted a vision of planners committed to redistributive goals (Davidoff 1975 and 1978; Krumholz, Cogger, and Linner 1975), and planners have empirically been found to be more liberal than the general American public (Vasu 1979, pp. 113–125).

Of course, there has been much criticism that these values are usually not followed in practice (Kravitz 1970; Krumholz 1982), and not all planners share them (Howe and Kaufman 1979, 1981). However, this does not diminish their status as part of the normative view of planning and planning ethics. In recent years there has also been growing emphasis on education of planners in ethics (Kaufman 1981). The view of ethics in planning goes far beyond "guild ethics" (Marcuse 1976), and tends to raise questions about the very social legitimacy of planning and its commitment to particular values.

The view of values and ethics prevalent in the graduate schools of policy analysis is quite different. The senior practitioners in the field were of course trained before the existence of specifically policy oriented schools. In economics, for example, as in most applied sciences, the graduate who intends to do applied work learns that the values involved in his or her choice of problems are personal and do not derive from the discipline. The analyst who wishes to promote national military security and the one who wishes to serve the urban poor may work at their jobs with equal dedication; others, however, may take a value-neutral stance, priding themselves on the quality of their analyses but, within a wide range, not having strong preferences among topics or clienteles (Meltsner 1976, pp. 21–23). In addition, the value of efficiency in production, implied by benefit-cost analysis, is widely held.

Since the growth of the graduate schools, courses

on the ethical dilemmas of the government analyst have been widely included in their curricula (Fleishman, Liebman, and Moore 1981). This is a secondary emphasis, but its importance is stressed by Wolf (1981, p. 3) in his APPAM presidential address. In addition, there has been increasing concern with the philosophical criticism of benefit-cost analysis as a criterion for choice among policy alternatives (MacRae 1976, 1981b); but, although open to ethical criticism, benefit-cost analysis has been worked out with elegance and linked to the theories of a well-organized discipline. Standards of equity, rights, and human development—to name a few major alternative values—have not been worked out with any comparable detail or precision.

These approaches to ethics differ from that of planning. They involve no explicit collective or professional commitment to social goals or particular ultimate clienteles. Although the notion of equity is not absent, it is viewed more often by policy analysts as a matter of calculation of effects of policies on various income groups, rather than as advocacy for the poor or the powerless.

Thus, a significant difference between the two fields in terms of their view of ethics and values can be seen. This difference will probably be a persistent one since it derives directly from the professional socialization of persons entering each field and from the collective self-perceptions of planners as expressed by their formal code of ethics. In the future there may be both a trend of growing divergence, and a possibility of some partial convergence. The greater divergence may arise from some of the newer planning modes, inasmuch as these have directed their criticism with increasing intensity at the one mode of planning where the two fields overlap most: rational and scientific planning. Possible partial convergence may emerge in the future if public policy analysis should undergo some change in its view of ethics, values, and source of legitimacy.

Options for planning and policy analysis at the universities

The relationship between planning and policy analysis in the future will undoubtedly be shaped to a considerable extent, as it has been in the past, by the way in which the universities view these two fields.

Choices as to whether to emphasize the substantive direction or the generic one will probably have to be made by each planning school and by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning. Departments in particular universities could conceivably evolve further in either the substantive direction or the generic one, but regardless of which choice is made, the other choice will also have to be represented in the academic and professional picture. General skills and principles will

have to be taught and learned and transferred to the particular professions; and among these particular professions there will have to be one that is concerned with cities and their spatial relations. Moreover, generic skills and concerns should have an important place in the training of urban and regional practitioners. At the same time, the contributions of planning to the evolving generic field, both in general and on particular campuses, can be most valuable.

The generic enterprise envisioned involves the application of systematic knowledge to public choices in view of the general good such choices are presumably intended to promote. The analysis of some of those types of public choices lies outside the present boundaries of both policy analysis and generic planning, but might well be included in the field the authors envision. The general function in mind is now claimed by a wide variety of professions that make use of social, physical, and biological science, as well as by the applied branches of several academic disciplines. Among this multiplicity of claims, one must then ask where a legitimate case can be made for the institutionalization of generic planning *or* policy analysis within the universities. Attention is directed first to the universities because the generic field in question is more a discipline than a profession in comparison with substantive fields.

In the generic sense, planning has special contributions that policy analysis may not represent sufficiently: a concern for complex problems extending over time in ways that are not wholly predictable, and a stress on representing the public good, including a particular ethical orientation. In a field that must continually encounter problems of the real world of politics and decisions, these broader considerations can be ignored only at the risk of an excessively narrow and technical perspective.

The field of public policy analysis has claimed a general capacity to deal with problems in many substantive areas—a claim which, in fact, has also been made by generic planning.¹¹ Yet in spite of some claims of analysts to be independent of bodies of substantive knowledge (e.g., urban studies, health, education, criminology, foreign affairs), this knowledge seems important.¹² Closer links with such substantive domains as are provided by professional schools are necessary for much analysis; indeed, some of the training for analysis may take place within properly designed curricula in professional schools. Work in the applied basic sciences—physical, biological, and social—is also relevant.

In the relationship between generic and specific substantive approaches there are therefore several possibilities. Persons in each substantive area can learn principles of generic analysis and apply them to that area. Thus departments (or the field) of planning can intro-

duce as much of generic problems into the education of their students as they wish. So, also, can schools of public health, education, social work, engineering, and other substantive areas.

In contrast, it is possible to set up a self-contained school of policy analysis independent of other academic disciplines or schools. This is the model followed by Berkeley, under Wildavsky's leadership (1979, p. 409) and by the Rand graduate school, since it is not in an educational institution.

A possible synthesis may be available, however, if suitable organizational forms can be found for it. This is to encourage coexistence between the generic field and the multiple specific substantive fields within particular universities, and to link these activities together nationally. Specific substantive fields, represented by professional schools and academic departments, can supplement the education of students who will receive their degrees in the generic field; and in return the generic field can provide resources for students in specific fields. Perhaps the most feasible organizational form would be a loose federation of professional schools and other programs—including planning—which deal with distinct substantive areas. Policy analysis or generic planning could then provide common intellectual ingredients to students in these areas, while educating as its own students those who wish a more general competence.

This is presented as a synthesis because the authors believe that in order to be well established and competent, a field of general decision methods must cooperate closely with multiple fields that represent expertise in particular substantive areas. In a university with numerous professional schools, these might include social policy (the health professions, education, and social welfare); policies concerning the environment, population, and energy; urban and regional policy (possibly including national planning); crime and justice policy; international policy; and communications and information policy. There may well be new areas in which little subject matter expertise exists, in which a generic analyst can move in and achieve successes; but in the established fields, a combination of generic techniques and field-specific knowledge is also required. Thus students in professional schools could take basic courses in the generic field,¹³ and students in the generic graduate program could benefit from instruction from the faculties of the professional schools.

It is easier to envision these relations in the abstract, however, than to propose and implement the institutions that would best put them into effect. Efforts at implementation face two sorts of difficulties.

For one thing, what is proposed runs counter to the traditional structure of graduate work in universities. Typically, each graduate field is socially and financially independent; "service" courses, though they are a per-

vasive feature of undergraduate education, are not highly regarded in graduate education. Graduate students are expected to develop a group identity centered in their particular department or professional school. To place beginning graduate students in a mixed, interdisciplinary setting for a substantial portion of their course work runs counter to this identity. Perhaps if each interested department or school offered its own courses in generic planning or analysis, departments could satisfy this identity need. This would deal with the problem; but it would be costly and would risk destroying the very common content and generality being sought.

In addition, the feasibility of implementation of this recommendation will vary from one local setting to another. One university will have a professional school that another lacks. The philosophy department on one campus will be less interested in cooperating with a public policy program than its counterpart on another campus. The planning school on one campus will have a different orientation from that on another. What must be sought, therefore, is a long-term pressure toward common concepts and standards—exerted by national associations, a scholarly literature, and job markets—with the hope that this pressure will favor the cooperative relation between generic and specific fields recommended.

At some universities, planning may supply the generic element in this picture; and *if* some planning schools or departments can persuade their colleagues in other professional schools and their university administrations that they are able to do this effectively, they may be able to take the lead in it. Elsewhere, that leadership might come from business schools, from public health, or from policy analysis. In the end, the system that will survive should be the one that attracts people of recognized high quality (manifested in both publication and practice), develops a clear and persuasive doctrine of its goals and methods, and effectively serves relevant publics by its practical advice. All these last criteria reach beyond the particular discipline or profession and relate to its reputation among outsiders.

Conclusion

The comparison of planning and policy analysis clearly reveals that while there are several similarities, there are also many significant and deeply rooted differences between these two fields. These differences probably go back to the intellectual roots of planning in the United States, and to the more recent developments in planning thought. Most significant of these differences is the tradition in planning (declared normatively, even if not always applied in practice) of social reform, of humanism, and of commitment to the public interest and to the ultimate clients affected by

planning decisions—together with its substantive urban emphasis. More recently, there has been increasing questioning by planners of the rational model and of the analyst role—both being important tenets of policy analysis—with a growing emphasis on planning as a social enterprise concerned with the promotion of specific social values and social change.

These differences in intellectual content probably imply that side by side with the strong trend of the past fifteen to twenty years which has been working to collapse the distinction between the two fields, there is also a trend which is likely to maintain and even strengthen their separate identity. This will entail some division of labor between the two. What follows is a discussion of some aspects of this division of labor in terms of the dimensions in Table 1, focusing first on what is undoubtedly the overriding dimension—the *generic versus substantive* distinction (row 1).

The kinship between planning and policy analysis is perhaps strongest where planning schools or planning professionals have chosen to define themselves entirely in the generic planning mode. In this discussion there are clearly the outlines of an intellectually respectable and useful generic field, drawing on the generic components of both planning and policy analysis. It involves the application of systematic knowledge to public choices in view of the general good which they are intended to further. Whether this field should be identified with planning or with policy analysis—or with other academic or professional fields—is an open question to be decided by each university separately and by the planning profession as a whole. Some options have been outlined above.

At the same time, planning has distinct contributions that should not be submerged in a content-free generic enterprise. Planning, with its dual identity, has strong roots in substantive areas, namely urban and regional problems and spatial issues. These important areas clearly need professionals equipped to make and analyze proposals that affect them, just as areas such as health, education, welfare, and foreign policy need them. In the 1960s and 1970s there was a growing trend for planning in the United States to define itself more and more generically, often at the inevitable expense of allocations of manpower, courses, and funds away from urban and regional concerns. In the authors' opinion, this trend need not be encouraged further at the expense of the substantive skills that urban and regional planners need. In Britain there is already a clear call coming from a significant group of planning educators to reassert those skills and concerns. In the United States, as well, in recent years one can observe some signs of a "back to basics" movement, with renewed interest in areas such as land use planning and planning controls which had in the near past been viewed as somewhat out of vogue.

Planning professionals may find it difficult to perform adequately both as generic planners (or policy analysts) and as experts in urban and regional matters. In a survey of practicing planners, many expressed their confusion and frustration about the expectations entailed by their dual identity (Hemmens, Bergman, and Moroney 1978, p. 187). If the training of all planners were to become totally generic, the price paid in abandoning substantive expertise would be too high. Possibly, new terms may emerge so as to distinguish the urban and regional specialist from the generic planner, thereby avoiding current confusion and misconceptions. Of course, this is not to say that the urban planner will no longer need to acquire proficiency in some generic skills. It is a question of what is to be the major identity.

If this division of labor between urban planners and generic analysts comes to prevail, it should have implications in terms of other dimensions as well. One should first expect a division of labor with respect to the *calculability* of analyses of problems (related to rows 2 through 4 in Table 1), such that persons trained in the generic field will be more likely to deal with problems that can be fruitfully treated by their analytic techniques. Substantive specialists, including those with an urban specialty, would have a greater claim on problems requiring either complex intuitive judgment or bodies of knowledge specific to their areas (design, transportation, or housing analysis for planners; health organization and technology for health policy specialists; and so on). Proponents of some techniques will no doubt try to use them inappropriately—e.g., applying abstract mathematical models or computer simulations that do not yield policies that those affected can live with. Such models will have to be tested continually by close interaction between theory and practice, with practical problems taken as stimulus for academic research and the results sent back into social experiments or into implemented policy.

A second aspect of this division of labor concerns the *ethical* orientation of planning to the *ultimate clients* (rows 7–8 in Table 1). The fact that planning overlaps with a number of substantive areas in the urban context gives it a greater affinity with broad participatory political groupings. Planning will continue to represent this orientation, but there will still be a tension between the planner's role as governmental staff employee and that of direct involvement in politics.

A third aspect concerns *team size* and *degree of specialization* (related to row 6 in Table 1). A small town barely large enough to employ someone for planning or analysis will have to combine various functions in a single person. In larger cities, states, or the national government it will be possible to hire more people, thus dividing the labor between generic and substantive planners/analysts, as well as including analytic staff

in particular departments and agencies. This last staff group may be known as health planners, military planners, and the like, as well as analysts. In agencies concerned with general tradeoffs (Office of Management and Budget, Congressional Budget Office, General Accounting Office), all types of skills will be needed; but the generic will be dominant because various policy areas are being compared and because elected officials claim the role of making intuitive tradeoffs. The relative mix will then be affected by the general budgetary situation; scarcity will lead to more one-person operations in localities and more emphasis on tradeoffs when cutbacks are required. The current emphasis in the United States on block grants to the states will move more tradeoffs to the state level, and might lead to more generic emphasis there if funds are available for generic planners or analysts.

There may well be changes in the specific emphases of both planning and policy analysis as the demands of national, state, and local political systems change. Some such changes will also emerge from the intellectual development of the fields, as new techniques of analysis or experimentation become more important and others prove less valuable. As the connections between generic and substantive fields (other than those within planning) grow, the generic field envisioned may become more general in content, draw contributions from more disciplines (such as sociology), and influence the perspectives of substantive fields, including that of urban and regional planning. In spite of these changes, the types of division of labor noted above are likely to remain.

Authors' note

The authors are grateful for the helpful suggestions received from Arnold J. Meltsner, David S. Sawicki, Edward M. Bergman, and the two anonymous referees for the *Journal*. They are, of course, not responsible for what has been written.

Notes

1. In his presidential address to APPAM, Wolf (1981, pp. 2–4) surveyed the relationship of policy analysis with a large assortment of fields—not including planning.
2. The distinction between planning or policy analysis as profession and as discipline will be discussed more fully below under Dimension 5—Institutionalization and Professionalization.
3. The economic approach to defense policy, summarized in Hitch and McKean (1961), includes study of the economy, the defense budget, and numerous particular problems of strategy, weapons choice, and cost effective conduct of particular operations.
4. Some of the diversity of APPAM is reflected in the backgrounds of its first two presidents: Joel L. Fleishman, of Duke University, trained in law, with a distinctive concern for the place of ethics in policy analysis (especially related to Duke's undergraduate policy program); and Charles Wolf, Jr., is an economist, Director of the Rand Graduate Institute, created at Rand in 1970.
5. This is centered around Oxford Polytechnic, which is today one of Britain's leading planning schools.

6. The new focus of interest on evaluation of impacts, at least within the political science oriented Policy Studies Organization, is noted by Grumm and Wasby (1980, p. 849) in their introduction to a special issue of the *Policy Studies Journal* devoted to analysis of impacts.
7. There are many examples of such attempts. One of the earlier ones (concerned with broad questions of urban planning although focusing on transportation) was the *Penn-Jersey Transportation Study* (1959–64). Interestingly, some of the most sophisticated examples of application of the rational model, quantified approach to comprehensive planning have come from Britain's structure plans prepared in the 1970s (see, for example, Wannop 1972), but these too have in recent years been questioned (Alterman 1982b).
8. Howe and Kaufman (1981, p. 267) note that a survey of the volumes of the *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* and its sequel, the *Journal of the American Planning Association*, shows that about half the articles published since 1975 are devoted to the history, methods, and processes of planning, and only half deal with questions of applied planning in specific substantive areas. In contrast, the journal *Policy Analysis* and its successor, the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*—closely associated with APPAM—have carried articles dealing largely with actual examples of analyses. An earlier journal, *Policy Sciences* (est. 1970), less closely associated with APPAM, did however contain some introspective scrutiny; and the *Policy Studies Journal*, closer to political science, has contained more political analysis.
9. The traditional commitment to the public interest has been expressed anew in the revised Code of Ethics and Professional conduct of the American Institute of Certified Planners (1981). Section A, "The Planner's Responsibility to the Public Interest" states: "The planner's primary obligation is to serve the public interest." Recognizing that the public interest is not a monolithic concept, the code then goes on to enumerate seven elements of the public interest.
10. The American Institute of Planners' 1962 "Code of Professional Responsibility and Rules of Procedure," which was in effect until recently, stated in Canon (b):

A planner shall seek to expand choice and opportunity for all persons, recognizing a special responsibility to plan for the needs of the disadvantaged groups and persons, and shall urge the alteration of policies, institutions, and decisions which militate against such objectives.

The recently adopted revised Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct of the American Institute of Certified Planners (1981) contains similar statements. Sections A(4) and (5) state:

4) A planner must strive to give citizens the opportunity to have a meaningful impact on the development of plans and programs. Participation should be broad enough to include people who lack formal organization or influence.

5) A planner must strive to expand choice and opportunity for all persons, recognizing a special responsibility to plan for the needs of disadvantaged groups and persons, and must urge the alteration of policies, institutions and decisions which oppose such needs.

11. Aaron Fleisher sees this capacity as one of the weaknesses of planning. He is paraphrased in Susskind (1974, p. 157) as describing planners as

those individuals without specialized competence who are prepared to take on any problem while a cadre of skilled professionals with specialized competence in the particular problem area is trained. When this very group, armed with

more explicit theories and more powerful methods, reaches the battlefield, planners move on to other skirmishes.

12. This is a conclusion also reached by Hemmens, Bergman, and Moroney (1978) in their survey of recently graduating planners and policy analysts.
13. The student in public health, for example, should learn that hospitals, schools, and prisons have common features which have been analyzed by sociologists, and that their population flows are susceptible to similar computer simulations. The student of urban spatial policy should learn that planning in the private sector uses management-science techniques similar to those needed in the public sector. The student of environmental policy must similarly understand the costs and benefits of effects that environmental regulations have on production in the private sector. Analyses of policies in various substantive areas are interrelated by general techniques and by tradeoffs.

References

- Alexander, Ernest R. 1979. Planning roles and contexts. In *Introduction to Urban Planning*, eds., Anthony J. Catanese and James Snyder. New York: McGraw Hill.
- . 1981. Design in the planning process: theory, education and practice. Paper presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) National Conference, Washington, D.C., October 23–25.
- Allison, Graham T. 1971. *Essence of decision: explaining the Cuban missile crisis*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Alterman, Rachele. 1982a. Implementation analysis in urban and regional planning: toward a research agenda. In *Planning Theory: Prospects for the 1980s*, eds., Patsy Healey, Glen McDougall, and Michael Thomas. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- . 1982b. British planning: a troubled look in the mirror. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 48, 4: 499–503.
- , and Page, John. 1973. The ubiquity of values and the planning process. *Plan* 13, 1: 13–26.
- Altshuler, Alan. 1965. The goals of comprehensive planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31, 3: 186–195.
- American Institute of Certified Planners. 1981. Code of ethics and professional conduct. Washington, DC: AICP.
- American Institute of Planners. 1962. Code of professional responsibility and rules of procedure. Washington, DC: AIP.
- Barr, Donald A. 1972. The professional urban planner. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 38, 3: 155–159.
- Beauregard, Robert A. 1980. Teaching planning theory: dilemmas beyond the rational model. *The Bulletin of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning* 18, 1: 1–4.
- Birch, Eugenie Ladner. 1980. Advancing the art and science of planning: planners and their organizations, 1909–1980. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 46, 1: 22–49.
- Catanese, Anthony J. 1979. History and trends of urban planning. In *Introduction to Urban Planning*, eds., Anthony J. Catanese and James Snyder. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Chapin, F. Stuart, Jr., and Kaiser, Edward J. 1979. *Urban land use planning*, 3rd edition. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Davidoff, Paul. 1965. Advocacy and pluralism in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31, 4: 331–337.
- . 1975. Working toward redistributive justice. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 41, 5: 317–318.
- . 1978. The distributive function in planning: creating greater equity among citizens of communities. In *Planning Theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions*, eds., Robert W. Burchell and George Sternlieb. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.
- Fleishman, Joel L.; Liebman, Lance; and Moore, Mark H., eds. 1981. *Public duties: the moral obligations of government officials*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Forester, John. 1980. Critical theory and planning practice. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 46, 3: 275-286.
- _____. 1982. Requirements for a theory of planning practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 1, 2: 59-69.
- Foster, John L. 1981. An advocate role model for policy analysis. In *The Analysis of Policy Impact*, eds., John G. Grumm and Stephen R. Wasby. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Friedmann, John. 1973. *Retracking America: a theory of transactive planning*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- _____, and Hudson, Barclay. 1974. Knowledge and action: a guide to planning theory. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 40: 2-16.
- Galloway, Thomas G., and Mahayni, G. Riad. 1977. Planning theory in retrospect: a process of paradigm change. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 43, 1: 62-68.
- Gans, Herbert. 1968. City planning in America: a sociological analysis. In *People and Plans*, Herbert Gans. New York: Basic Books.
- Goldstein, Harvey A., and Rosenberry, Sara A., eds. 1978. *The structural crisis of the 1970s and beyond: the need for a new planning theory*. Proceedings of the Conference on Planning Theory. Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
- Grabow, Stephen, and Heskin, Allan. 1973. Foundations for a radical concept of planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 39, 2: 106-114.
- Grumm, John G., and Wasby, Stephen L., eds. 1980. Introduction to symposium on the analysis of policy impact. *Policy Studies Journal* 8, 6: 849-851.
- Haveman, Robert H., and Margolis, Julius, eds. 1977. *Public expenditure and policy analysis*, 2nd edition. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- _____, and Weisbrod, Burton A. 1975. Defining benefits for public programs: some guidance for policy analysts. *Policy Analysis* 1, 1: 169-196.
- Healey, Patsy; McDougall, Glen; and Thomas, Michael. 1982. Theoretical debates in planning: towards a coherent dialogue. In *Planning Theory: Prospects for the 1980s*, eds., Patsy Healey, Glen McDougall, and Michael Thomas. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Healy, Robert G., and Rosenberg, John S. 1979. *Land use and the states*, 2nd edition. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.
- Hemmens, George. 1980. New directions in planning theory. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 46, 3: 259-260.
- _____, Bergman, Edward M.; and Moroney, Robert M. 1978. The practitioner's view of social planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 44, 2: 181-192.
- _____, and Stiffl, Bruce. 1980. Sources for the renewal of planning theory. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 46, 3: 341-345.
- Hitch, Charles J., and McKean, Roland W. 1961. *The economics of defense in the nuclear age*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Howe, Elizabeth, and Kaufman, Jerome. 1979. The ethics of contemporary American planners. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 45, 3: 243-255.
- _____. 1981. The values of contemporary American planners. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 47, 3: 266-278.
- Hudson, Barclay. 1979. Comparison of current planning theories. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 45, 4: 387-397.
- Kaufman, Jerome L. 1978. The planner as interventionist in public policy issues. In *Planning Theory in the 1980s*, eds., Robert W. Burchell and George Sternlieb. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research.
- _____. 1981. Teaching planning ethics. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 1, 1: 29-35.
- Klosterman, Richard. 1978. Foundations for normative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 44, 1: 37-46.
- _____. 1980. A public interest criterion. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 46, 3: 323-333.
- Kravitz, Allan. 1970. Mandarinism: planning as handmaiden to conservative politics. In *Planning and Politics: Uneasy Partnership*, eds., Thad L. Beyle and George Lathrop. New York: Odyssey Press.
- Krieger, Martin. 1981. *Advice and planning*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Krumholz, Norman. 1982. A retrospective view of equity planning: Cleveland 1969-1979. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 48, 2: 163-174.
- _____, Cogger, Janice M.; and Linner, John H. 1975. The Cleveland policy planning report. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 41, 5: 298-304.
- Lynn, Laurence E., Jr., ed. 1980. *Designing public policy: a casebook on the role of policy analysis*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- _____, and Whitman, David de F. 1981. *The president as policy-maker: Jimmy Carter and welfare reform*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- MacRae, Duncan, Jr. 1976. *The social function of social science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- _____. 1981a. Combining the roles of scholar and citizen. In *Models for Analysis of Social Policy: An Introduction*, eds., Ron Haskins and James J. Gallagher. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- _____. 1981b. Valuable problems of public policy analysis. In *Research in Public Policy and Management*, Vol. 1, ed., John P. Crecine. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- _____, and Wilde, James A. 1979. *Policy analysis for public decisions*. Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press.
- Mann, Laurence D. 1978. Planning behavior and professional policymaking activity. In *Planning Theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions*, eds., Robert W. Burchell and George Sternlieb. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research.
- Marcuse, Peter. 1976. Professional ethics and beyond: values in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 42, 3: 264-274.
- Meltsner, Arnold J. 1976. *Policy analysts in the bureaucracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1980. Creating a policy analysis profession. In *Improving Policy Analysis*, ed. Stuart S. Nagel. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Meyerson, Martin. 1956. Building the middle-range bridge to comprehensive planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 22, 2: 58-64.
- Needleman, Carolyn, and Needleman, Martin. 1974. *Guerrillas in the bureaucracy*. New York: Wiley.
- Penn-Jersey Transportation Authority. 1959-1964. *Penn-Jersey Transportation Study*, P. J. Papers, Vols. 1-5; Reports.
- Perloff, Harvey S. 1957. *Education for planning: city, state and regional*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- _____. 1980. *Planning the post-industrial city*. Washington, DC: American Planning Association Planners' Press.
- Quade, Edward. 1975. *Policy analysis for public decisions*. New York: American Elsevier.
- Rabinovitz, Francine F. 1969. *City politics and planning*. New York: Atherton Press.
- Reiner, Thomas A. 1967. The planner as value technician: two classes of utopian constructs and their impacts on planning. In *Taming Megalopolis*, vol. 1, ed., H. Wentworth Eldridge. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Robinson, Ira M. 1965. Beyond the middle-range planning bridge. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31, 4: 304-312.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. 1973. Urban planning as policy analysis: management of urban change. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 39, 1: 13-22.
- Sarbib, Jean-Louis. (n.d.) The history of the Chicago program of education and research in planning. Chapel Hill: Department of City and Regional Planning, University of North Carolina.
- Sawicki, David S. 1979. Quantitative methods in urban planning. In *Introduction to Urban Planning*, eds., Anthony J. Catanese and James C. Snyder. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- . 1982. Teaching policy analysis in a graduate planning program. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 1, 2: 78–85.
- Stokey, Edith, and Zeckhauser, Richard. 1978. *A primer for policy analysis*. New York: Norton.
- Susskind, Lawrence E. 1974. The future of the planning profession. In *Planning for America: Learning from Turbulence*, ed., David Godschalk. Washington, DC: American Institute of Planners.
- Szanton, Peter. 1981. *Not well advised*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Tugwell, Rexford E. 1939. The fourth power. *Planning and Civic Comment* (April/June): 1–31.
- . 1940. Implementing the general interest. *Public Administration Review* 1, 1: 32–49.
- Vasu, Michael. 1979. *Politics and planning: a national study of American planners*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Wannop, Urlan. 1972. Coventry-Solihull-Warwickshire sub-regional study. *Journal of the Royal Town Planning Institute* April: 159–167.
- Wetmore, Louis B. 1970. Preparing the profession for its changing role. In *Urban Planning in Transition*, ed., Ernest Erber. New York: Grossman.
- Wheaton, William L. C., and Wheaton, Margaret F. 1970. Identifying the public interest: values and goals. In *Urban Planning in Transition*, ed., Ernest Erber. New York: Grossman.
- Wildavsky, Aaron. 1973. If planning is everything, maybe it's nothing. *Policy Sciences* 4, 2: 127–153.
- . 1979. *Speaking truth to power: the art and craft of policy analysis*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Wolf, Charles, Jr. 1979. A theory on non-market failures. *The Public Interest* 55: 114–133.
- . 1981. Policy analysis and public management: strengths and limits. Rand Paper Series. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corp.