**Taylor & Francis**
Taylor & Francis Group

# What do the professions 'profess'? Comparing architecture and planning codes of ethics

Bonnie J. Johnson[a] and Nils Gore[b]

[a]Department of Urban Planning, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA; [b]Department of Architecture, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA

## ABSTRACT

Using concepts from the sociology of professions and institutional theory, we explore the ethical dispositions of the planning and architecture professions over time. We use the relevant codes from their major professional organizations (American Institute of Architects (AIA)) and American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP)) to track what the professions have 'professed' from the 1940s to today. They converge in the 1970s over women's rights, racial inequalities, the environmental movement, and historic preservation. They diverge as planning becomes process-oriented, concentrating on democratic values, long-range thinking, and citizen engagement, while architecture continues its focus on specific projects and the physical environment. There was a time of brief overlap in the professions when AIA codes started mentioning planning and policy matters in its remit, but those themes did not last. The professions could be headed for a clash or a collaboration as the current AICP code now mentions design, which has historically fallen within the AIA's purview.

## Introduction

In the early 1900s, planning was a 'spinoff' of the related professions of engineering and architecture and was 'heavily suffused with the professional styles of these design-based professions' (Hall 2002, 355). Today, architects and planners work together on interdisciplinary teams for public entities and private firms, but they can also be adversaries, facing off across development review tables at city halls. In academia, it is difficult for planning departments to find their place as they commonly move between homes in social science or design. As the two professions split over time, each is criticized for having something the other lacks. Architects are faulted for ignoring social and political issues, while planners have been too quick to let design go in favour of social policies (Anselin, Nasar, and Talen 2011). To better understand the planning–architecture interface, we use concepts borrowed from institutional theory and the sociology of professions. We look for sources of isomorphism from which the two professions evolve similarly over time but also for evidence of each profession's staking its claim to a particular domain and thus distinguishing itself from potential competitors, that is, each other.

To follow the professions, we look at the two major organizations representing architecture and city planning in the United States. Architecture organized first in 1857 with the American Institute of Architects (AIA). City planning's American City Planning Institute (ACPI), later the American Institute of Planners (AIP) and the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP), emerged after 1917 (Wilensky 1964). In particular, we examine these organizations' codes of ethics, which express, for their members and the public, 'the norms that ought to govern professional behaviour' (Frankel 1989, 109).

The first AIA code of ethics dates from 1909 and the first planning code from 1948. For the period when codes exist for both organizations, the 1940s to the present, we compare the relevant contents, looking for similarities and differences in what each profession 'professes.' By focusing on the ethical manifestos and a timeline of historical events, we trace changes in the major professional organizations within the contemporaneous context and dominant discourses (DiMaggio and Powell 1983). In addition to the values expressed in the codes, we look at changes in the professional domains of each profession seeing what they claim as their 'territory.'

The starting point, to provide the theoretical context for our study, must be a brief discussion of institutional theory and the sociology of professions. We then present overviews of the professionalization processes of architecture and planning. After explaining the methodology used to analyse the codes of ethics, findings are discussed in terms of similarities and dissimilarities decade by decade. In general, the major areas of overlap (which arose after the 1970s) include greater attention to human rights, the environment, and cultural heritage. The primary differences are architecture's steadfast commitment to the physical environment and planning's greater attention to process over product. Planners and architects are competitors and teammates in the common playing field of the built environment and we use the codes of ethics to tease apart when they might conflict and when they complement each other.

## Institutional theory: coming together

Organizational theorists have been interested in why whole fields with unique origins and needs to remain competitive in the marketplace seem to become more homogeneous over time. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) call this phenomenon of co-evolving along similar lines 'institutional isomorphism.' They describe three component processes: coercive, mimetic, and normative. Coercive isomorphism results from 'formal and informal pressures exerted on organizations by other organizations upon which they are dependent and by cultural expectations in the society within which organizations function' (DiMaggio and Powell 1983, 150). Mimetic processes minimize uncertainty by copying successes of another organization. As more and more organizations follow suit, they all become alike. The normative tendency expressly involves how professionals establish legitimacy and includes credentialing, formal education, and networks. The institutional point of view 'recognize(s) that organizations are embedded in larger cultural and political contexts' (Frumkin and Galaskiewicz 2004, 283) which can promote convergence over divergence.

The notion of isomorphism has also been applied to the study of codes of ethics with expectations that the latter borrow language from each other, such that they all start to say the same thing (Holder-Webb and Cohen 2012). Research shows that there are similarities in legal statements among codes, but that value statements differ (Forster, Loughran, and McDonald 2009). Banks (2003, 143) observes that codes evolve, 'gradually (changing) over the years, from a short series of abstract first person proclamations . . . to the latest version in the form of a set of principles followed by what could almost be described as a "rulebook."' Due to isomorphic forces, we expect planning and architecture codes to converge, but we might also anticipate divergence as each profession articulates its values.

## Sociology of professions: marking territory

Sociology studies the origins and evolution of 'professions' and their interactions with society (Macdonald 2013). Scholarship started with work distinguishing between professions and other occupations. The rise of the former is associated with a revival of cities in the Middle Ages (Siggins 1996) and their industrialization in the late 1800s (Hall 2002). Cities make specialization possible and provide the arena for professional action, particularly for architects and planners developing the built environment. The professionalization process involves having full-time work, a training school, a professional association, licensing, and an official code of ethics (Wilensky 1964). The special knowledge and training of professionals mean they have an advantage over clients and must earn the public's trust; hence, codes of ethics appear as 'contracts' between professionals and the public (Moore and Rosenblum 1970; Fullinwider 1996).

In the 1960s, scholars advanced their theorizing to understand how professions create and maintain their monopolies. Abbott (1988, 33) indicates that one cannot truly understand professions without seeing them as economic monopolies which seek to '(take) over each other's tasks' by making 'jurisdictional claims.' These claims can range from ones with a legal basis identifying which professionals can do certain things due to health and safety concerns to simply arguing that one profession has better strategies than others do to solve certain issues. By virtue of their common history and common arena (cities), architects and planners must distinguish themselves in order to compete for clients.

It was not until later that the actual work conducted by professionals gained attention, leaving Abbott (1988) to lament that many authors just looked at one profession at a time without examining larger systems and potential competition. The most commonly studied fields are those in health care, teaching, social work, accounting, architecture, journalism, and engineering. Today, in the sociology of professions, there are still few comparative studies (Adams 2015). We look now to address part of this gap in the literature by comparing two disciplinary foci of central interest to this journal, architecture and planning.

From institutional theory, isomorphic forces should lead to convergence; however, we still expect values of the professions to differ and their jurisdictional claims to set them apart. Unlike other professions which experience isomorphism despite marketplace pressures, we speculate that, by virtue of their common origins and common arena, architects and planners are particularly cognizant of working together yet, at the same time, having to distinguish themselves from each other. We propose these countervailing forces, isomorphism and jurisdictional and value claims, to help explain when architecture and planning converge and when they diverge. The need now is to examine each discipline in turn.

## Overview of architecture

Of the two professions, architecture was first with a national association, the AIA founded in 1857 (Wilensky 1964). Thirteen New York architects met to create an organization to 'promote the scientific and practical perfection of its members' and 'elevate the standing of the profession' (American Institute of Architects 2015, np). At this time, anyone could claim the title of 'architect,' and no specific education, certification, or license was required. Shortly thereafter, a constitution and bylaws were adopted along with a new name, the 'American Institute of Architects.' By 1867, the mission statement, reflecting both social and promotional purposes of the AIA, read: 'the objects of this Institute are to unite in fellowship the Architects of this continent, and to combine their efforts so as to promote the artistic, scientific, and practical efficiency of the profession' (American Institute of Architects 2015, np). In the 1860s, the AIA was ambitiously hoping to include architects from Mexico and Canada, but the organization remained largely American in scope.

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) established the first school of architecture in the United States in 1865. Beforehand, the primary means of practical education was apprenticeship in architects' offices, while formal education in civil engineering, drafting, and technical/scientific subjects surrounding construction could be found in numerous polytechnic institutes. In contrast to the technical facilities, the new architecture schools sought a more balanced approach to aesthetic and technical aspects of architecture and buildings (American Institute of Architects, Commission for the Survey of Education and Registration 1954).

Professional licensing of architects was first established by Illinois statute in 1897, with other American states following suit until universal adoption occurred in 1951 (American Institute of Architects, Commission for the Survey of Education and Registration 1954, 357). At about the same time, municipalities began passing building codes to promote safe constructions and adopting zoning ordinances mandating size and use restrictions. With these three props – university education, licensure, and building codes – architects achieved in their domain what all professions seek: a jurisdictional 'monopoly.'

Licensing of architects is regulated by individual states, whereas the ethical codes discussed here are written by the AIA, a national professional membership organization. Though one might expect otherwise, violation of an ethical code does not necessarily lead to punishment by the licensing body. Licensing by the state is undertaken primarily to ensure the 'health, safety and welfare' of the public. If an ethical violation does not adversely affect public health, safety, and welfare, then the state would have little interest in exacting penalties. The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB), the countrywide organization in which licensing bodies for the individual states participate to promote overall consistency across the various regions, assists states in issuing licenses for architects wishing to practice across jurisdictions simultaneously. It started issuing its own 'rules of conduct' in 1977 which parallel some of the language and concepts of the AIA code, but only for a subset of five categories, (1) Competence, (2) Conflict of Interest, (3) Full Disclosure, (4) Compliance with Laws, and (5) Professional Conduct. These NCARB rules are compulsory, with the force of legal statute in the states, while the AIA codes also contain aspirational items, which are not enforceable by legal statute.

Architects started practices on the basis of their individual talents, social connections, and local opportunities and those offices were closely identified with the principal(s) in charge, usually identified by name (Cuff 1992). As part of a project-based discipline, architects tended to cater for individual clients or small businesses developing singular buildings from conception through construction. Their work consisted of hand-made drawings and specifications through contract documents, with separately engaged builders executing the construction (Davis 2000). To this day, such activity – singular buildings for singular clients – is still a large percentage of the work of many architects' offices.

The AIA 1947 Code of Ethics, with its concise list of eight self-concerned points, reflects the nature of that kind of limited, personal, private practice. Understanding movements afoot following the Second World War, Cummings (1955, 12), a regional AIA director writes that:

> in fifty years we have seen this country change from a predominantly rural to a predominantly urban society. We have become a mobile people. We have become a minutely differentiated people, as each new technological change has altered vocational demands. And by those tokens we have become a much more mutually interdependent people. As we have veered toward interdependence, we have become morally more responsible toward our neighbors. So our codes of ethics are being stated or re-stated ever more in the public interest.

In subsequent years, the activities of architectural practice expanded and evolved to encompass less-constrained project types and approaches. In 1970, the United States Supreme Court ruled that minimum fee schedules violated federal anti-trust laws and were thus illegal. In 1978, the AIA allowed that architects could engage in construction activities. 'Fast-track' construction had been invented in the early 1970s, thus introducing a less-rigid approach to contract documents. Today, digital computing fosters different communication and relationships with contractors and fabricators, changing the nature of practice (Gore 2014).

## Overview of city planning

Shifting populations from rural to urban areas resulted in the birth of city planning in the late 1800s (Johnston 1965). Overcrowded, unsanitary, and unsafe cities led Progressive reformers to seek help from old and new professions, such as engineering, architecture, landscape architecture, public health, social work, public administration, law, and city planning. This varied group of professionals and high-minded citizens began to gather every year at national conferences in order to network (the National Conference of Charities, the American Civic Association, and the AIA). They organized the first Conference on City Planning in 1909 (Birch 1980). At one such conference, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. 'raise(d) the issue of distinguishing the specialist in city planning from members of other professions' (Scott 1969, 163). Thus, in 1917, the ACPI was begun. Unlike the AIA's 13 founding architects, the charter ACPI members were diverse: landscape architects, engineers, attorneys, architects, land economists, and writers.

In its infancy, planning was typified by the City Beautiful Movement and was 'dominated by the architect-planner' (Johnston 1965, 202). Beauty gave way to the City Efficient movement, as sociologists and engineers pursued sanitation, efficiency, and housing reforms (Ward 1999). With the advent of the automobile in the 1920s, the new planning profession was tested and found to be too small and too inexperienced to cope (Scott 1969). However, zoning passed the test of constitutionality and land use regulation spread, particularly with the advocacy of the real estate industry through the National Association of Real Estate Boards (NAREB) (Weiss 1987). The 1929–1932 Depression would slow city growth, but federal New Deal programmes opened planning to a new type of planner, the public administrator (Birch 1980). Thus, the planning profession had different constituencies resulting in competing professional organizations. The ACPI served professional planners, often private sector consultants. The American Society of Planning Officials (ASPO) was founded by public administrators in 1934 as an information clearinghouse for public planning agencies (Scott 1969). The American Planning and Civic Association (APCA) served citizens who were amateur, activist planners. In the 1940s, NAREB influenced the formation of organizations for builders and developers such as the Urban Land Institute which now serves planners as well (Weiss 1987). As the listing of these organizations shows, planning as a singular profession drew on diverse roots but was still finding its way.

In terms of planning education, Harvard had a class in 1909 but there was no department of planning until 1929. By the 1930s, planning schools had formed at MIT, Cornell, Columbia, and Illinois (Hall 2002). The ACPI indicated that requisite education should include architecture, landscape architecture, and

civil engineering (Birch 1980). Early on, the educators were practitioners but, later, planning academia included social scientists and economists.

In 1938, the ACPI was renamed the American Institute of Planning (AIP), dropping the 'city' in its name but expanding to include regional planning (Hall 2002). Into the 1940s, Institute leadership was still augmenting the definition of 'planning,' declaring that planners could now come from liberal arts educations. The profession began to include problem-solving and data analysis, while moving away from aesthetics (Birch 1980). Unlike other professional organizations, Birch (1980) contends that AIP's vacillations about 'what is planning?' resulted in its coming late to a code of ethics and educational requirements.

By the 1960s, planning encompassed not only design-based master planning but also systems planning (goals, objectives, decisions, and computer models). Academics and grassroots activists criticized reliance on rationality and expertise that seemed irrelevant to the realities of inner cities (Hall 2002). Subsequently, planning took up advocacy and policy analysis. It evolved to be more about 'process' than 'products' (Rodwin 2000). Even so, in the present century, some see planning and architecture coming back together in a commitment to place making (Rodwin 2000; Anselin, Nasar, and Talen 2011).

Currently, the main professional organization for planners is the American Planning Association (APA), established in 1978 when the AIP and the ASPO merged (Birch 1980). The APA 'includes members who have very different perceptions of the field'; those 'see(ing) planning as a practical activity tied to public service and occupation; others see(ing) planning as a form of professional expertise' (Hoch 1994, 343). Within the APA, the descendant of the AIP's 'professional' point of view is the AICP, which follows the AIP traditions of requiring experience and passing a test to become 'certified.' Unlike architecture, licensing of planners never came to fruition except in New Jersey in 1966 and the process took almost 10 years as engineers, landscape architects, and architects complained that planners were moving into their respective territories (Meck 1998).

## Methodology

The data for this study consist of codes of ethics collected from the AIA, the AIP, and the AICP, all covering the timeframe from 1940 to the present. The AIA codes which were analysed run from 1947, 1964, 1970, 1977, 1981, 2007, and 2012. The AIP's codes are from 1948, 1959, 1971, and 1976, while the AICP codes derive from 1981, 1991, 2005, and 2009. We use codes of ethics because they are articulations of a 'profession's commitment to a set of values (and) reflects its interpretation of the world'(Frankel 1989, 113). They provide a mechanism for self-reflection and foster a discourse about ethical issues (Frankel 1989; Freckelton, 1996). Interest attaches to what each profession 'professes' as its expectations for appropriate behaviour. Using directed content analysis of words and concepts (Berg 2004; Hsieh and Shannon 2005), we analysed the codes in detail, using a definition of values and categories established by Kernaghan (2003). The AIA codes came from the AIA Archives in Washington, DC, and some of the AIP/AICP codes can be found in the APA Library in Chicago, Illinois. We read the codes, asking the question: 'is this an expression of an enduring belief that would influence the choices

the professional would make among available means or ends?' (Kernaghan 2003, 722 based on Rokeach 1973). The extracted values and concepts were then placed into four categories (ethical, democratic, people, and profession) as per previous studies (Kernaghan 2003; Wæraas 2010; Johnson 2014).

Examples of *ethical values* include accountability, loyalty, fairness, confidentiality, integrity, and non-discrimination. *Democratic values* include the rule of law, openness, equal opportunities, and neutrality. *People values* refer to how to treat people, involving compassion, care, honesty, and tolerance. In general, *professional values* cover creativity, efficiency, and leadership. However, within *professional values*, we especially focus on those representing 'jurisdictional claims' or *professional domains* (Abbott 1988). Professional domains are what each profession considers its particular purview, such as public health, the built environment, or citizen participation. There can be overlap in the categories, as in citizen participation representing a democratic value and a professional domain. The authors worked together to avoid this conjunction and decided on single categories for such items.

## Findings and discussion

We present the results by decade with items from the codes included under the categories of *ethics, democratic, people*, and *professional domains*. The major events in each decade come from a variety of sources (So et al. 1979; So and Getzels 1988; Anon 2000; Senville 2000).

### The 1940s

The AIA amended its code in 1947. Meanwhile, the AIP adopted its first code of ethics called 'AIP Code of Professional Conduct' on 10 January 1948. The major events in the 1940s concern the United States coming out of the Second World War with accelerated growth as exemplified by suburbanization and concomitant urban renewal efforts (see Table 1).

The AIA's 1947 code cited 'Standards of Professional Practice.' Like many such ethical statements, it consists of a set of aspirational advisory principles and another one of mandatory rules. In scope, tone, and content, they are consistent with codes coming before them (post-1909). They assume that architects are men and employ gendered pronouns. The *ethical* values stress being honest, free of financial conflicts of interest, and a fair competitor in the marketplace. *Democratic* values point to leadership in civic affairs and the promotion of community well-being. *People* values discuss treatment of employees through mentoring and fair compensation. The *professional domain* reinforces the notion of professionalism through fellowship with other architects and the differentiation of one's self from non-professionals. With a generalized notion of responsibility towards community health and well-being, the codes are primarily a set of principles and rules that seek to strengthen the image of the profession in the public's mind as fair, honest 'men' of integrity and selflessness.

The first (1948) planning code is typical of early ones in terms of being abstract and focusing on managing competition (i.e. not competing based on fees) and setting standards for advertising (no self-laudatory language). Not many *democratic* values

**Table 1.** The 1940s' major events bearing upon architecture and planning codes of ethics.

| The 1940s major events |
| --- |
| 1944 'G.I. Bill' Serviceman's Readjustment Act – Guaranteed home loans for veterans with favourable terms, thus fuelling suburbanization |
| 1947 Construction of Levittown, New York, begins – planned community, mass production of homes, suburbia |
| 1948 Cincinnati is the first American city to adopt a comprehensive plan following the Second World War |
| 1949 First regional shopping centre is built, Town and Country Shopping Center, east of Columbus, Ohio |
| 1949 The Housing Act of 1949 introduces 'urban renewal' reshaping central cities and clearing neighbourhoods |
| 1949 The National Trust for Historic Preservation is created and chartered by Congress |

| Code of ethics' characteristics | |
| --- | --- |
| American Institute of Architects (1947) | American Institute of Planners (1948) |
| *Ethical* | *Ethical* |
| Compete for work fairly, not based on charges | No competition with fellow planners based on fees |
| Avoid exaggerated, misleading, or paid publicity | No advertising using self-laudatory language |
| Be free of personal or financial interests | Do not undertake work unqualified to do or at a price that precludes adequate performance |
| Integrity | |
| Sincerity | |
| *Democratic* | *Democratic* |
| Be of constructive service in civic affairs | General welfare |
| Promote health and well-being of community | Public interest |
| Unprejudiced and honest advisor | Faithful agent |
| Forward justice | |
| *People* | *People* |
| Uses male pronoun | Code written for male planners using 'he' |
| Inspire loyal interest of employees, pay just compensation | Encourage assistants and students |
| Courtesy and sincerity | |
| Mentoring of young professionals | |
| *Professional domain* | *Professional domain* |
| Should unite in fellowship in professional organizations | Basic objective of planning is the promotion of general welfare, even when it might conflict with the interests of smaller groups or individuals |
| Respect punctiliously hallmarks that distinguish professional practice from non-professional enterprise | Planning unified development of urban communities and their environs (states, regions, and the nation) |
| Good design, good construction, proper placement of structures, adequate development, and adornment of the areas about them | Comprehensive land uses, land occupancy, and regulation thereof |
| Give advice and counsel on buildings, their equipment and areas for health, safety, efficient operation, and economical maintenance using appropriate and economical materials and methods, beauty that lifts them above the commonplace | Acknowledges collateral fields of physical, social, economic, and fiscal planning |
| Services from beginning to completion of project | Land is a natural resource of the nation but also the property of individuals/groups |
| Good business capacity and artistic and technical abilities | Protect public and private interests appropriate to the situation |
| Professional treatment of other professionals and other practitioners of the arts | |

appear except for looking out for the general welfare, the public interest, and being a faithful agent. *People* values emphasize encouraging assistants and students and treating colleagues fairly. The code is not gender neutral and assumes planners are male.

As explained earlier, the AIP and the planning profession grappled with what exactly 'planning' is. Found within the *professional domain* are topics around planning of unified development, comprehensive arrangement of land uses/occupancy and their regulation, and recognition of land as a natural resource. In addition, the code mentions collateral fields of physical, social, economic, and fiscal planning, recognizing that planning involves multiple interests. It speaks to having to deal with public and private interests at the same time but realizes that the former is paramount. This delicate balancing of interests and attention to what is appropriate to particular situations will emerge as a common theme throughout the planning codes over time. The tension over individual versus group rights could be a reflection of the growing pains taking place in United States politics and the expansion of the role of the national government.

The 1947 AIA and 1948 AIP codes are similar in their aversion to competing with colleagues on price and advertising. Having more years of experience with a code of ethics, the AIA version is more detailed and extensive than that of the AIP. The AIA *ethical, people,* and *democratic* values are more wide-ranging and include health, safety, and well-being. The AIA underlines an advisory but also a leadership role for architects, who should inspire loyalty among their employees and be part of the civic affairs of their communities. The *professional domains* do not show much overlap, since the architects focus on buildings and their immediate surroundings and the planners are looking at land use and unified development which can take in larger environs extending to regions, states, and the nation. The architects are also interested in economical, efficient, and beautiful construction, while the planners do not mention art or aesthetics.

## The 1950s and 1960s

These decades were times of urban renewal, social unrest, and criticism of both planners and architects for their ineffectiveness in meeting social responsibilities (Table 2). Councils of government, interstate highways, and a more proactive national government opened up possibilities for regional planning and coordination. The AIA code from 1964, entitled 'The Standards of Professional Practice,' takes a different form and, thus, reflects the significant social changes that have occurred since the Second World War. Matters are now categorized in four spheres of responsibility, namely to: the public; the client; the profession; and related professionals. Much of the language regarding the need for honesty, integrity, and sincerity remains, now situated in the different spheres. But the re-organization itself is significant, in the sense that the public is listed first. This code is less inward looking than earlier ones. It still has aspirational principles and mandatory rules, but the emphasis seems to have shifted to the rules – if only in the number of words dedicated to each section. There are more rules in 1964 than before and they are more situationally specific. For instance, Rule 1.2 states that, 'an architect shall perform his professional services with *competence* . . . ' (emphasis added). In contrast, the 1928 code describes 'men of the *highest* integrity, business capacity and artistic ability' (italics added). While the *ethics, people*, and *democratic* values remain consistent, the *professional* sphere is clearer, claiming jurisdiction over the public domain in 'creating environments of orderliness and beauty.'

The AIP's 1948 code was amended in 1959 and became the 'Code of Professional Conduct.' Reflecting the major events of the time, it now mentions 'social consciousness,' but without any further elucidation. The *ethics* category continues its guidance on competition and advertising. Under *ethics* and *people*, perhaps in recognition of planning's diversity of occupations, the code urges respecting those in related professions and recommending their services when needed. Added to the *democratic* category are desires for public confidence and acceptance. The *professional domain* outlined in the code is the same as in 1948 but with the addition of advancing the art, science, and practice of the profession.

Both organizations' codes seem to be a reflection of the concerns with post-war development and the need for someone to be responsible for making sound environmental design and planning decisions. They also converge in the recognition that these disciplines are highly collaborative in nature, with calls for promoting positive relationships with 'related professionals' in design, regulation, finance, law, engineering, and construction. The AIA now speaks to the public interest but the planning code is alone in addressing the difficulties of balancing private and public interests. The planners' code adds 'art and science' which has appeared in previous architecture codes. Planning now recognizes a 'social consciousness' which joins the AIA's previously established 'forward justice,' but neither code fully addresses social issues plaguing cities. The *professional domain* of architects expands to include 'man's physical environment' and, more prominently, mentions being part of the design professions. The planning code does not mention design or aesthetics.

## The 1970s

The 1970s brought significant advances in environmental awareness and regulation (Table 3). In planning, one can note the first moves away from the traditional land use planning to creating policy plans including advocacy. The nation continued to deal with race and poverty and the failures of urban renewal. The Equal Rights Amendment appeared headed for ratification, but ultimately failed. With the many social changes taking place, it is not surprising that both the AIA and AIP amend their codes twice in a short 10-year timeframe. The AIA's 'The Standards of Ethical Practice' of 1970 continues the trend of 1964 by further reducing the aspirational content and focusing on 'subjects that our professional organization can and should control' – through mandatory rules, including an 'attempt to accommodate an expanding spectrum of services and responsibilities that people trained as architects provide in enhancing man's environment' (Train 1970, 2). Such an 'expanding spectrum' includes forays into fee-based construction management. The wider interests also reflect many of the changing social norms, through non-discrimination clauses based on sex, race, creed, and national origin, along with support for 'human rights of all mankind.'

The AIP adopted its 'Code of Professional Responsibility and Rules of Procedure' in 1971. Under *ethics*, that code now covers confidentiality and integrity. The guidelines for advertising and competition are still in place, but there are more items addressing what a planner in 'public office' should do. One new *democratic* item is added, namely, engaging independent professional judgement. Code items dealing with *people* continue to include social consciousness and relationships with related professions. Planning's *professional domain* moves from focusing on the 'general welfare' to the 'public interest,' which could be in response to its becoming more populated by public sector planners. Instead of referring to 'land use,' the code deals with 'community resources.' A new *professional* value is research and preparation adequate to the circumstances, perhaps responding to a need for more data gathering and understanding of cities, which were criticisms during the 1960s. The code is still written with an assumption that planners are male.

In 1977 the AIA again reorganized its code by combining specific aspirational principles and mandatory rules beneath a set of six canons of broad professional conduct. It becomes longer, with more situational nuance, regulating, for instance, self-promotion through brochures or phone book listings. At the same time, it proactively and declaratively states in one of the canons, 'members of the (AIA) should uphold all human rights' and, in another, 'members of the (AIA) should serve and promote the public interest in improving the human environment.' Earlier AIA codes might have talked about these matters, but only in the context of general 'obligations to the public.' Now they are extracted from a generic 'public' category and made ethical canons in their own right.

The next AIP code dates from 1976 and it is finally written to be gender neutral. The *ethics* items are the same as those of 1971, except that a non-discrimination clause related to race, colour, creed, sex, or national origin is added. Nevertheless, it is narrowly defined to apply to hiring and employment. Social consciousness is now expanded to include a special responsibility to plan for the needs of disadvantaged groups and persons. *Democratic*

**Table 2.** The 1950s'–1960s' major events bearing upon architecture and planning codes of ethics.

| The 1950s'–1960s' major events |
|---|
| 1954 In *Berman v. Parker*, United States Supreme Court upholds right of redevelopment agency to condemn properties that are unsightly, though not deteriorated, complicit with a municipal redevelopment plan |
| 1954 In *Brown v. Board of Education*, United States Supreme Court upholds school integration in a win for civil rights but 'white flight' from central cities to suburbs had already begun |
| 1954 The Council of Government movement (COGS) begins in the Detroit area for informal regional planning |
| 1954 The Housing Act of 1954, The first federal conservation and rehabilitation programme establishes the first federal 50–50 (Section 701) funding for preparation of general plans |
| 1956 Interstate System of limited access highways underway |
| 1961 *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* by Jane Jacobs critiques planning and planners |
| 1962 'A Choice Theory of Planning,' in the *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* by Paul Davidoff and Thomas Reiner starts the advocacy planning movement |
| 1962 Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* alerts the public to the impacts of pesticides on wildlife |
| 1963 The federal Clean Air Act controlling air pollution passes |
| 1964 The federal Civil Rights Act outlaws discrimination based on race, colour, religion, sex, or national origin |
| 1965 The Black Arts Movement combines literature, theatre, and art with the black power movement |
| 1964 President Lyndon Johnson declares a 'war on poverty' |
| 1965 United States Department of Housing and Urban Development is established. Robert Weaver becomes the department's first Secretary and the nation's first African-American cabinet member |
| 1965 Watts riots in Los Angeles, California typifies other urban and racial unrest across the United States |
| 1966 Unites States National Historic Preservation Act passed |
| 1967 Executive order directs federal agencies to take 'affirmative action' in hiring |
| 1967 Yale University's Vlock Building Project has graduate students use design/build to create low-income housing |
| 1968 The National Urban League's Whitney Young challenges members of the American Institute of Architects to make civic and social contributions |
| 1969 Ian McHarg publishes *Design with Nature* for planning with the natural environment |

| Code of ethics' characteristics | |
|---|---|
| American Institute of Architects (1964) | American Institute of Planners (1959) |
| *Ethical* | *Ethical* |
| Shall adhere to 'competition code' | No competition with fellow planners based on fees |
| No advertising that is self-laudatory, exaggerated, misleading, or false | No advertising using self-laudatory language |
| Honesty of purpose above suspicion | Do not undertake work unqualified to do or at a price that precludes adequate performance |
| No conflicts of interest | Recommend services of other professionals when needed |
| Moral obligations to society | |
| *Democratic* | *Democratic* |
| Be of constructive service in civic affairs | General welfare |
| Safety, health, beauty and well-being of community | Public interest |
| Public interest | Public regard, confidence, and acceptance |
| Forward justice | |
| Advice is sound and unprejudiced | |
| *People* | *People* |
| Uses male pronoun | Code written for male planners using 'he' |
| Contribute generously to foster justice, courtesy and sincerity | Encourage assistants and students |
| Encourage continuing education of employees | Social consciousness |
| Shall not injure reputations of fellow architects | Respect-related professions |
| Courtesy and sincerity | |
| Respect and collaborate with other professions to create optimum physical environment | |
| Contribute to design profession and building industry | |
| *Professional domain* | *Professional domain* |
| Motives abilities and conduct . . . command respect and confidence | Basic objective of planning is the promotion of general welfare even when it might conflict with the interests of smaller groups or individuals |
| Communications shall be clear, concise, and fair | Planning unified development of urban areas and their environs (states, regions, and the nation) |
| Development of man's physical environment | Comprehensive land uses, land occupancy, and regulation thereof |
| Creating environment of orderliness and beauty | Acknowledges collateral fields of physical, social, economic, and fiscal planning |
| Art and science of environmental design | Land is natural resource of the nation but also property of individuals/groups |
| | Protect public and private interests appropriate to the situation |
| | Advance art, science, and practice of planning |

items stipulate the expansion of choice and opportunity for all persons, and urge the alteration of policies or institutions which hurt disadvantaged groups or fail to expand choice. The overall *professional domain* stays the same, mentioning community resources, but a planner's social responsibilities expand.

The first set of codes in the 1970s respond to some of the criticisms of the 1960s by addressing social consciousness and human rights, but not much beyond recognizing those obligations. The AIA code expands its *professional domain* to include 'planning and building' and leadership for the building industry.

**Table 3.** The 1970s' major events bearing upon architecture and planning codes of ethics.

| The 1970s major events |
| --- |

1968–1977 Practice of red-lining is attacked through a series of federal laws
1970s Lawrence Halprin sets a standard for collaborative, human scale, interactive works
1970 The United States Environmental Protection Agency established
1970 First Earth Day
1971 Rouse Company's Columbia, MD, 'new town' was marketed as a progressive community for all races, but then criticized for not having African-American-managed or -owned business in the community. The Company responded with an affirmative action programme
1972 The United States Federal Water Pollution Control Act rewritten and becomes known as 'Clean Water Act'
1972 Demolition of St. Louis's high-rise, modernist architecture Pruitt-Igoe public housing project
1972 First rapid transit built for centre-to-centre service in San Francisco called The Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system
1972 In *Golden v. Planning Board of Ramapo, New York* the United States Supreme Court allows the use of performance criteria to control growth
1973 The United States Endangered Species Act
1973 The Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) oil embargo leads to an energy crisis
1973 Oregon adopts a statewide land use system supporting compact cities and preserving woodlands, farmland, and coasts
1974 The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) programme
1975 Cleveland Policy Plan Report shifts emphasis from traditional land-use planning to advocacy planning
1976 Rouse Company and Ben Thompson start the festival marketplace trend with Faneuil Hall Marketplace in Boston
1977 The Association for Community Design (ACD) is founded to foster community-based design and planning
1978 Creation of APA through merger of AIP and ASPO
1978 Lifting of restrictions on architects as builders by a vote of the AIA membership at annual convention
1972–1982 Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution is open for ratification but fails

| Code of ethics' characteristics |
| --- |

| American Institute of Architects (1970) | American Institute of Planners (1971) |
| --- | --- |
| *Ethical* | *Ethical* |
| No paid advertising | No competition with fellow planners based on fees |
| No public endorsements, but may be identified with designs | No advertising using self-laudatory language |
| Shall preserve confidences | Do not undertake work not competent to perform |
| Be truthful as to ability | Confidentiality |
| No conflicts of interest if reasonably appear to compromise judgement | Integrity |
| | List of items to avoid conflicts of interest or to obtain or use some special advantage/influence |
| *Democratic* | *Democratic* |
| Conform to registration laws | General welfare |
| Disseminate knowledge | Public interest |
| Serve and promote public interest | Insure accommodation of client's or employer's interest within public interest |
| | Independent professional judgement |
| *People* | *People* |
| Uses male pronoun | Code written for male planners using 'he' |
| Advancement of living standards | Social consciousness |
| Support human rights | Relationships with public, clients, employers, fellow members, and related professions |
| Shall not discriminate sex, race, creed, national origin | |
| *Professional domain* | *Professional domain* |
| Science and art of planning and building | Serve the public interest primarily |
| Coordinate the building industry | Coordination, for the general welfare, of that use and development of community resources that are best designed to fulfil human needs and purposes |
| Advancement of living standards of our people through their improved environment | |
| Aesthetic, scientific, and practical efficiency | |
| Design and construction of the physical environment | |
| American Institute of Architects (1977) | American Institute of Planners (1976) |
| *Ethical* | *Ethical* |
| Shall pursue activities with honesty and fairness | No advertising using self-laudatory language |
| Shall preserve confidence of clients and employees | Do not undertake work not competent to perform |
| Shall not engage in building if compensation is based on profit from materials and labour May engage in construction management for professional fee | Confidentiality |
| No conflicts of interest if reasonably appear to compromise judgement | Integrity |
| No free sketches to pursue work, except through design competitions | List of items to avoid conflicts of interest or to obtain or use some special advantage/influence |
| Not discriminate against any business associate, employee, employer, or applicant because of race, religion, sex, national origin, age, or handicap | Not discriminate based on race, colour, creed, sex, or national origin in hiring/employment |

**Table 3.** Continued.

| The 1970s major events | |
| --- | --- |
| *Democratic* | *Democratic* |
| Shall preserve and protect the public interest in the environment | Public interest |
| Should communicate with public in professional manner | Insure accommodation of client's or employer's interest within public interest |
| Seek opportunities for civic service, and be involved in matters of public policy | Independent professional judgement |
| No illegal or immoral conduct | Expand choice and opportunity for all persons |
| | Urge alterations in policies, institutions, decisions which do not expand choice and meet the needs of disadvantaged groups/persons |
| *People* | *People* |
| Code written to be gender neutral, no discrimination regarding sex, race, religion, national origin, age, handicap | Code written to be gender neutral using 'him or her' and 'planner' |
| Recognize professional contributions of employees and associates | Social consciousness |
| Provide suitable working environment and fair compensation for employees | Relationships with public, clients, employers, fellow members, and related professions |
| | Special responsibility to plan for the needs of disadvantaged groups and persons |
| *Professional domain* | *Professional domain* |
| Shall make clear to public that ability and competence should be primary consideration in hiring | Serve the public interest primarily |
| Shall raise standards of aesthetic excellence, education, research, training, and practice | Coordination, for the general welfare, of that use and development of community resources that are best designed to fulfil human needs and purposes |
| Maintain integrity and high standards of profession | |
| Serve clients competently and unprejudiced | |
| Respect the natural environment while striving to improve the built environment and the nation's quality of life | |
| Conserve natural resources and the heritage of the past | |
| Aesthetic excellence | |
| Building industry | |
| Matters of policy and planning relate to settlement and growth | |
| Public understanding of architecture | |

The planners shift theirs to 'community resources' instead of 'land use'. Under *ethics,* there are more detailed rules.

The two codes in the latter part of the decade both become gender neutral. Both include a non-discrimination clause, although they only focus on hiring. This is perhaps coercive isomorphism (Abbott 1988) at work as the codes respond to court cases and regulations. Mimetic isomorphism could be at play as both codes provide more details about ethical rules and conflicts of interest. In the 1977 code of ethics, the AIA includes obligations to the natural environment and heritage of the past in its *professional domain*, reflecting the impact of current events. Unlike the 1971 AIP code, which simply acknowledges 'social consciousness,' the 1976 code proactively urges planners to expand choice and opportunities for people, including a special responsibility to plan for the needs of disadvantaged persons. The AIA *professional domain* also includes policy and planning related to settlement and growth, which is clearly extending into planning's bailiwick. This move could be in response to the increasing application of federal policies and their impact on cities. As a result, there are more opportunities for planners and architects to 'run into' each other on federally funded or regulated projects. At this time, planning is also adjusting its *professional domain* to include community resources and not simply land use.

## The 1980s

In the 1980s, the policies of President Ronald Reagan devolved responsibilities to states, deregulated industries, and focused more attention on economic development (Table 4). The AIA adopted a significantly modified code in 1981 by going back to a shorter listing of broad aspirational principles (as opposed to enumerated rules) and, as in planning, it does not concern itself with advertising anymore. It merely states that professional communications with the public should be 'candid and truthful.' The list of variables against which members should not discriminate becomes longer, including 'race, creed, color, sex, national origin, age or handicap, and striving to provide equal opportunities for all.' The ethical content appears to be progressing alongside that of the planners and society, yet, in contrast to recent trends, does it in a way that is less pragmatic and more aspirational.

The AICP took over from the AIP with its own code of ethics in 1981 (American Institute of Certified Planners 1992). Under *ethics*, its code no longer concerns itself with competition and advertising. The list of *ethical* values is similar, with the addition of an item about critically analysing ethical issues in practice. *Democratic* values expand, adding full, clear, and accurate information, continuous debate, and respecting the rights of others. The non-discrimination clause becomes less specific (must not discriminate against persons) but more generally binding, since it no longer applies just to employment. In 1981, the *people* values included facilitating broad participation, thereby incorporating people who lacked formal influence. On a related note, planners are asked to volunteer for groups lacking planning resources. Another addition is increasing opportunities in the profession for women and 'recognized' minorities.

In terms of the *professional domain,* the AICP code reflects advances in the environmental and historic preservation movements, and includes the integrity of the natural environment, excellence of environmental design, and conserving the

**Table 4.** The 1980s' major events bearing upon architecture and planning codes of ethics.

| The 1980s major events |
| --- |
| 1980 'Reagan Revolution' begins with less federal domestic spending, more privatization, deregulation, and emphasis on public–private partnerships |
| 1981 Architects/Designers/Planners for Social Responsibility is founded to pursue peace initiatives then expands to cover environmental protection, social justice, and the development of healthy communities |
| 1983 Start of Richard H. Driehaus Foundation to preserve and enhance the built and natural environments |
| 1984 Seaside, Florida is one of the earliest examples of the New Urbanism |
| 1986 In *Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson* the United States Supreme Court recognized sexual harassment as a violation of the Civil Rights Act |
| 1989 The Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) is recognized by the Washington-based Council on Post-Secondary Education to be the accrediting agency for planning schools |
| 1980s – 1990s Use of geographic information systems (GIS) for mapping and data analysis grows and becomes standard |

| Code of ethics' characteristics | |
| --- | --- |
| **American Institute of Architects (1981)** | **American Institute of Certified Planners (1992)** |
| *Ethical* | *Ethical* |
| Candid and truthful in professional communications. | Do not undertake work not competent to perform. |
| Serve clients and employers in thorough and competent manner | Confidentiality |
| Respect confidences of clients, employees and employers | Integrity |
| Disclose any circumstance that could be construed as a conflict of interest | List of items to avoid conflicts of interest or to obtain or use some special advantage/influence |
| Not discriminate against anyone or any group for reasons of race, creed, colour, sex, national origin, age, or handicap | Not discriminate against persons |
| | Be responsible in criticism of profession |
| | Accurately represent qualifications, views and findings of colleagues – treat fairly views of qualified colleagues and members of other professions |
| | Critically analyse ethical issues in the practice of planning |
| *Democratic* | *Democratic* |
| Thoughtfully consider the social and environmental impact of their work | Public interest |
| Support human rights and not discriminate against others | Insure accommodation of client's or employer's interest within public interest |
| Equal opportunities for all | Independent professional judgement |
| | Expand choice and opportunity for all persons |
| | Full, clear, and accurate information |
| | Continuous debate |
| | Faithful service to the public interest |
| | Accept the decisions of client or employer unless illegal or inconsistent with the public interest |
| | Respect the rights of others |
| *People* | *People* |
| Acknowledge, respect, and give credit for professional contributions of employees, associates, and colleagues | Code written to be gender neutral using 'planner' or 'planner's' |
| Compete fairly with other professionals, no bribes | Special responsibility to plan for the needs of disadvantaged groups and persons |
| | Participation should be broad enough to include people who lack formal organization or influence |
| | Time and knowledge to students, interns, beginning professionals and other colleagues |
| | Increase opportunities for women and members of recognized minorities to become professional planners |
| | Time and effort to groups lacking in adequate planning resources and to voluntary professional activities |
| *Professional domain* | *Professional domain* |
| Members accept the primacy of learned and professional judgement over any other motivation | Serve the public interest – primary obligation |
| Uphold the credibility and dignity of the profession | Balancing interests |
| Maintain and advance their knowledge of the art and science of architecture | Balancing based on facts and context of particular situation |
| Design excellence | Long-range consequences of present actions |
| Built environment | Interrelatedness of decisions |
| Social and environmental impact of their work | Integrity of the natural environment |
| Environmental quality | Excellence of environmental design |
| Conserve resources | Conserve the heritage of the built environment |
| Respect heritage of the past | Work relevant to solutions of community problems |
| Advocates for the needs of building users | Public understanding or planning activities |
| Built environment and quality of life related and matters of policy and planning related to these issues | Fair, considerate, professional, equitable review of the work of other professions |
| | Examine applicability of planning theory, methods, and standards to the facts and analysis of each particular situation and must not accept the applicability of a customary solution without first establishing its appropriateness to the situation |
| | Diligent, creative, competent, proficiency, knowledge, high standards, continue professional education, improving knowledge and techniques |

heritage of the built environment. Since 1948, this is the most specific the codes have been about what planners do. However, similar to those early codes, this one follows recurring themes of balancing rights, the interrelatedness of decisions, and paying attention to the particulars of situations. In 1981, we find the introduction of the obligation to consider the long-range consequences of present actions. Equally broadly, planners are asked to treat members of other professions fairly and, especially, to be fair when reviewing their work. This caveat continues the codes' recognition of planning's roots in, and connections to, related professions and its role in regulation.

As outlined in the codes, the *professional domains* of both professions are now focused on the environment and the heritage of the past. Unlike its planning counterpart, the AIA code adds 'conserving natural resources' to its environmental view. Planners now bear an obligation to excellence in environmental design, which is tapping the domain of architects. The planning agenda becomes much more process-oriented towards citizen participation, the interrelatedness of decisions, long-range consequences, balancing of interests, and tailoring solutions to circumstances. These points could be responses to the shrinking role of government and planners searching for other ways to bolster community cooperation.

The AIA code alters how it describes architects involved with planning and policy, changing from 'settlement and growth' to citing the built environment and quality of life. It now adds that architects should be advocates for those who use their buildings. Perhaps reflecting that planners are more often in the public sector, the AICP code has much more in the *democratic* category than the AIA one. All along, the AIA code has mentioned architects participating in civic affairs, while the AICP code now encourages planners to volunteer for organizations that lack adequate planning resources. In terms of normative isomorphism (Abbott 1988) which includes professional norms, both codes now address how members should contribute to the overall body of knowledge in their professions.

### Post-1990

The 1990s and 2000s take as themes attending to the environment and green building but also economic development. In the early 1990s, there continued to be strife surrounding equal rights for women and minorities. Later on, Hurricane Katrina showed up America's limitations in emergency preparedness and race relations (Table 5). The latest AIA codes date from 2007 and 2012 (American Institute of Architects 2013), and both revert to the form established in 1977, with a broad set of six aspirational canons. They cover general obligations and, thereafter, five more to: the public; the client; the profession; colleagues; and the environment. Within each canon are more situational ethical standards and rules. The inclusion of the environment as a new focus is significant and reflective of the times, as it is in the AICP code. Other evolutionary changes are as follows: the non-discrimination clause expands to include 'orientation,' and another one encourages the promotion of the public interest through *pro bono* work. Reflecting hurricane-related events, the *pro bono* work mentions contributions after disasters. In general, as noted before, much of the AIA code stays the same, promoting

timeless principles of honesty and integrity, while evolutionary changes conform to that of the society around it.

The AICP's 1991 code (American Institute of Certified Planners 2001) carried over many of the 1981 and the 1976 codes' components. The most notable change is the addition of the clause, 'shall not commit an act of sexual harassment' which echoes events at the time. There is also a prohibition of a planner leaving public employment being able to represent a private client before the previous public employer for one year. Lastly, the professional domain of planners includes giving citizens the opportunity to have a meaningful impact on the development of plans and programmes. From the 1980s to the 1990s, the planning code keeps expanding a planner's responsibility for citizen engagement.

The AICP code (American Planning Association 2005) underwent a thorough overhaul in 2005. It is reorganized to make it easier to use and divides provisions into 'aspirations,' to which members are not held in terms of misconduct, and 'rules' which *can* result in revocation of certification (Salkin 2006). In the 2005 AICP code, the *ethics* list is expanded considerably to detail when and how to avoid conflicts of interest. Attention is upon full disclosure versus following specific rules; for instance, the one-year restraint on a former public planner before working for his or her previous employer as a consultant is gone. The clause against sexual harassment is removed and replaced with a generic one about not committing any wrongful act which reflects adversely on professional fitness. The non-discrimination clause is changed from 'improperly' to 'unlawfully' discriminating. Instead of helping 'women and minorities' become planners, it refers to helping 'members of under-represented groups.' The few additions to the *democratic* list involve promoting not only continuous but also open debate to discern the public interest. The focus on privatization and a business orientation in the 1980s into the 1990s is perhaps the reason for providing 'full, clear, and accurate information' becoming 'timely, adequate, clear and accurate information.' By 2005, the code is not as explicit about attending to 'related professions' and simply refers to treating other or fellow professionals fairly.

At the time, the 2005 code was criticized for watering down the high ideals from previous codes (Peterson 2006). However, it keeps items from the 1976 and 1981 codes and builds 'compassion and social justice' into the *people* category. Remarkably, perhaps as a reaction against the politics of the day, it adds, 'promote racial and economic integration' to the *professional domain* of planners. While maintaining traditional, more generalized, *professional* items of balancing interests, appropriateness of solutions to particular situations, and long-range consequences of present actions, the 2005 code contributes specifics such as creating better, more inclusive communities, excellence of design, and educating the public about planning issues. They come on top of conserving and preserving the integrity and heritage of the natural and built environments. The code was amended in 2009 (American Planning Association 2013), but the only change is the addition of a section on appropriate procedures if an AICP planner is convicted of a serious crime.

The AIA and AICP codes respond to current events similarly, to wit, continuing to emphasize the environment and heritage of the past. However, the AIA code adds 'cultural' in front of

**Table 5.** The 1990s'–2000s' major events bearing upon architecture and planning codes of ethics.

*The 1990s'–2000s' major events*

1990s Internet takes off
1990 United States Americans with Disabilities Act passed
1991 Anita Hill testifies before Congress about United States Supreme Court nominee Clarence Thomas and allegations of sexual harassment
1991 Passage of Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) includes multi-modal and historic preservation options
1991–1992 Rodney King beaten by Los Angeles police, trial, and subsequent riots
1993 Enterprise Zone/Empowerment Community (EZ/EC) proposal becomes law containing tax incentives, wage tax credits, special deductions, and low-interest financing to certain impoverished urban and rural communities
1991 The Rural Studio starts as a design-build architecture studio at Auburn University teaching social responsibility and providing homes and buildings for poor, rural communities
1993 United States Green Building Council
1994 Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) construction standards begin
1996 Smart Growth Network
1996 The AIA's Boyer Report calls for focus on public benefits of architecture
1999 AICP launches a College of Fellows (FAICP) to recognize significant contributions by AICP members
2000 President Clinton creates eight new national monuments in five western states
2000 Structures of Inclusion (SFI) begins national conferences on public service architecture and community design
2000s Mobile apps become common
2003 By this time, many states in the United States have legalized gay marriage
2005 Hurricane Katrina wreaks havoc on communities in the Gulf coast from central Florida to Texas, particularly the city of New Orleans
2009 High Line in New York City (linear park on former elevated train tracks) opens after successful grassroots efforts
2009 The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) create the Partnership for Sustainable Communities
2010 'Small Scale, Big Change: New Architectures of Social Engagement' is an exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art, New York City, New York
1990s – 2000s Growth management turns to how to shrink cities gracefully

*Code of ethics' characteristics*

The AICP's 1991 Code carried over much of the 1981 and the 1976 codes, except the clause 'shall not commit an act of sexual harassment' appears along with a prohibition of a planner leaving public employment not being able to represent a private client before the previous public employer for one year.

| American Institute of Architects (2013)[a] | American Planning Association (2005, 2013)[b] |
|---|---|
| *Ethical* | *Ethical* |
| Be candid and truthful | Overall changes from 'must' to 'shall' |
| Avoid conflicts of interest | Do not undertake work not competent to perform |
| Safeguard trust of clients | Confidentiality |
| Promote dignity and integrity of profession | Integrity |
| Not discriminate on race, religion, gender, origin, age, disability, orientation in professional activities | Even more extensive list of items to avoid conflicts of interest including avoiding the appearance thereof and no misrepresentation |
| Disclose when having economic interest in public issues | Not discriminate against persons (unlawfully) |
|  | Be responsible in criticism of profession |
|  | Accurately represent qualifications, views and findings of colleagues – treat fairly views of qualified colleagues and members of other professions |
|  | Critically analyse ethical issues in the practice of planning |
|  | Sexual harassment clause dropped |
|  | Not commit any wrongful act that reflects adversely on our professional fitness |
| *Democratic* | *Democratic* |
| Embrace spirit and letter of law | Public interest |
| Should render public interest services, *pro bono* work | Welfare of all people |
| Promote and serve public interest | Insure accommodation of client's or employer's interest within public interest |
|  | Independent professional judgement |
|  | Expand choice and opportunity for all persons |
|  | Urge alterations in policies, institutions, decisions which do not expand choice, meet the needs of disadvantaged groups/persons, or pursue racial and economic integration |
|  | Timely, adequate, clear, and accurate information |
|  | Continuous debate (and open) |
|  | Faithful service to the public interest |
|  | Accept the decisions of client or employer unless illegal or inconsistent with the public interest |
|  | Conscious of the rights of others |
|  | Not accept work that is illegal or violates the code |
| *People* | *People* |
| Gender-neutral pronouns | Code written to be gender neutral using 'we' |
| Respect rights and acknowledge contributions of colleagues | Compassion |
| Provide suitable working environment, fair compensation, facilitate professional development | Social justice |
| Nurture development of fellow professionals through mentoring | Special responsibility to plan for the needs of disadvantaged groups |

(*continued*).

**Table 5.** Continued.

| The 1990s'–2000s' major events | |
|---|---|
| Uphold human rights | Participation should be broad enough to include people who lack formal organization or influence |
| Pro bono services are those rendered without expecting compensation, including those rendered for indigent persons, after disasters, or in other emergencies. | Time and resources to professional development of students, interns, beginning professionals and other colleagues |
| Candor and truthfulness | Increase opportunities for under-represented groups to become professional planners and advance in the profession |
| | Time and effort to groups lacking in adequate planning resources and to voluntary professional activities |
| *Professional domain* | *Professional domain* |
| Maintain and advance knowledge; consider social and environmental impacts; uncompromised judgement | Serve the public interest – primary obligation |
| Serve clients in professional manner | Building better, more inclusive communities |
| Strive to improve knowledge and skill | Promote racial and economic integration |
| Promote allied arts and building industry | Excellence of design |
| Promote sustainable design, development, and practices (sustainable building and site design) | Balancing interests |
| Respect and conserve natural and cultural heritage, improve environment and the quality of life within it | Balancing based on facts and context of particular situation |
| Continually seek to raise the standards of aesthetic excellence, architectural education, research, training, and practice | Long-range consequences of present actions |
| Promote allied arts and contribute to the knowledge and capability of the building industries as a whole | Interrelatedness of decisions |
| | Integrity of the natural environment |
| | Conserve and preserve the integrity and heritage of the natural and built environment |
| | Work relevant to solutions of community problems |
| | Public understanding or planning activities |
| | Educate the public about planning issues and their relevance to our everyday lives |
| | Fair, considerate, professional, equitable review of the work of other professions |
| | Examine applicability of planning theory, methods, and standards to the facts and analysis of each particular situation and must not accept the applicability of a customary solution without first establishing its appropriateness to the situation |
| | Diligent, creative, competent, proficiency, knowledge, continue professional education and training, improving knowledge and techniques |

[a]Only difference between 2007 and 2012 codes is a single clause about timely review of documentation for mentoring through the internship development programme.
[b]Only difference between 2005 and 2009 codes is a section on procedures to follow if a certified planner is convicted of a serious crime.

'heritage' and includes 'sustainability' in its *professional domain*. The AIA is ahead of the AICP in incorporating sustainability. The current AIA code no longer mentions planning or policy as being under the purview of architects. Yet, the AICP code now mentions excellence of design, which it has not mentioned previously. Under the *ethics* category, that code becomes more detailed and, for its part, the AIA lists specific rules. In particular, the latter code addresses anti-trust laws. The two organizations both emphasize the importance of full disclosure. *Democratic* values are emphasized in the AICP code as opposed to the AIA one. The *people* values in the AIA code include specifics about non-discrimination and also 'orientation,' but are more generic in terms of upholding human rights. The AICP code continues to emphasize responsibilities to the disadvantaged and the desirability of inclusive communities and economic and racial integration, thus showing a new commitment to social issues. The AIA mentions *pro bono* services for indigent persons, after disasters, or during emergencies. The AICP mentions other professionals, but not in as much detail as previously. The AIA code dropped collaboration with other professions after citing it in 1964, but does bring up working with the allied arts and the building industry.

## Convergence and divergence over time

As indicated earlier, institutionalism focuses attention on how organizations are influenced by their cultural and political contexts which can lead to coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Frumkin and Galaskiewicz 2004). The architects' and planners' codes responded to coercive legal and cultural events in similar ways. Following the women's movement, they finally use gender-neutral wording after the late 1970s. They both start looking at social issues and human rights in the latter 1960s, but really do not fully engage with race and discrimination until the 1980s. Progress in terms of the environment and historic heritage are also more fully realized in the 1980s. Nonetheless, the passage of the federal Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990 does not cause the same specific responses in the codes as seen in kindred attention to sexual harassment, race, or the environment. However, the AIA changes its list of non-discrimination items from 'handicap' to 'disability' in the 2000s.

Mimetic isomorphism is recognized when organizations become more alike as they seek to minimize uncertainty (DiMaggio and Powell 1983). Over time, both sets of codes became more rule-bound and instructive about what constitutes misconduct. The AIA and AIP/AICP also reflect normative isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell 1983) in so far as they establish professional legitimacy and networks of information-sharing. They both consistently showed a dedication to students and colleagues and then became clearer about pursuing continuing education and contributing to their bodies of knowledge.

While converging on issues of social justice, heritage, and environment, the codes of ethics show divergence, particularly

in terms of their professional domains. While adding more *people* values and expanding to include 'quality of life,' architects continued to be more product-oriented, specifically talking about drawings, reports, the built/physical environment, and what qualifies for an architect's 'seal' of approval. In the 1970s, it appeared that AIA was sending forays into the realm of planning by mentioning planning and policies, but those ideas were dropped by the 1980s. This step could show the AIA responding to a more activist federal government in the 1970s that was no longer the case by the mid-1980s.

Over time, planners became more process-oriented, looking out for democratic values, citizen participation, balancing interests, long-range views, and inclusivity. Their code mentioned environmental design on occasions but actually listing 'excellence in design' did not occur until the 2000s. Planning scholars speculate that architecture and planning might be coming together in regard to 'place and form' (Rodwin 2000, 22). Nevertheless, planning could need to specify design is in its domain differently from architects to avoid infringing on each other's monopolies.

## Urban design: filling in the interstices

There appears to be an emerging, and possibly competing, profession that sits somewhere in between architects and planners: urban design (Schurch 1999; Cuthbert 2007; Banerjee 2011; Van Assche et al. 2013). Late twentieth-century European cities, recognizing the economic benefits of re-energizing economically underperforming parts of the existing urban fabric, proposed and constructed urban landscapes of buildings and open spaces re-imagined as economic engines for cultural activities, high-order business services, corporate headquarters, research institutions, and media industries. Projects such as the Docklands in London, Mitterand's *Grand Projets* in Paris, and Berlin's post Cold-War resurgence come to mind (Gospodini 2002).

For instance, in London, a collective of urban design practitioners and academics came together in 1980 to form the Urban Design Group (UDG), as a deliberate alternative to both architecture and planning:

> architects and planners have failed in important aspects of their responsibilities. Architects have been pre-occupied with their own individualism; planners have retreated into the more abstract and strategic issues of planning. Architects and planners have collided head-on over development control. The important middle ground between architecture and planning – urban design, the making of urban spaces and places – has gone by default. Worse still, terrible consequences have come from ill-informed 'good' intentions. (Meadows 1980)

This argument appeared in what was then conceived and described as a quarterly newsletter, with the above quotation appearing in a kind of manifesto entitled, 'Less "Architecture" and "Planning," more Urban Design,' thus staking a claim for the distinctness of urban design as a practice and knowledge base from that of the other professions. Today, we can look at where the UDG has ended up and see sociological professionalization in process. It commits itself to: (1) dissemination of knowledge, through its journal, *Urban Design* (which evolved from the original newsletter); (2) specialized training in academic programmes promoted by the UDG; (3) raising standards; (4) developing a

network of urban designers – a professional association; and (5) a certification process called 'Recognised Practitioner,' which one achieves by submitting materials which are examined to ensure that the practitioner has a suitable background in both education and practice (Urban Design Group 2015).

Looking to how professions 'professionalize' (Wilensky 1964; Abbott 1988), we see, in the development of UDG, that many of the pieces are in place for Urban Design to become a legitimate profession. It has a professional association, training schools, a certification system, and a set of aspirational principles, outlined in a 'manifesto,' to be adhered to, though not (yet) a code of ethics. One of the hurdles to professionalization could be 'full-time work' exclusively in urban design, as against urban design with part-time deployments in either architecture, planning or both alternative disciplines to make up a full work load. The progression of the overall process is not unlike what we have seen in architecture and planning. In addition, the landscape architecture profession claims to engage in urban design.

## Conclusion

This article has considered the architecture/planning interface by comparing and contrasting the codes of ethics of both disciplines. Useful guidance has emerged from institutional theory and the sociology of professions. Operating in the same arena – cities – architects and planners have an uneasy relationship, collaborating at times to improve communities and other times competing. There are clearly countervailing divergent and convergent forces. Cultural and societal isomorphisms bring them together in common ways. However, the professions continue to diverge and they deliberately seek to set themselves apart. In addition to the values in the codes, we looked at changes in the domains of each profession, seeing what they each claim as its purview. This research reveals that, when they speak of their aspirations in their codes of ethics, they can be graceful dance partners in addressing human rights, the environment, and cultural heritage. It helps when they divide the work, leaving 'process' to planners and 'product' to architects. Nevertheless, they can 'step on each other's toes' in certain applications. Finally, today, another incipient profession (urban design) is seeking to 'cut in,' within the realm of environmental design. It is therefore particularly in the process of design that the professions encounter a crowded dance floor.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Notes on contributors

*Bonnie J. Johnson*, Ph.D., AICP, is Associate Professor in the University of Kansas' Urban Planning Department. She teaches planning theory, land use, and politics and planning courses. Research interests include: civic bureaucracy, public service, planners in democracies, and television and citizen participation. Prior to academia, Johnson was a practising city planner for eight years.

**Nils Gore** is Associate Professor of Architecture at the University of Kansas and a licensed architect. His research consists largely of public-interest design through design/build projects in the public realm.

# References

Abbott, Andrew. 1988. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labour*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Adams, Tracey L. 2015. "Sociology of Professions: International Divergences and Research Directions." *Work, Employment & Society* 29 (1): 154–165. doi:10.1177/0950017014523467.

American Institute of Architects. 1947. "Standards of Professional Practice." AIA Document No. 330.

American Institute of Architects. 1964. "The Standards of Professional Practice." AIA Doc. J330.

American Institute of Architects. 1970. "The Standards of Ethical Practice." AIA Doc. J330.

American Institute of Architects. 1977. "Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct." AIA Doc. J330. 1–3.

American Institute of Architects. 1981. "Ethical Principles." AIA Document 6J400.

American Institute of Architects. 2013. "About the AIA: Code of Ethics & Bylaws." Accessed March 8. www.aia.org/about/ethicsandbylaws/index.htm.

American Institute of Architects. 2015. "History of the American Institute of Architects." American Institute of Architects. Accessed July 28. http://aia.org/about/history/AIAB028819.

American Institute of Architects. Commission for the Survey of Education and Registration. 1954. *The Architect at Mid-century: Report*. Edited by Turpin Bannister Bannister and Rancis Rufus Bellamy. New York: Reinhold.

American Institute of Certified Planners. 1992. "Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct 1981." In *Ethics in Planning*, edited by Martin Wachs, 335–340. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

American Institute of Certified Planners. 2001. "AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, 1991." In *Everyday Ethics for Practicing Planners*, edited by Carol D. Barrett, 203–205. Chicago: American Planning Association.

American Institute of Planners. 1948. "AIP Code of Professional Conduct." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 14 (2): 47–48. doi:10.1080/01944364808978612.

American Institute of Planners. 1959–1960. "Code of Professional Conduct." *Handbook & Roster,* xii–xiii.

American Institute of Planners. 1971. "Code of Professional Responsibility and Rules of Procedure." *Roster*, VI–VIII.

American Institute of Planners. 1976. "Code of Professional Responsibility and Rules of Procedure." *Roster*, iv–v.

American Planning Association. 2005. "AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct." Accessed November 13. http://www.planning.org/ethics/conduct,.html.

American Planning Association. 2013. "AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct." Accessed March 7. www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode.htm.

Anon. 2000. "Timeline of American Planning History." Accessed July 25. http://www.txplanning.org/media/files/page/Planning_History_1785_to_2000.pdf.

Anselin, Luc, Jack L. Nasar, and Emily Talen. 2011. "Where Do Planners Belong? Assessing the Relationship between Planning and Design in American Universities." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 31 (2): 196–207. doi:10.1177/0739456x11402356.

Banerjee, Tridib. 2011. "Response to 'Commentary: Is Urban Design Still Urban Planning?': Whither Urban Design? Inside or Outside Planning?" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 31 (2): 208–210. doi:10.1177/0739456x11403275.

Banks, Sarah. 2003. "From Oaths to Rulebooks: A Critical Examination of Codes of Ethics for the Social Professions." *European Journal of Social Work* 6 (2): 133–144.

Berg, Bruce L. 2004. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. 5th ed. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

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. doi:10.1080/01944368008977014.

Cuff, Dana. 1992. *Architecture: The Story of Practice*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Cummings, George Bain. 1955. "Standards of Professional Practice in Architecture." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 297: 9–16.

Cuthbert, Alexander R. 2007. "Urban Design: Requiem for an Era – Review and Critique of the Last 50 Years." *Urban Design International* 12 (4): 177–223. doi:10.1057/palgrave.udi.9000200.

Davis, Howard. 2000. *The Culture of Building*. New York: Oxford University Press.

DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48 (2): 147–160. doi:10.2307/2095101.

Forster, Margaret, Tim Loughran, and Bill McDonald. 2009. "Commonality in Codes of Ethics." *Journal of Business Ethics* 90 (2): 129–139. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0380-x.

Frankel, Mark S. 1989. "Professional Codes: Why, How, and with What Impact?" *Journal of Business Ethics* 8 (2/3): 109–115. doi:10.2307/2507 1878.

Freckelton, Ian. 1996. "Enforcement of Ethics." in *Codes of Ethics and the Professions*, edited by Margaret Coady, and Sidney Block, 130–165. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Frumkin, Peter, and Joseph Galaskiewicz. 2004. "Institutional Isomorphism and Public Sector Organizations." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14 (3): 283–307. doi:10.1093/jopart/muh028.

Fullinwider, Robert K. 1996. "Professional Codes and Moral Understanding." In *Codes of Ethics and the Professions*, edited by Margaret Coady, and Sidney Bloch, 72–87. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Gore, Nils. 2014. "Live Projects at Mid-century: A Pre-history." In *Architecture Live Projects: Pedagogy into Practice*, edited by Harriett Harriss, and Lynette Widder, 72–76. New York: Routledge.

Gospodini, Aspa. 2002. "European Cities in Competition and the New 'Uses' of Urban Design." *Journal of Urban Design* 7 (1): 59–73. doi:10.1080/1357 4800220129231.

Hall, Peter. 2002. *Cities of Tomorrow*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Hoch, Charles. 1994. *What Planners Do: Power, Politics, and Persuasion*. Chicago: Planners Press.

Holder-Webb, Lori, and Jeffrey Cohen. 2012. "The Cut and Paste Society: Isomorphism in Codes of Ethics." *Journal of Business Ethics* 107 (4): 485–509. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1060-1.

Hsieh, Hsiu-Fang, and Sarah E. Shannon. 2005. "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis." *Qualitative Health Research* 15 (9): 1277–1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687.

Johnson, Bonnie J. 2014. "Codes of Ethics, Public Values, and What Public Servants Offer the Bureaucratic Compact." *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior (PrAcademics Press)* 17 (4): 459–497.

Johnston, Norman J. 1965. "A Preface to the Institute." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31 (3): 198–209. doi:10.1080/0194436650897 8167.

Kernaghan, K. 2003. "Integrating Values into Public Service: The Values Statement as Centerpiece." *Public Administration Review* 63 (6): 711–719. doi:10.1111/1540-6210.00334.

Macdonald, Keith M. 2013. *Sociology of the Professions*. London: Sage.

Meadows, Robert. 1980. "Less 'Architecture' and 'Planning' More Urban Design." *Urban Design Group Quarterly* 1 (1): 3.

Meck, Stuart. 1998. "Certification, Licensing, and Registration of Planners." *Land Use Law and Zoning Digest* 50 (8): 3–9.

Moore, Wilbert E., and Gerald W. Rosenblum. 1970. *The Professions: Roles and Rules*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Peterson, Sarah Jo. 2006. "The Ethics of Urban Planning: Remembering the Old AICP Code (1978–2005)." Accessed December 4, 2008. www.planetizen.com/node/20046.

Rodwin, Lloyd. 2000. "Images and Paths of Change in Economics, Political Science, Philosophy, Literature, and City Planning, 1950–2000." In *The Profession of City Planning: Changes, Images and Challenges, 1950–2000*, edited by Lloyd Rodwin and Bishwapriya Sanyal, 3–26. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Rokeach, Milton. 1973. *The Nature of Human Values*. New York City, NY: The Free Press.

Salkin, Patricia E. 2006. "Examining Land Use Planning and Zoning Ethics from a Planner's Perspective: Lessons for All Stakeholders in the Real Estate Game." *Real Estate Law Journal* 34 (Spring): 508–522.

Schurch, Thomas W. 1999. "Reconsidering Urban Design: Thoughts about its Definition and Status as a Field or Profession." *Journal of Urban Design* 4 (1): 5–28. doi:10.1080/13574809908724436.

Scott, Mel. 1969. *American City Planning Since 1890: A History Commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the American Institute of Planners*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Senville, Wayne M., ed. 2000. "The Promise Kept/The Promise Broken." *Planning Commissioners Journal* 38 (Winter): 1–11 and 1a–9a.

Siggins, Ian. 1996. "Professional Codes: Some Historical Antecedants." In *Codes of Ethics and the Professions*, edited by Margaret Coady, and Sidney Bloch, 55–71. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

So, Frank S., and Judith Getzels, eds. 1988. *The Practice of Local Government Planning*. Washington, DC: International City Management Association.

So, Frank S., Israel Stollman, Frank Beal, and David S. Arnold, eds. 1979. *The Practice of Local Government Planning*. Washington, DC: Published in cooperation with the American Planning Association by the International City Management Association.

Train, Jack D. 1970. *Task Force Report on the Proposed AIA Standards of Ethical Practice*. Washington, DC: American Institute of Architects.

Urban Design Group. 2015. "About Urban Design Group." Urban Design Group Accessed November 5. http://www.udg.org.uk/about.

Van Assche, Kristof, Raoul Beunen, Martijn Duineveld, and Harro de Jong. 2013. "Co-evolutions of Planning and Design: Risks and Benefits of Design Perspectives in Planning Systems." *Planning Theory* 12 (2): 177–198. doi:10.1177/1473095212456771.

Wæraas, Arild. 2010. "Communicating Identity: The Use of Core Value Statements in Regulative Institutions." *Administration & Society* 42 (5): 526–549. doi:10.1177/0095399710377435.

Ward, Stephen V. 1999. "The International Diffusion of Planning: A Review and a Canadian Case Study." *International Planning Studies* 4 (1): 53–77. doi:10.1080/13563479908721726.

Weiss, Marc A. 1987. *The Rise of the Community Builders*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wilensky, Harold L. 1964. "The Professionalization of Everyone?" *American Journal of Sociology* 70 (2): 137–158. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2775206.