Striving for Impact Beyond the Academy?

Planning research in Australia

Paul Burton
Griffith University

Introduction

The distinction between theory and practice in planning, while itself subject to considerable debate, is often manifest in the distinctive practices and world views of planning academics and planning practitioners. A significant aspect of this distinction lies in the tendency for planning academics to do research and write *about* planning, while practitioners devote more time to *doing* planning, albeit often in reflexive ways (Schon, 1983). The question sometimes arises of how the research done by planning academics is connected to the planning done by practitioners? Is academic planning research designed specifically to meet the needs of practitioners, and if so, how are these needs determined and does the research in fact meet the needs of planning practitioners? Or is academic research less directly connected with day-to-day practices of planning and more concerned with broader and perhaps more abstract questions of the relationship between place and society, with nature of planning and its social, political and economic role in contemporary and indeed historical settings? If the second of these positions seems attractive, does this research nevertheless prove useful, perhaps in the longer term, to practitioners who want to reflect on their broader role and impact as well as dealing with the important but more prosaic challenges of land use regulation and growth management? Of course, each of these positions is plausible and for years they have coexisted. Nevertheless, there is an enduring sense that academic planning research should be more sensitive to the imperative to be of practical relevance and to aspire to a degree of usefulness, and a prevailing view among many practitioners and some academics that it could do better in this regard. Finally, there is a widespread although not unanimous view that the nature of the contemporary university is changing and that the expectations held of academics and their labours are increasingly driven by a broad set of neoliberal imperatives.

This chapter takes as its starting point the assumption that planning research could and should be of greater practical value, but subjects this assumption to critical scrutiny. It does so in the context of planning research and practice in Australia, a place that has been dominated by British planning traditions but is now subject to a more global set of values and expectations about the theory and practice of planning. The chapter also explores what we mean by 'planning research': who conducts this research, in what settings and for what purposes? While most of what might be claimed as and regarded as planning research is conducted by academics working within university settings, a smaller but significant amount is conducted elsewhere – by local, national and international planning consultancies, by think tanks and by practicing planners as part of their practice – and this cannot be ignored.

The argument developed here reflects my position as a planning academic based in an Australian university. I am currently Professor of Urban Management and Planning and Director of the Cities Research Centre at Griffith University in Queensland. The Cities Research Centre supports research on all aspects of cities and processes of urban development and strives to ensure our research is both academically rigorous and

practically useful and this aspiration reflects my belief that such an accommodation between scholarly and practitioner imperatives is desirable and possible. Before moving to Australia I was a member of the School for Advanced Urban Studies and then the School for Policy Studies at the University of Bristol in the UK, where I conducted a wide range of research on urban policy issues, often with the financial support of central or local governments, and on the relationship between evidence and policy. But before re-entering the academy to carry out research for my PhD (on the ways in which planning theory might help us understand the redevelopment of London's Docklands) I trained as town planner at what was then the Polytechnic of the South Bank in London and worked subsequently as a development control planner with the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames and as a planning researcher with the London Borough of Southwark. So, over a career spanning forty years, I have worked mainly as a research active planning academic and also as a planning practitioner.

Engaged planning scholarship

The relationship between scholarly and more applied research has been a subject of debate within universities for centuries. In her history of European universities, Zonta (2002) notes that there has always been great variety, both in the founding principles and in the emphasis given to different scholarly traditions. The importance of monastic traditions in France and Spain compared with the primacy of service to local rulers embodied in the establishment of the central European universities of Prague, Krakow and Vilnius illustrates this variety. But the principles espoused by two of Europe's oldest universities, Paris and Bologna, typify two essential and different roles for universities both ancient and modern: presenting and criticizing the theoretical foundations of knowledge imparted to students and providing training '*..in the practical solution of problems of importance to society.*' (Zonta, 2002: 29). In other words there has always been a clear European tradition in both extending knowledge *and* in putting this to the service of contemporary problem solvers. This tradition lives on in many contemporary universities in their commitment to service as well as to 'pure research' and to teaching.

In the USA during the second half of the 19th century the higher education system expanded both in scale but more importantly in its scope with President Lincoln's signing of the Morrill Act in 1862 (Inman, 2004). Later known as the Land Grant College Act, this saw the federal government provide land to the states to use as collateral in creating public universities and colleges, '*...for the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life*' (Rhodes, 2001 quoted in Hambleton, 2006: 109). This practical and ideological commitment to local service remains, although some like Rhodes, a former president of Cornell University has lamented a loss of local engagement and of the conviction that '*..the pursuit of knowledge is best undertaken by scholars living and working not in isolation, but in the yeasty and challenging atmosphere of community*' (*op cit*, p111).

Despite the significance of these historical roots for European and North American universities and their relevance to contemporary Australian universities, for many academics a spectre is now haunting the contemporary university. Against a background of nostalgia for levels of public funding for universities in Australia not seen since the 1970s, the form and function of contemporary universities is a source of profound disquiet to many. While the expanding opportunity to attend university is not often criticised openly, it is possible to detect mutterings in senior common rooms or their contemporary

equivalent about the proliferation of ‘degrees in basket weaving and golf course management’ as an unwelcome symptom of this expansion. Current concern about the state of the modern university in Australia and elsewhere tends to focus on a number of very different developments: from the consequences of the outright expansion of the sector, through ‘intolerable’ work pressures, to a growing publish or perish culture (Davis, 2012; Thornton, 2014; McCamish, 2016). Much of this critique is inextricably linked to a broader critique of neoliberalism and its apparent application within the contemporary academy (see for example Readings, 1996; Whelan, 2015; Carlin, 2016).

But there is also a powerful strand of criticism among some academics at the growing emphasis on relevance and application in research and an apparent retreat from disengaged scholarship (McLennan, 2008; Gaita, 2012; West 2016). This is less evident among academic planners who have traditionally acknowledged the importance of basing planning theory on planning practice and in turn on providing both a theoretical explanation and justification for planning in practice. However, theorists of planning have not been immune to the linguistic complexities and conceptual contortions associated with post-modern, post-structuralist and post-normal dispositions (eg Gunder and Hillier, 2009).

It is one thing to be more or less comfortable with the relationship between planning theory and planning practice, but what of the slightly different relationship between planning research and planning practice? To be sure, planning research might seek to test with empirical evidence existing planning theory and to develop new theories on the basis of this testing, but much published planning research does not involve the explicit testing or development of theory but something rather more vague and diffuse. In her insightful and substantial critique of Hillier and Healey’s *Research Companion to Planning Theory*, Sandercock (2011) refers somewhat scathingly to a contemporary tendency towards ‘theoretical musings’ at the expense of what Healey suggests should be the principle task of planning theorists: ‘to learn from practices, through methodologically careful and thick accounts’. In other words, much of what passes for planning theory involves abstract musings on the institutions of government (federal, state or local) or the repressive consequences of political ideologies such as neoliberalism that are held to frame and constrain planning practice. The empirical testing of clearly stated hypotheses that seek to uncover causal connections is less often seen and more often condemned as a remnant attachment to discredited forms of positivism. Of course planning theory is not alone in this, but struggles alongside other social scientific disciplines to reconcile the sometimes conflicting imperatives of academic freedom and social relevance.

Planning research in Australia: who does and what does it focus upon?

The main domestic outlets for Australian planning research are two journals: *Urban Policy and Research* (of which I am a member of the Editorial Board) and *Australian Planner*, which is associated with the Planning Institute of Australia (PIA). Of course, planning research by Australian-based researchers is also published in a variety of other, international academic journals and research about Australian planning issues is conducted by researchers based in other countries. Nevertheless, we will look below at the profile of research published in *Australian Planner* and at debates about the state of planning or urban research conducted in *Urban Policy and Research*.

Planning research is also presented at conferences. The main conferences for practising planners are the annual state conferences and annual national congress of PIA, which provide opportunities for planners (academic and practice-based) to present their research. The main conferences for planning academics in Australasia are the annual Australia and New Zealand Association of Planning Schools (ANZAPS) conference and the biennial State of Australian Cities (SOAC) conference. Others conferences attended by planners include those organised by the Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA), the Property Council of Australia (PCA), the Housing Institute of Australia (HIA) and the Green Building Council of Australia (GBCA). We should note that few planning practitioners attend the SOAC conference and that few planning academics attend the PIA conferences and congress. While there may be good reasons for this, it does little to foster productive and constructive debate across the theory/practice or academic/practitioner divide.

So, not all research about planning or research designed to be of benefit to practicing planners is produced by academics working within Australian universities. Professional bodies such as the PIA, UDIA, PCA and HIA produce and commission research and publish reports with a research base and numerous think tanks, both global and local publish work intended to be of benefit to planners. In Australia for example, the Grattan Institute was formed in 2008 to contribute to public policy debates in ways that are (in their own words) rigorous, practical and independent. They do this through a number of policy focussed programs of work, including one on transport and cities, and have published reports on cities as the engines of prosperity (Kelly, Donegan, Chisholm, and Oberklaid, 2014), the need for new approaches to housing policy (Kelly, Hunter, Harrison, and Donegan, 2013) and on suburbs of the future (Kelly, Breadon, Mares, Ginnivan, Jackson, Gregson, and Viney, 2012). At the global scale, bodies such as the JLL Cities Research Centre who recently published a study of benchmarking techniques for current and emerging world cities (see Hu, Blakely, and Zhou, 2013), Global Cities, Inc of Bloomberg Philanthropies, which looks to build communication among global city leaders to promote innovation and the 100 Resilient Cities initiative of the Rockefeller Foundation, which focuses on building the capacity of member cities to cope with global shocks and disruptions. While front line planning practitioners may not be the target audience of these initiatives, their research does appear to have some traction among some senior planners and city leaders, insofar as cities elect to join these networks and bring leading members to local conferences.

To provide a snapshot of one element of the state of planning research in Australia, data is presented on the profile of papers published in Australian Planner. Formerly published as the Royal Australian Planning Institute Journal (from 1958-81), the journal now claims to be 'Australia's leading peer reviewed journal for the planning profession, and is the most read and influential planning journal in Australia and the Pacific Region' (Australian Planner website) and is published in association with the Planning Institute of Australia. Over the last decade (2006-16) this quarterly journal has published 350 peer reviewed papers, excluding letters to the editor and book reviews, on a variety of topics and by different types of planner. For the purpose of this short analysis, we have classified the authorship of papers as either academic only, practitioner only or as a mix of academic and practitioner. We also subjectively classified the subject area of each paper into one of 28 categories, although we acknowledge that papers might in fact cover more than one topic (history and transport or climate change and healthy cities for example). Thirteen categories have more than ten papers in each and to simplify the data, we have limited the

subsequent analysis to this narrower range of categories, which are listed below in Table One. <**TABLE 1: Australian Planner – paper topics, 2006-16** HERE> Papers classified as being about planning practice have been the most popular (31) followed by papers on planning history (27), climate change (25), transport (23) and urban form (21), while other topics include healthy cities (17), smart cities (11) community engagement (10) and international issues (10). We also classified the type of paper, distinguishing discussion/review papers; modelling and analysis; case studies; policy analysis papers; research results; histories and critiques. Again, we recognise that these categories are not entirely mutually exclusive but serve to indicate something of the range of types of paper.

By cross-tabulating the type of author with the topic and type of paper, we begin to see areas which are often dominated by particular types of author. For example papers on planning history, planning education, oil depletion and social issues were almost the exclusive preserve of academic authors, while papers on planning practice, climate change, housing, development, economics and water quality had the highest proportion of practitioner authors.

What can we conclude from this? In some instances the correlation between author type and topic is unsurprising. It is understandable that planning academics write about planning education more than practitioners, although in the next section a recent survey shows that practitioners have strong views about the nature of planning education and the work-readiness of recent graduates. It is also not surprising that practitioners are willing to write about economic issues and about development, although it is likely that the practitioners in these cases are consultant researchers rather than employees of statutory planning agencies.

But we should remember that research about and for planning is produced by a wide range of people and while academic researchers constitute a major source, practitioners themselves produce a lot of research, as do consultants and researchers working for industry bodies, think tanks and lobby organisations. While the latter have a vested interest in making their work available, even if on a commercial basis, the research of practitioners does not always enter the public domain.

Commercial sector researchers face a commercial imperative to carry out research that someone is prepared to pay for, whether or not it is subsequently made more widely available. This is not to say that the results of their research will be tailored to the beliefs or predilections of their clients, although in some cases this is manifestly the case. Market research commissioned by developers will in the long run stand or fall by the rigour and reliability of the analysis, while research commissioned to support the policy preferences of industry groups such as the UDIA, the PCA or the HIA may be more susceptible to accusations of partisanship.

Academic research is not immune from similar accusations and there is a clear and long-standing tradition among some academic planning researchers to produce research that is explicitly and unapologetically supportive of particular groups or political positions. Sandercock, for example, has for many years articulated an approach to planning that is unashamedly radical and progressive and her ongoing support for the Planners Network, a body whose constant objective has been, ‘to advocate that planning be used to eliminate inequalities and promote peace and racial, economic and environmental justice.’ (Planners Network website: <http://www.plannersnetwork.org/about/history/>)

What does the profession think about the focus of contemporary planning research?

There is little by way of systematic or robust evidence of the views of Australian planners about the focus, the quality or the usefulness of contemporary planning research. However, a recent survey of Australian planners captured their views on a range of issues, including the relationship between theory and practice and the matters of greatest concern. This survey replicated many of the questions posed to European planners by Professor Klaus Kunzmann (2015), but to a larger sample of planners in Australia and New Zealand. The online survey was directed at planners through a number of channels, including the listserv RePlan (350 planners mostly in Australasia) and through notices on the PIA website. Over 250 responses were received from a mix of practitioners (69%) and academics (31%), although not all respondents completed the full range of questions. The gender distribution was more even, with 53% of male respondents and 45% female. In terms of length of service in the profession, the largest group of respondents (30%) had worked as planners for over 20 years, while recent entrants (0-5 years) accounted for 23% of respondents.

Table 2 below summarises the main planning challenges identified by respondents and their popularity for different groups of planners (women, men, practitioners, academics). It is notable that academics tended to rank highly some of the ‘big issue’ topics such as climate change, governance, social justice and sustainability, while the practitioners included more substantive topics such as housing and transport alongside the ‘big issues’. Of perhaps even greater significance is that planning education and indigenous issues were at the bottom of these lists for all types of planner, although it should be noted that a much longer list of issues exists for all respondents. <**TABLE 2: Ranking of main planning challenges** HERE>

In terms of the links between theory and practice, the survey asked respondents about the relative importance of three specific relationships: between academic research and planning practice; between planning theory and planning practice; and the working relationships between academics and practitioners. Overall, all respondents agreed that the relationship of academic research to planning practice was important or extremely important, as was the relationship between planning theory and planning practice. They also felt that the relationship between academics and practitioners was important. The strength of these relationships were seen somewhat differently by academics and practitioners, with the former believing they have good connections with the latter to a greater extent than in the opposite direction. Around half of all practitioners said they used academic research, while slightly fewer (46%) said that research was relevant and useful to them.

When asked about their views on what could be done to make academic research more relevant to them, the practitioners offered a number of suggestions, including:

- Creating more opportunities for collaboration
- Providing better access to research findings
- Allowing academics more opportunities to work directly with practitioners
- More applied research, including research commissioned by practitioners

From the academics’ perspective, most felt they had good connections with the planning profession and that these connections were important in maintaining the relevance and the quality of their research. Far fewer believed that it was similarly important to maintain

good relations with members of the development industry, indeed some suggested that close relations of this nature might compromise the integrity of academic planning researchers. The complex nature of these relationships was summed up well by one respondent, who said,

At present we know a bit, but probably not enough to properly understand the different pressures and priorities of working in each sector and as a consequence sometimes slip into making glib statements about what others should do: why don't practitioners take the time to read my work; why don't academics write for me rather than for themselves; why don't commercial researchers stop just writing what their clients pay for...and so on.

While discussions of the practical relevance of academic planning scholarship have waxed and waned over the decades in Australia, some recent contributions have reignited the debate. Randolph's (2013) editorial in the journal *Urban Policy and Research* highlighted the failure of planning research to receive support from successive rounds of funding from the Australian Research Council (the principal funder of scholarly research in Australia) and concluded,

The research funding drought is a corrosive situation. Without new research funding at scale, we will fail to train the next generation of urban researchers. Without the new researchers, our discipline area will simply wither away. Moreover, without an active research community, the forces creating our cities will continue to roll forward without a thoroughgoing understanding of the drivers of urban change and the options for planning and other interventions. (p.133)

In the same issue, Troy (2013) offered a typically trenchant review of the history of urban research in Australia, pointing to a colonial legacy of physical determinism that eschewed critical research of the type that was becoming commonplace in many leading North American universities. While sharing Randolph's pessimistic analysis, Troy concludes rather more optimistically by advocating the establishment of a Town Planning Bureau to provide rigorous, independent advice to government on the development and management of Australian cities. While I see considerable merit in Troy's proposal for a Bureau, the approach to urban policy taken by the relatively new Assistant Minister for Cities and Digital Transformation, Angus Taylor, suggests that global consultancy firms are at present a more favoured source of urban research than Australian universities.

Hurley and Taylor (2016) recently published an important and provocative paper that explores the use of urban research in planning practice, presenting evidence of why time-poor practitioners find it difficult to access and utilise most of the published academic research. The telling phrase uttered by one of their respondents, 'Not a lot of people read this stuff' captured the painful reality for those committed to engaged scholarship, but Hurley and Taylor do not just describe, they suggest a number of ways in which academic research might become more accessible and useful to planning practitioners. These include translating often long and complex research reports into more digestible summaries and bringing academic work out from behind the paywalls of journals and more into the public domain. But they also suggest that it might require reducing research to, '...only one page, with a click-bait title, a nifty graphic and, even more difficult, a simple unambiguous answer.' (p.129). These may well help, but there is a danger in believing that uptake and application is necessarily part of a rational process of policy making (Burton, 2006).

Finally, Bunker (2015) addresses the paradox of why Australian urban research, which is judged to be of high quality, is used so little in local planning practice. His critique raises important questions about how the quality of research is judged and how traditional academic and scholarly criteria might need to be supplemented by factors of value to practitioners. But they also remind us that for some academics, obligations and expectations of greater engagement with policy and practice are to be resisted or treated with suspicion.

Conclusion: Is there a case for a renewed focus on greater ‘engagement’ in planning research by academics?

An Australian tabloid newspaper recently carried one of its regular items condemning the expenditure of public funds on ‘absurd’ research (Brooks, 2016). While such attacks are easy to dismiss and ignore, slightly more worrying was the response of the Australian Federal Treasurer, the Honourable Scott Morrison, who agreed with the suggestion that research supported by the Australian Research Council (ARC) should be able to withstand the ‘pub test’. While the Treasurer no doubt meant that decisions about public expenditure should in general be tested against notions of the public interest, in this particular case it represented a thinly veiled attack on the alleged disconnection between academic research agendas and the apparent interests of the public at large. This itself is part of a wider and long-running debate about the extent to which publicly funded research in universities should make a contribution to meeting public needs, addressing government priorities and solving social problems (Gardner, 2016). While these are entirely laudable aims, the question remains as to whether each and every piece of publically funded research should be able to demonstrate in advance how it will contribute to the public good or solve contemporary social problems and policy challenges?

When presented in this way, further questions are raised about the relationship between research and policy or practice. First, it can be difficult to establish with any degree of precision trajectories of policy development and the role of research in these trajectories, for as Rein famously observed, ‘Social science does contribute to policy and practice but the link is neither consensual, graceful nor self-evident’ (1976: 12). Second, the temporal connection between the publication of research and its possible impact on policy and practice is unpredictable and variable. The policy streams conception of policy making (Kingdon, 1995) suggests that a number of factors must come together in order for a ‘policy window’ to open and allow relatively rapid policy development and the availability of relevant research is only one of these factors. Third, the application of research to policy and practice can be unpredictable. There are many cases where excellent research on topics of great significance is ignored in policy processes and cases (admittedly far fewer) where seemingly obscure research on arcane topics become tremendously influential. Few would have imagined that Robert Putnam’s (1994) economic history of the performance of Italian local governments and their relationship with local democracy would serve as the intellectual foundation for governments around the world to develop policies for the building of social capital.

We are left with the question: Is the relationship between planning research, policy and practice in Australia in need of renewal, and if so, what should be the basis of that renewal? First, we should recognise that the relationship will never be one in which every piece of conducted and published research about planning will be of immediate value to practitioners. Some research is designed to address wider issues of the social, political

and economic context of planning. Some will be critical of contemporary planning practice, perhaps even wantonly so, but we academics might strive to ensure that our critiques are more sophisticated in the benchmarks upon which we build them and the political assumptions that underpin them. For example, the critique of planning that claims it no longer sets out to redress deep seated social and political inequalities might itself be critiqued for advancing a naïve and unsophisticated conception of planning both now and in the past. Similarly, academic papers that decry the neoliberalisation of contemporary planning thought and practice, often fail to define the structural and material conditions of neoliberalism, despite persistent calls for research on ‘actually existing’ neoliberal forms and practices (Peck et al, 2009).

There are various steps that can be taken by academic and practitioner planners to work more closely together in defining shared research agendas, collaborating in the conduct of research and drawing out the possible practical implications flowing from research. But we should also recognise that the imperatives and obligations facing academic planners working in universities are not the same as planners working for statutory planning agencies or in the commercial sector. Practicing planners have to develop and implement planning policies as they regulate development, while academic planners have to educate students, conduct research and publish their findings. To be sure, part of the education of planning students involves preparing them for the world of planning as it is actually practiced in different settings, and there are trends in the assessment (and reward) of academic research quality to give greater credence to impact beyond the academy. At the same time, practicing planners should continue to recognise that devoting some time to reading more abstract and reflective work on planning may well help them in becoming more reflective practitioners and hence better planners.

To some extent the take up or readership of planning research by practitioners might be helped if published research was described and catalogued more clearly. The growing field of systematic reviews, often as part of the broader evidence-based policy movement, has revealed how published research in some fields - and planning would almost certainly be one of them – is very poorly described. Titles often seem to reflect the practices of popular magazines, with little attempt to accurately describe the work in question and some abstracts fail to describe the research methods used or the scope of the work. In contrast to journals in the sciences or medical sciences, the metadata associated with papers in planning is very limited. One consequence of this is that papers must be read in full in order to determine their relevance or to discover their irrelevance, which is not conducive to broadening readership among fellow academics, let alone pressed-for-time practitioners. But even here, there can be profound differences in the expectations of academics and practitioners. At a recent roundtable of academics and practitioners held at the national congress of the Planning Institute of Australia, it emerged that while *Australian Planner* was seen by some academics as a low-ranking journal in terms of academic prestige, it was viewed by some practitioners as an overly academic journal with few papers of great practical relevance.

Research on planning in Australia, as elsewhere, is produced by a range of different people, working in different settings and to different sets of imperatives. Academics are rewarded for securing certain types of research grants - nationally competitive grants provided by the Australian Research Council for example – for publishing in prestigious ‘high impact’ journals and for procuring as many possible citations of their work. While there are moves to give greater weight to ‘engaged scholarship’ and to the demonstrable

social impact of one's research, planning academics still tend to measure their success according to internal rather than external factors. Consultant planning researchers must do work that someone else is willing to pay for, on the basis of their reputation, track record and technical skills and while some of this work will enter the public domain, publication and promulgation is not typically a key performance indicator. Researchers working for planning think tanks and advocacy organisations have similar obligations to conduct high quality research, but their principal imperative is to produce work that is influential, because of its focus, timeliness, quality and clarity of presentation. Researchers working within planning organisations (typically State or Territory governments and local governments) are more likely to carry out research on very closely specified topics that address particular needs in their organisation. They are less likely to be called upon to do board scale or highly conceptual work, and their work may not be available beyond their organisation. Despite these different research imperatives, there is scope for each domain to learn from the others. Rigorous systematic reviewing skills learnt within the academy may be useful to consultants, advocacy researchers and internal researchers; clarity of expression is valuable in all domains; while the ability to synthesise quantitative data from a number of sources and present it cogently also has wide appeal.

In conclusion, planning research will continue to be marked by its diversity - of topic, method, focus, outlet and intent. Perhaps the most we can hope for is that this diverse product range is more clearly labelled. As with any other product, customer satisfaction is often undermined when what you get is not what appears on the label. From the perspective of the practitioner, it may be the case that some planning research sells itself as being based on practice and appears to offer readily adoptable solutions to practical problems, while falling short on both counts. Sometimes the practice base of research is so thin it cannot support the weighty recommendations for policy and practice that follow. Sometimes the recommendations and proposed solutions betray an alarming degree of political naiveté and ignorance of actually existing political systems and institutions. However, practitioners searching in academic journals devoted to planning theory should not be surprised if there is a paucity of 'how to fix it' papers; they might even find that more scholarly and conceptual pieces help them reflect more widely and critically on their own role as reflective practitioners.

References

- Brooks, R. (2016) If you're going to ridicule research, do your homework, The Conversation, August 22. Available at: <https://theconversation.com/if-youre-going-to-ridicule-research-do-your-homework-64238>.
- Bunker, R. (2015) Linking Urban Research with Planning Practice. *Urban Policy and Research* 33 (3): 362-369.
- Burton, P. (2006) Modernising the policy process: making policy research more significant. *Policy Studies* (27) (3): 173-195.
- Burton, P. (2010) Engaged scholarship in turbulent times: should academic policy research strive for policy relevance? Paper presented at the 2010 Public Policy Network Conference, School of Government, University of Tasmania, Hobart, 28-29 January.
- Davis, G. (2012) The Australian idea of a University, *Meanjin*.
- Davis, G. (2016) Facing the zeitgeist: Dissolving the university? *Griffith Review* 52: 247-258.
- Forsyth, H. (2014) *A history of the modern Australian university*. Sydney: New South Books.
- Freestone, R., Goodman, R. & Burton, P. (2016) Challenges, Complaints and Critiques: Australasian planners on the profession, education and research in 2016, paper for the 2016 ANZAPS Conference, Western Sydney University, Parramatta, 28-30 October.
- Gaita, R. (2012) To civilise the City? *Meanjin* 71 (1).
- Gardner, A. (2016) The War between Higher Education and the Right, Inquisitr, May 4. Available at: <http://www.inquisitr.com/3060902/the-war-between-higher-education-and-the-right/>.
- Gunder, M. and Hillier, J. (2009) *Planning in Ten Words or Less: A Lacanian entanglement with Spatial Planning*, Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Hu, R., Blakely, E. J., & Zhou, Y. (2013). Benchmarking the competitiveness of Australian global cities: Sydney and Melbourne in the global context. *Urban Policy and Research*, 31(4), 435-452.
- Hurley, J. & Taylor, E. (2016) Not a lot of people read this stuff: Australian urban research in planning practice. *Urban Policy and Research* 34 (2): 116-131.
- Kelly, J-F., Donegan, P., Chisholm, C., Oberklaid, M., 2014, Mapping Australia's Economy: Cities as engines of prosperity, Grattan Institute, Melbourne.
- Kelly, J-F., Hunter, J., Harrison, C., Donegan, P., 2013, Renovating Housing Policy, Grattan Institute, Melbourne.
- Kelly, J.-F., Breadon, P., Mares, P., Ginnivan, L., Jackson, P., Gregson, J. and Viney, B. (2012) *Tomorrow's Suburbs*, Grattan Institute, Melbourne.
- Kingdon, J. (1995) *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. London: Longman.
- Kunzmann, K. and Koll-Schretzenmayr, M. (2015) The State of the Art of Planning in Europe, *disP: The Planning Review* 51 (4): 42-51.
- McLennan, G. (2008) Disinterested, disengaged, useless: Conservative or progressive idea of the university? *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 6 (2): 195-200.
- Peck, J., Theodore, N. and Brenner, N. (2009) Neoliberal Urbanism: Models, moments and Mutations. *SAIS Review* 24 (1): 49-60.
- Putnam, R. (1994). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Randolph, B. (2013) Wither urban research? Yes, you read it right first time! *Urban Policy and Research* 31 (2): 130-133.

- Rein, M. (1976) *Social Science and Public Policy*. Harmondsworth, Middx.: Penguin.
- Rickards, L., Gleeson, B., Boyle, M. & O'Callaghan, C (2016) Urban studies after the age of the city. *Urban Studies* 53 (8): 1523-1541.
- Sandercock, L. (2011) Review of J Hillier and P Healey (2010) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Planning Theory: Conceptual Challenges to Spatial Planning*, Farnham, England: Ashgate. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 31 (4): 461-463.
- Schon, D. (1983) *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*. London: Temple Smith.
- Thornton, M. (2014) *Through the glass darkly: The social sciences look at the neoliberal university*. Canberra: ANU Press.
- Troy, P. (2013) Australian urban research and planning. *Urban Policy and Research* 31 (2): 134-149.
- West, D. (2016) *The Managerial University: A Failed Experiment?*, DEMOS Essay, April 14. Available at: <http://www.demosproject.net/the-managerial-university-a-failed-experiment/>.
- Whelan, A. (2015) Academic Critique of Neoliberal Academia. *Sites* 12 (1): 1-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11157/sites-vol12iss1id258>.
- Zonta, C. (2002) The history of European universities: overview and background. In: N Sanz & S Bergan (eds) *The heritage of European universities*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Acknowledgements

I would like thank Dr Heather Shearer, Research Fellow in the Cities Research Centre for her analysis of publications appearing Australian Planner from 2006-16.

The survey of planners in Australasia was conducted by Professor Robin Goodman, RMIT; Professor Robert Freestone, UNSW; and Professor Paul Burton, Griffith University. Support in the design and administration of the survey and the initial data analysis was provided by Dr Elizabeth Taylor and Raven Cretney, RMIT and Dr Heather Shearer, Griffith University whose contributions are gratefully acknowledged.