

# Being Professional Together – Collective Quiet Resolve: Integral Ethics as Ethos-Making

Ian Wight<sup>1</sup> and Ross Mitchell<sup>2</sup>

*[NB This paper was originally prompted by a 2014 call for submissions from JAPA, the Journal of the American Planning Association, for a special issue on 'planning ethics.' After several exchanges with the editors, it was determined that this was not a viable publication forum for the piece; the 'integral' framing appeared to constitute too much of a challenge at the time, for the authors to effectively communicate – and for the editors to adequately comprehend. Other avenues were explored, in hopes of demonstrating the value of this framing in mainstream publications – but there was no take-up. The translation of 'integral' into 'professional' contexts has been, and mostly remains, problematic. Perhaps its 'time' has still to come, and/or perhaps we need to do a much better job of communicating its potential. For now, it is being published here as still very much a 'work-in-progress' – as a part of an ongoing exploration of integral ethics and ethos-making. IW March 2022]*

**Abstract:** Any profession's ethics, in practice, may be viewed as a function of a combination of personal ethics and professional ethics – implicating the person that is the professional professing, and the operative professional context, where the professionals commune as practitioners. It involves a meshing of the personal and the professional with a larger societal goal in mind – in ethics terms, a good society, privileging goodness. This is ultimately communal territory, involving a collective sense of ethics; being professional together in this respect may be represented as having a common *ethos* – more than the sum of all the individuals' ethics, more of an overarching ethic that resides in the minds and

---

<sup>1</sup> **Ian Wight**, PhD FCIP, Senior Scholar, City Planning, University of Manitoba, Canada. Born and raised in Scotland, with an adult and professional life in Canada, and now back in his native land again, in Edinburgh, in his 'retirement'. By turns a professional planning practitioner and then an educator of planning professionals, now – as a pracademic – exploring transformative professional learning. Actively engaged with application of integral theory for the past 25 years, especially in relation to place and placemaking. His current focus is 'the essencing in professing', in the context of professional-self design, the main elements being *praxis* (personal), *ethos* (interpersonal) and *poiesis* (transpersonal). For more on his scholarship of integration visit here.

ian.wight@umanitoba.ca

<sup>2</sup> **Ross Mitchell**, M.E.S (York University, ON), MCIP, (formerly, Senior Planner/Project Manager, WSP Group Inc., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada). Ross's 43-year career has spanned the private and public spheres and all sectors of community and regional planning in urban, rural, and First Nation settings. His world view and perspectives on the behavior of the people and the workings of the physical and social communities he serves have been shaped by explorations of the Enneagram behavioral framework and models of the evolutionary development of individuals, organizations, cultures, and societies, specifically Spiral Dynamics and Integral Theory through the writings of Don Beck and Ken Wilber. Ross currently works with the Winnipeg-based civil engineering firm of SBC Inc. with a focus on land development planning, design, and regulatory approvals. Ross is a member of the Canadian Institute of Planners and is a Registered Professional Planner with the Manitoba Professional Planning Institute.

rmitchell@sbcinc.ca



hearts of the collective. This ethos is also more than the reference professional institute's ethical code of practice or conduct; it has a more interior cast – something made by the professional practitioners, on their insides, together. It is like a professional 'we-place', grounding their collective professing.

This presentation explores such ethos-making, from an integral ethics perspective, with ethos as the integration of a collective ethical practice. It features the outcome of one workshop – the ethos represented as *Quiet Resolve*. Staged in the professional context of planning, and specifically as a component of a capstone Professional Planning Practice course – intended to help students with their own professional-self design, the workshop included a mix of planning students (professionals-in-the making) and professional planners (practitioners professing). It was designed to also assist the participant-practitioners with their own continuing professional development, so that they might potentially be more of a support for one another, especially on ethically-challenging terrain. *Quiet Resolve* represents a statement of their collective ethos – conceived as an integration of theoretical studies (their knowing), practice experiences (their doing), and personal values and beliefs (their being and becoming). Might this be a context for better bridging theory and practice, in relation to ethics especially – for helping professional practitioners to distill their collective 'prof-essence', their being professional together?

## **Introduction: Being Professional Together – A Collective Ethic in Action?**

The ethics associated with a particular profession (planning being the exemplar profession – the 'it' – mainly referenced here) may – in practice – be viewed as a function of a combination of *personal* ethics and *professional* ethics. 'It' implicates the person that – in this case – is the planner planning, and the operative professional context, where the planners commune as practitioners – professing planning. It therefore clearly entails a meshing of the personal and the professional with a larger societal goal in mind – in ethics terms, a good society, privileging goodness; the public good or the common good, and public interest, is very much in view (McGettrick and Su, 2012). This is ultimately communal territory, involving a collective sense of ethics, effectively 'being professional together'.

In the compilation edited by McGettrick and Su (2012) the focus is 'professional ethics', traversing a range of professional domains, but grounded in the perspective of (professional ethics as) 'education for a humane society'. Any profession's ethics could usefully merit explicit placing within this particular 'professional ethics' perspective, and the related 'professional person' service orientation:

Professional ethics derive from and reside in a professional setting, based on the dynamic inter-relatedness of the professional person with the 'client'... residing within the living experiences of service to others ... Sound ethical principles and practices are informed by both practices and by humanitarian principles. These are not best thought of as alternative sources of wisdom. Consistently we see that it is the coming together of these that best informs sound ethical practices. (McGettrick and Su, 2012, p. 3)

Being professional together – consciously, explicitly, overtly – engages, arguably, an 'altogether' very different expression of ethics; categorically beyond the realms of the personal and

the individual, but still encompassing them – and more besides. This particular territory – larger than conventional ethics, and essentially collective – appears to merit occupying together, especially in the context of the ‘public domain’ – a particularly critical reference for the profession of planning, with its privileging of collective action (Friedmann, 1987). This territory is represented here in *ethos* terms, where *ethos* is situated culturally – a manifestation of collective interiors – rather than institutionally or organizationally (in exterior systems terms) where conventional ‘planning – as profession/discipline – ethics’ might mostly reside. *Ethos* includes ethics, but is more than ethics; *ethos* is an ethic writ large – and wide, and deep. In Aristotle’s terms, *ethos* is very much *prior* to ethics, in the process of becoming ethical; it is that which enables us to ‘grasp what ethics is’ (Nixon, 2012).

Nixon (2012) explicitly advocates an ‘institutional ethos’ perspective for advancing professional ethics, grounded in the context of academic practice in higher education – the context where most accredited professionals receive their foundational ethical training. Nixon’s valuing of such institution-wide *ethos*-making responds to his critique that:

... professional ethics has over the last twenty years become increasingly professionalised, compartmentalised, and individualized. At the same time the field of academic practice has become increasingly stratified. (p. 11)

The *ethos*-making featured here may be considered to complement Nixon’s ‘institutional ethos’, especially in its ‘associative’ (rather than individualist) quality, but should be regarded as having a more ‘interior culture’ – and less ‘exterior systems’ – focus; it is more inter-subjective, while Nixon’s *ethos* may be more inter-objective.

Being professional together may be a rather large ‘ask’ these days, where individuals are liable to be quite challenged by intentionally occupying ‘we-space’ – possibly because of a greater *de facto* comfort with ‘I-space’, i.e., our own individualization, with the associated propensity for operating ‘individually’.

Individualisation is identified by Nixon (2012) as a major feature of the ‘recent resurgence’ of ‘professional ethics’ and ‘ethical practice’. What has emerged, in his assessment, is the realization that:

Professional ethics could, after all, be managed; it could be bureaucratized; it could be absorbed into existing systems of accountability. It could also be individualized. It could shift responsibility for the ethical conduct of professional practice onto the individual professional and leave the corporate state, and the corporate institutions supported by such a state, free to get on with their core business: making a profit. As privatization became the *sine qua non* of institutional efficiency, so individualization became the guiding principle of ethical practice. Institutions would take responsibility for determining the right thing to do, while professionals would work out the right way of doing it... (p. 12)

Collective inter-subjective *ethos*-making cannot easily make much headway in such a context, without considerable concerted effort: ‘being professional together’ might feel somewhat foreign, if not outlandish.

The profession of planning may also seem – at first blush – like a fairly well-defined domain, but the planning ‘we’ has to contend with some potentially deep differentiations, most notably between those professing (their planning) in a public sector or private sector context, and those ‘homed’ in the academy vis-à-vis those operating in the world of professional practice.

Trends in planning – as a discipline, profession and industry or trade – probably mirror larger societal trends in recent decades, reflecting shifts in the balance of influence among the differentiations. For Nixon (2012):

It is not insignificant that the rise of ‘professional ethics’ coincided with, on the one hand, the erosion of the public sector and the demise of the public sector professional and, on the other hand, the expansion of the private sector and the emergence of the private sector professional as the model of the new era of public management. (p. 11)

We are operating in a context of mix and flux, in mostly solo and silo mode, pulling – and being pulled – in many different directions, segmenting and differentiating. The ethos-making advanced here is intended to counter these problematic aspects, by enabling some integration and collaboration, tapping the underlying mutuality.

Such differentiation virtually demands commensurately differentiated ethics, for example, as between **personal** ethics, **planning (as profession/discipline)** ethics, **professional (as person)** ethics and/or **Professional (as profession member)** ethics.

A focus on any professions’ ethics demands to be teased out in terms of constituencies and contexts. A professional context seems implicit, if not explicit, and the personal – the person – in the professional seems unavoidable. It might be observed that there can be – and in the past there has been – an antipathy around too much of a connection between the personal and the professional (distancing and divorcing have often been the default positions, including ‘taboo’ language).

For some, their professional identity may be essentially qualified, as a small-p professional, holding high broad ideals – with no formal affiliations, or as a capital-P Professional – explicitly affiliated with a certifying professional body, and adhering to specific codes of ethical conduct (these two notions – professional and Professional – are not necessarily mutually exclusive).

All may identify as ‘planners’, for example, but their ethics in practice may be a variable mix of personal ethics, professional ethics, and/or Professional ethics. The ethos-making featured in this presentation seeks to transcend, while including, all these potential constituencies and contexts, within the domain of a particular profession – planning. The ethos aimed for would be prior to such differentiated ethics.

With these different constituencies often at odds with one another, ethos-territory may be regarded as potential over-arching common-ground. Ethos is here being held out as potentially more all-encompassing than ethics, deeply tapping core concerns, and more grounded universalist aspirations – inter-cultural and inter-relational (Weir, 2012).

Weir (2012) appears open to an ‘ethos’ perspective on business ethics, based on ‘concern for the other,’ in contrast to an ‘individualistic absorption with self’. He also approvingly references Paul Ricoeur on the importance of pursuing ‘an expression of identity as processually derived and

experienced in relations with others' (99). Weir approvingly references the notion of 'a practice-based ethical habitus' (103) which might well align with the usage of 'ethos' in this presentation.

As authors our own professional personas are situated in the profession of planning. Our background and experience straddle the public and private sectors, and the academy and practice spheres. One of us, the first author, had almost two decades in mainly public sector practice, before two decades in the academy – mainly teaching professional practice. The other has had several decades practicing professionally in both the public and private sectors, but mostly the latter of late. We share an interest in the essence of the 'professing' associated with professional practice, in the intricacies of professional-self design, and in the nature of our profession as – in essence – ethical inquiry (in action, via intervention) (Sandercock, 1999, 542). Somewhat peculiarly, and rather uniquely it seems, we have also shared an interest in the application of so-called 'integral' theory to our professional field of practice (Wight, 2005; 2012). And this has led to a view of ethos as a form of integral praxis in *we-space*, and to an interest in the associated ethos-making (Wight, 2011; 2013c) – one outcome of which, *Quiet Resolve*, is the focus of this offering. Ethos represents, for us, an integral bridging of theory and practice, transcending – while including – ethics; it is all about mapping and elucidating the collective interior of groupings of professionals – as a community of practitioners, sharing a particular practice time and place – more consciously 'making' the professional culture (planning in our case) that distinguishes 'us', that 'we' profess.

The *integral* nature of the ethos-making featured here does not appear to have any precedent in the current theorizing, philosophizing and application-exploration around our home profession's ethics. It involves taking off some possible 'blinkers' or 'blindners' – and going 'inside'. It positively engages what is normally kept on the outside of, and at a safe distance from, those individuals – those persons – actually practicing and professing planning. And this inner-world valuing, this interior-privileging – quite subjective or inter-subjective – is specifically situated in a collective, professionals-communing, context; ethos-making is *we-space* (if not *we-place*) work. However, it does very much complement current conventional efforts to support 'being professional together', which tend to be characterized by a comparative exteriority – much more objective or inter-objective; a world of systems, of institutions, of corporations – where an 'it' is more valued (than a 'we' or an 'I'). In our own (Canadian) context this particular world furnishes ethical supports in terms of a system anchored in a code of practice, a statement of values, and a formal definition of our field – for planning institute (CIP) purposes. These are necessary, but by no means sufficient; an ethos can be reinforcing, and inspiring – a *we-manifestation* rather than simply an *it-manifestation*.

The ethos-making demonstrated here may also come to be appreciated as a complement to some other framings that seem to engage more deeply with professional ethics in general, in ways that might benefit a more evolved approach to a particular profession's ethics. These include the framing of Jane Jacobs (1991) in one of her lesser-known books, *Systems of Survival* (in effect an ethics primer par excellence for professionals negotiating the public and private sectors), and the extended efforts of Howard Gardner and colleagues in the *Good Work* project (exploring the terrain 'where ethics and excellence meets') (Gardner et al, 2001). Jacobs lays out the tenets of two basic systems by which societies cohere and function – the Guardian (Politics) and Commerce syndromes – each depending on the other, but demanding an extraordinary 'moral flexibility' on the part of practitioners who may find themselves moving between, or having to act across, the two systems. Gardner's recent work (Gardner, 2011) includes an effort to re-frame consideration of the

classic virtues – truth, goodness and beauty. In particular, his discussion of the emerging re-framed ‘goodness’ territory touches on some very pertinent issues for those engaged with our particular profession, including what he refers to as ‘neighborly morality’ and ‘the ethics of roles’ (especially the roles of worker and citizen). The ethos-making featured here could help extend and ground some aspects of these wider framings – informing the ‘moral flexibility’ necessity identified by Jacobs, as well as the implicit ‘professional neighborhood’ morality, and the associated ‘ethics of roles’ – especially as more or less ‘civic’ professionals – indicated as important by Gardner.

These potentially complementary framings will be touched on again later, when assessing the prospect for more concerted inter-subjective ethos-making efforts, as an approach to navigating the challenging shoals of our profession’s ethics. However, it may be helpful for now to indicate that a key premise associated with the ethos-making advanced here involves the capacity to straddle the public/private division of loyalties, and to encompass the often polarized representation of the presumed ‘theory’ bias of those operating in the academy, and the ‘practice’ bias of those now outside or beyond the academy – that helped ‘credit’ their professing. The ethos-making (in contrast to simply ethics-observance) involves a drilling deeper together, on the insides of those professing, to source their common human ‘being-ness’, forged in their own direct experience, and all that they have come to know – not only in their mind, but also in their gut, and their heart, and their soul. It may be considered in terms of ‘one’s ethics’ becoming ‘our ethos’, with an associated interest in the ‘be-coming’, as in what might be being willed to come into being (which happens to be a quintessentially ‘planning’ preoccupation).

## **One’s Ethics Becoming Our Ethos – Engaging the Us in Our Profession’s Ethics**

When considering (the its-space of) ‘planning ethics’ from an integral perspective especially, it becomes necessary to simultaneously invoke the dimensions of the persons doing the planning (their I-space), and the professional culture dictating the professing (the we-space). The operative question becomes – where might *personal* ethics, and *planning* ethics, and *professional* ethics meet? And then, how might their meshing be best manifested? It is being suggested here that they meet through guided ethos-making, and manifest in a collective ethos. As touched on earlier, where ‘planning in the public domain’ is concerned (Friedmann, 1987), collective action – for the public good – would seem to clearly furnish the operative context. And, it is further being suggested, such a less purely personal – or mainly individual – approach to ethics may be in order, especially in an explicitly professional context, with its inherently communal and collective dynamics. This could be conceived as bringing a greater ‘we-awareness’ in a community of practitioners – what some have characterised as ‘awareness-based collective action’ (ABC) (Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013).

Drawing on Jacobs (1991), such consideration may be particularly pertinent where the planning in view anticipates the planning professionals discharging mainly ‘guardian,’ rather than ‘commercial,’ functions (Wight, 2013b).

This distinction is further discussed in an examination of the possible relevance of Jane Jacobs’ Systems of Survival for helping planners navigate their ethical obligations (Wight, 2013b), building on the four-fold ‘sources’ of such obligations articulated by Peter Marcuse (Wight,

2013a). The distinction needs to be considered in both/and, rather than either/or terms, as does the related distinction between the public domain/sub-domains of planning, and the de facto private domains of planning where professional planners also practice. Maintaining the distinctions, while also integrating them, may be assisted by attempting an integral approach, including the integral ethos-making advanced here.

Public domain planning by assigned guardians of that public domain – serving much more than simply economic or commercial purposes – and involving much more than mainly technical or technocratic roles – raises the possibility that ‘much more’ is required in terms of ethics. But – paraphrasing while re-interpreting Gardner (2011) – this is also where ‘the ethics of roles’ come into play. The planner-as-guardian needs, and needs to respect, the legitimate role of the planner-as-commercial – and vice versa; the underlying systems need one another. Ideally, both types of planner will find themselves sharing an underlying ethos, even though their ethical parameters on-the-job may differ (the tenets that Jacobs elucidates include several contrasting ‘pairings’ – see Wight, 2013b). It is suggested that an integrally-informed ethos can privilege the roles they share, alongside their differentiated sub-roles (e.g. public or private; academic or pragmatic; professional or Professional).

Within the planning academy those professing planning may well be ambivalent about their professional identity.

In this case, the planning academy should be regarded as a sub-set of the academy in general. The latter is the forum for essentially academic practice, which is highly discipline-based, subject to increasing specialization and diversification. Professional ethics in relation to academic practice must contend with a specific institutional context that may nevertheless be informative for other institutional contexts, such as that surrounding planning. Nixon (2012) argues that ‘the context is constitutive of the ethics’- and makes a case for more consideration of institutional ethos-making:

Institutions cannot lay the ethical burden exclusively on the individual professional; nor can individuals off-load their ethical responsibilities onto the institution; ethics is centrally concerned with mutuality and interdependence. Nevertheless, within the current context the reduction of the ethical to an individualist rather than associative category is particularly marked. The moral hazard comes in the main not from the professional ethics of the individual practitioner but from the institutional ethos within which practitioners operate. We need to focus both on the ethics of the professional situated within the institution and on the ethos of the institution located within the broader frame of civil society. (Nixon, 2012, p. 15)

There could well be lessons here for professional practice; we need to be thinking about our institutional context, and associated ethos-making, to complement ethics-articulation. This presentation is arguing for a complementary inter-subjective ethos-making, within professional culture, to parallel the kind of inter-objective institutional ethos-making advocated by Nixon.

Many may be most comfortable as a small-p ‘professional’ rather than a capital-P ‘Professional’, namely, that associated with registered or certified membership in a planning institute. For many professing in the academy their main association is probably with planning as a discipline, rather than as a profession – although they may also acknowledge that their discipline is one with a professional persona. Theirs may therefore be a mainly ‘personal’ take on ethics, along with a

small-p ‘professional’ ethics, and a generalized interest in ‘planning ethics,’ leavened by their disciplinary specialty. In addition, the academic practice context – not surprisingly – may well dominate their professional ethics landscape (Nixon, 2012).

Outside the planning academy there may also be those who prefer a small-p professional identity, but most are likely to more or less identify as a capital-P Professional, aligning with prescribed institutionalized injunctions. In particular, a professional institute’s code of ethics may help such individual members, in particular circumstances, just as a set of tenets may help a planner ethically navigate their basic operative system (guardianship or commerce) (Jacobs, 1991). When it comes to ethics, these ‘Professionals’ are likely to conflate planning ethics with their profession’s ethical prescriptions, and are likely to suppress any pertinent personal ethics in their professional work. Indeed, their planning education has probably emphasized the separation of the personal from the professional, stressing instead the importance of objectivity and rationality.

But, ideally, all these carefully nuanced purveyors – if not professors – of planning will acknowledge their mutual complementing by something deeper and wider – that binds and grounds these fellow planners in common cause; something they have made together, that they profess together – embedded and embodied. In the context addressed here, such planners – in their own communities of practice – would be defined by their collective inter-subjective *ethos*; an integration of all they hold dear, a special bundling of their personal ethics, anchoring their professional life, and the planning that reflects their heart and soul – and not simply their body and mind – at work. One example of such an ethos is *Quiet Resolve*, presented here (see below, pages 474-477) as an example of what might usefully complement our current understanding, by engaging the ‘us’ in planning ethics.

Quiet Resolve is the outcome of an experiential ‘ethos-making’ workshop, involving a mix of graduate planning students and professional planning practitioners (Wight, 2011). It reflects an approach to professional ethics education aimed at the co-creation of an ethos, to complement the more conventional focus on codified professional ethics. Based on this work, ethos has come to be differentiated from ethics, and is being viewed as a potentially superior focus, transcending while including conventional ethics. It is also being situated beyond the normal institutional or organizational container context, where ethos (as codified ethics) can seem rather abstract, objective and lifeless. Rather, the ethos in play here is being envisaged more in the context of a sumptuous slice of professional culture, animated by a communing of self-selecting professionals, sharing a particular affinity with one another, making their ethos more proprietary, highly inter-subjective, and very much alive in their thoughts and deeds.

For the record, and as introduced earlier, ethos is here considered as being prior to ethics: it is more the whole, while ethics is more the parts. Ethos is also viewed as something that is made, collectively – forged in the ongoing moment, in the now, in the heat of dialogic practice. It is perhaps best regarded as not so much a case of opportunistically or expediently ‘taking action’ – an impersonal subject operating on an impersonal object. Rather, it should be viewed as more of a well-considered and well-reflected-upon ‘making together’ – a collective enaction of all that is held dear, especially that deemed ‘good’. Ethos is therefore being construed as very personal and very relational at the same time. Our professional ethos is for us to make, with our audience in mind – those to whom, with whom, and for whom, we ‘profess’. It requires the conscious evolution of the notion of ethics into the realm of ethos.



The workshop which generated Quiet Resolve was designed to enable participants, individually and collectively, to mesh the personal, the professional and their own notions – if any – of the spiritual. It privileged their own collective experiences – the good, the bad, and the ugly – and helped them make something essentially ‘good’ from it, together. It builds on – and emerged from – complementary initiatives to assist students to develop their personal planning praxis (Friesen and Wight, 2009), en route to emerging a potentially shared praxis, i.e., an ethos. Quiet Resolve is mainly the result of a three-hour experiential workshop, featuring a mix of facilitated small-group discussion, individual reflection and plenary sharing circles (Wight, 2011).

The workshop structure, flow and activities are documented at length in Wight (2011) – mainly with a planning educator audience in mind.

Particular use was made of some recent work by Parker J. Palmer, on ‘educating the new professional’ (Palmer, 2007).

In particular, the five ‘immodest proposals’ featured in the ‘Afterword’ (The New Professional – Education for Transformation). These proposals may be summarized as: 1. Us Versus Institutions: Privileging our whole self. 2. Trusting Our Emotions: As much as our intellects. 3. The ‘Intelligence’ in Emotional Intelligence: Taking it seriously. 4. Cultivating Communities of Discernment and Support – knowingly, skillfully, with sensibility. 5. An Undivided Life – Living and working with the question – What is of ultimate concern? (Palmer, 2007, pp. 191-214).

An initial rough draft of the emerging ethos was prepared by the workshop facilitator (the first author here), followed by a much expanded second draft reflecting extensive contributions by participants (in particular, by the second author here). The final draft was endorsed by the participants as ‘our emerging planning ethos’. All workshop participants should be regarded as the authors of Quiet Resolve.

The workshop was held in The Quiet Room at St John’s College, University of Manitoba, in March 2011. To fully take it in may involve a mind-set change, and this in turn may depend on a heart-set change – or what Parker Palmer might render as a new ‘joining of soul and role’ (Palmer, 2004). The pursuit of professed goodness asks a lot of us, individually and collectively.

## **In Pursuit of Professed Goodness – A Lived Ethic: Let Us Be Resolved...**

Being a professional – in the current often highly-charged political environment – can involve tough choices between competing interests, and ethically-sharp challenges for those committed to being a force for good in all their personal and professional encounters. Being good professionals can invoke a higher calling, to be not only ethical by the book, or the code, when needs must, but to embody the spirit of good professional conduct, at all times, intrinsically; i.e. integrity collectively personified, patently living an ethic writ large.

Connecting directly to one of the three classical virtues, ethical behavior – at root – is about being good, doing good, serving goodness (Gardner, 2011; McGettrick and Su, 2012). Institute codes of ethical conduct and good practice may provide a useful external reference, for members

engaging with the often-messy exterior world. Yet the codes mostly reference the individual professional in particular situations, when they are essentially on their own, often in relation to legally proscribed contexts. Codes can only go so far; the pursuit of what's good also requires going inside, consulting one's conscience and feeling into a wider, deeper field of consciousness, where some broader, but finely-targeted, professional communing might be of service. This cannot be simply a solo project; it demands interaction with trusted fellow professionals, in good relationship – to validate important discernment, to realize valued common-meaning-making.

Being professional together in such ways can take prescribed individual ethics to a new level, with peers supporting one another, in relation to their immediate meaningful contexts – authentically-grounded, culturally-sensitive, thematically-customized: topical, timely and dynamic. Instead of simply observing prescribed ethics as and when necessary, these peers share a larger 'ethic' – an ethos – that is of their own making. Something they own; something between them, that is in them; something that is always 'on' – lighting them up together. Something practical – as applied moral philosophy-in-action.

The ethos-making workshop that generated Quiet Resolve was staged in the context of a capstone Professional Planning Practice course, intended to help students with their own professional-self design (Wight, 2014). It naturally reflects some of the then-dominant teaching themes – such as planning as placemaking as wellbeing by design, as well as a guided inquiry into particular questions set for the course.

Within the context of the Professional Practice course as 'a professional self-design studio', the guiding questions for in-depth inquiry were set as follows:

- What is calling me? What is my calling? What am I being called to profess?
- What do I want to make of myself, personally and professionally?
- What does the world want of me... to use me for?
- What is my unique gift or gifts, that I cannot not give?
- How do I plan to be of service in the world, to the world?

(From the course outline: CITY 7470 w2011)

However, this workshop was also positioned to assist the participant-practitioners with their own continuing professional development, to potentially be more of a support for one another, especially on ethically challenging terrain. The outcome of the workshop represents a statement of their collective ethos – conceived as an integration of theoretical studies (their knowing), practice experiences (their doing), and personal values and beliefs (their being and becoming).

For an extended discussion of these elements and their integration in the context of praxis, ethos and poiesis, see Wight, 2014.

Might this be a template for better bridging theory and practice, in relation to ethics especially – for helping practitioners to distill their 'prof-essence', the essence of their professing? As you review Quiet Resolve, consider what might resonate for yourself, and the others that you mainly practice with, in some ethos-making of your own.

---

~ **Quiet Resolve** ~

**Our Emerging Planning Ethos**

[Finalized in May 2011, this represents the outcome of the March 23, 2011 Ethos-Making Workshop, held in The Quiet Room, St. John's College, University of Manitoba.

The Workshop participants comprised a mix of University of Manitoba City Planning students and Winnipeg-based professional planning practitioners (mostly UM MCP alumni): Adam Ceske, Susanne Dewey-Povoledo, Jacquie East, Derek Eno, Susan Freig, Mike Friesen, Erin Huck, Mike Lennon, Christina Maes, Kyle McStravick, Jan Miller, Ross Mitchell, Carole O'Brien, Michael Robinson, Aaron Short, Stephen Walker and Fernando Velarde-Trejo.

The ethos-draft was mostly compiled and integrated by the Workshop Facilitator (Professional Practice course instructor), Ian Wight, based on contributions by the planning students and practitioners, including – especially – the contribution of a practitioner, Ross Mitchell, to elaborating the opening section (the 'what') and the contribution of a student, Erin Huck, to inspiring the theming of the final section (the 'why')]

**1. The WHAT of Our Ethos  
We Statements, as Planners**

- We are all searching for a purpose, for deeper meaning, and for making an impact beyond our own lives.
- We have answered our Soul's calling to help make balanced and healthy places for people at every stage of their lives – with 'place' meaning anywhere that people come together and call home (be it a city, a neighborhood, a family or a social organization) reflecting agency in communion, integrating physicality, functionality, community and spirituality – in a sacred geography.
- We strive beyond our own personal egos, and our inter-personal tribes and allegiances, to enact a world-honoring, world-centric vision, integrated and integrating to an extraordinary degree, in awe of both the local and the global.
- We embrace conflict as an unavoidable and often positive by-product of human endeavor. We seek to help people and organizations work through conflict to reach a place of mutual respectful understanding, a vantage point from which common ground might be claimed and built upon.
- We possess many qualities that make us good team players, as quintessential agent-collaborateurs. We are sensitive, optimistic, inclusive, adept at communication, intensely curious, embracing an intuitive knowing of what is necessary to help move all of us – one "place" at a time – towards an ever-evolving realization of the classic ideals of Truth, Beauty and Goodness.

- We work with collectives of all conceivable types to help bridge the gap between outer socio-economic systems and interior culture markers. In serving our communities and helping them to achieve their goals, we assist them in distinguishing between what is possible and relevant – and what is not; between what is necessary – as opposed to what is frivolous; and between what is beneficial – as opposed to what is potentially harmful. We always strive to ‘do no harm’; more positively, we seek to achieve wellbeing by design.
- We are constantly evolving in pursuit of a more serviceable over-standing, a higher state of flourishing, and a fundamental thriving. More than personal sense-making or inter-personal meaning-making, our planning is in essence an act of mindful, heart-felt, soul-serving place-making – a whole-making exercise that is also an imperative.

## 2. The HOW in Our Ethos Enacting and Manifesting

### Pairings that Matter: Aligning Inner and Outer

**Self + Service:** In our professing we respectfully enact ‘Self as Source’, while acknowledging ‘Source as Us’. We draw on our inner selves, to be of service in the outside world, beyond our small selves. Our whole selves – body, mind, soul and spirit – are invested in our service to others, in service to the wellbeing of all, including our unique central selves. We profess our mission accordingly, and acknowledge our own subjectivity – on our own, and together – in this service ethic.

Valuing fairness and equity, we seek to empower a new democracies, beyond conventional politics, beyond commercial motives. In spite of the predilections of our superiors and clients, our finest work emerges when we keep people, and their living environments and precious places, at the apex of our focus. As practitioners and human beings we realize our highest ideals and achieve our highest potentials when we help those we serve to achieve theirs.

We organize hopes and put fears in perspective. We are transparently our-selves; our professional selves are integrated with our personal selves; we are integrated beings providing an integration service. Our soul and role are aligned.

**Soul + Role:** Soul connotes depth, heart, core, centre – what touches our souls undoubtedly touches the soul of others. Soul transcends religious faith; it crosses faith boundaries. It has a secularity to it, as well as sacredness. It calls us to honor it in all our professing – we must never sell our soul short.

Our professional role is driven by our personal soul; the soul of our profession arises in building inter-personal and inter-species relationships, and making eco-logical and ego-restrained connections – as developers of choices and possibilities. We connect people and institutions, places and environments.

We infuse our professional roles with our personal passions and all the attributes of our unique selves. We draw on, and feed, our personal passions – to fuel, and sustain, our professionalism.

Our professionalism is rooted in our sense of the role of soul in our praxis, underpinning our interventions – our actions with vision – as positive-change-makers, as ecological stewards, as part of the corps of place-makers. This is also the route to our sense of the spirit in our purpose, the spirit at work in us and through us.

Our soul merits constant nurturing and bolstering, best done through close, meaning-filled, professional communion. We combat corrosion of our souls by supporting one another, consciously and conscientiously. Our professional capacities and sensibilities are thereby fortified, encouraging an ongoing challenging of all problematic aspects of the status quo. There is a spirit to our purpose.

**Spirit + Purpose:** Translating spirit into purpose should be our default mode, always in gear, always on show, always at work in us. The daily work of planning is that of the human spirit; we work for people – with our minds, but from the heart, and with all our soul. The purpose of our work is also of the human spirit – providing a creative, optimistic human ‘spark’ or pulse, in places, projects and plans.

Our collective spirit needs to be released, to courageously run free, in service of the True, the Good and the Beautiful. It strengthens by exposure, taking on challenges, enduring tribulations, overcoming disdain, constantly tested and testing. Our spirit underpins, and literally in-forms, our purpose – in ongoing resolution.

Our spirit is manifest in our clarity and focus and motivation: it represents a ‘common-well-th’ to be tapped; an uncommon intent to be realized; and a form of consciousness that will not be denied. In such professional communion beyond individual ego there is the synergy of authentic soul-powered agents – on a service path – to be harnessed and deployed. A powerful, captivating and motivating force is released – intangible, ineffable, extraordinary – but unreservedly real, manifested in observance of the highest standards of ethical practice, always eschewing what is easy – in favor of what is right, in favor of what is truly true and unreservedly good and poetically beautiful.

Our purpose is not static – it is dynamic, a product of a mesh of dynamics. Kaleidoscopically, it transforms as it works its way out, meshing interior and exterior, nurturing new unfoldings – growths and developments in consciousness, as spirit-in-action. This is our work – a common visioning and a collective enacting – work of the highest, most ennobling order, a pilgrimage in pursuit of all we might most identify with, an emergent ‘we-dentity’, transcending our individual identity. This is our work – our spirit at work, the underlying purpose in our work.

### 3. The WHY in Our Ethos

#### **In pursuit of our ultimate concern Being + Meaning + Discerning**

**Being + Meaning + Discerning:** In enacting our professional selves we embody the linking of being and meaning, the linking involving a deep inquiry, in the realm of discernment. In discerning we bring a higher power to bear on our decision-making. We discern that human beings are more

than their individual doings; we make meaning together – meanings that take us beyond ourselves, well beyond ourselves, when we are truly discerning.

Our ultimate concern is to be full-filled and full-filling, expansively, always at our leading/learning edge, pushing into the beyond – ethical inquiry collectively enacted. This is our work, our livelihood, our motivation, our passion, our pilgrimage – in service to our wider world.

Transactively and collaboratively, we make and harvest new knowledge together; we create and translate new understanding together. We take our cues from our ‘audiences’, those we serve – our clients, our employers, our communities, our constituencies, future generations, fellow species – the subject and object of our ‘professions.’ We seek to make our worlds more whole, being a contribution, to the causes of sense-making, meaning-making, and place-making. Listening actively, while acknowledging and privileging the highest and best interests of our audiences, our being honours their being, our meaning is a shared meaning, with discernment. We seek to better, to improve – to be agents of betterment, of improvement, with discernment.

As professionals our core ‘being + meaning + discerning’ situates us as being on tap, not on top, in synch with our audiences and with our central selves.

Paying particular attention to prepositions, we seek to temper our technocratic planning FOR people, by empathetically planning WITH people. We aspire throughout to authentically empower planning BY, and ultimately a caring-filled planning THROUGH, people themselves – the epitome of place-making.

This all manifests in a common quest for comprehensive wellbeing, that is ultimately an elegantly simple wholeness: self-aligned with service; soul aligned with role; and spirit aligned with purpose – a higher flourishing all-round, telling our we-story to the future.

We include below some of our own reflections – to try to communicate some of what we experienced, and what still resonates.

## **What Still Resonates: A Practitioner-Participant Reflects Back (Ross Mitchell)**

One element I recall about the March 2011 ethos-making workshop was the diversity of the participants – from the career paths of the practitioners, to the passions of the students. A casual observer could be forgiven for thinking that the room contained students and alumni from many faculties across the university, and their respective professional avenues; such was the variety of perspectives that emerged from the frank and at times personal disclosure of values, beliefs, experiences, hopes, fears, dreams and, yes... biases and prejudices.

It left me wondering, is there a profession on earth that has to make room for such a kaleidoscope of worldviews, all the while having to mediate the tensions between them? Could the beginnings of a planners’ ethos emerge from our modest gathering, an ethos that could come close to encapsulating the moral and ethical challenges and dilemmas confronting practitioners across such a broad field of endeavor? What would an ethos need to absorb in order to bind – morally, ethically

and emotionally – the hearts and minds of planners across the socio-economic, political or spiritual spectrums, or – increasingly it seems – divides?

The challenge laid down seemed overwhelming at first, almost comical given the three-hour time limit. In the beginning, arrayed in an opening circle, and very tentative at first, it felt as though we were seated before an imaginary loom upon which, over the course of our sharing, we began to weave the fabric of “us” – as a collective of individuals. From the thread of our own collective experience ethos-fragments emerged, finding form and shape – as uniquely ‘ours’ – in a sort of collective professional tapestry. But could we find enough common thread within the group to sew our scant swatches into a beautiful intricate tapestry quilt – a metaphoric ethos that could swathe all of us?

Over the course of the afternoon, participants gave expression to a variety of tenets relevant to not only a planning ethos, but potentially to those of allied professions working across classic continuums: individual-community, personal-transpersonal, material-spiritual, and natural-built (environment). I recall being inspired to offer some expression of such tenets, in what emerged as the first section of Quiet Resolve – an early crystallization of seemingly foundational ‘we-statements’ from our closing circle, conveying essential elements of the ‘what’ of our emerging ethos. We were all planners, and were reflecting as planners, but what is possibly of special interest now is that there is no particular or explicit mention of ‘planning’ per se in these tenets. Should this surprise us?

Arguably, small “p” planning is so much part and parcel of human and societal evolution that it seems presumptuous for one profession, such as our own, to add a capital “P” and lay claim to it. In some circles this might be akin to planting a flag on the Moon, or at the bottom of the ocean at the North Pole. Why would anyone salute what they can’t readily see, or credit? This existential dilemma has haunted the planning profession over the years, at least in an egoic sense. We have the trappings of a profession in the planning schools, institutions, conferences, journals and awards, and yet the insecurities persist; we invariably look further – often anxiously and apprehensively it seems – for acknowledgment and recognition. What’s more important – recognition as capital ‘P’ planners, or acknowledgment of an ethos we enact that transcends planning as we know it, while ranging across the full spectrum of planning that we experience? Could something so seemingly nebulous even have a core around which an ethos could be formed? The tenets are giving me hope, in some unifying perspectives.

So, what might unite ‘we’ planners? Can you see something in Quiet Resolve that you could rally round? We often find ourselves in different camps, facing off over issues that divide people and communities; issues involving community diversity, mobility and the ongoing struggle to build cities that foster positive social, economic, and cultural interactions, and racial and religious harmony, and peaceful co-existence. And how do we craft a professional ethos that resonates with planners whose callings may have taken them away from the mainstream and the familiar; perhaps to the fringes of the profession where they have adapted their skills in a variety of ways, in working with governmental organizations and NGOs in impoverished and war-ravaged – and with increasing frequency weather-ravaged – countries, or in our own indigenous communities. Seeking to stabilize governance systems and economies; rebuild communities, schools and health care facilities; and secure for people the very basic necessities of food, housing, water and sanitation – planners, in the poignant lyrics of Bruce Cockburn, “waiting for a miracle.”

But are these planners on the “fringe” at all? Perhaps they are at its very ethical heart, in service to the marginalized and dispossessed, where our gifts and skills are most needed. After all, how can our species truly evolve to a higher, more peace-full state of being without sending foot soldiers into the trenches of war, poverty and the many manifestations of social and economic injustice, to help restore – within people and communities – dignity, purpose and, above all, hope? As the news-cycle and social media noise attests, signs that the evolution of mankind may be stalled are apparent across the globe, but no more so than in our cities and the communities that comprise them. Might groups of planners, through quiet resolve and common cause, manifest goodness by generating an ethos that serves them as they attempt to be of service in the wider world of challenges?

And so, where were we at the end of that workshop day? Was common ground to be found, sufficiently firm and fertile for the seed of a planning ethos to germinate? For myself it came down to the simple realization that something worthwhile had transpired in that space. For three hours or so a cross-section of planners, present and future, came together to turn that nondescript basement room into a capital “S” special Space. Something that was welcoming, safe, inclusive and, importantly, honest and discerning, to the point where I, for one, emerged feeling encouraged, inspired and reinvigorated.

I believe that, at the end of the day, that space became a professional development place, a well-designed space for deep dialogue – and for framing some common action intentions. What emerged from the dialogue, as a common denominator, was the stitching together of a multi-hued quilt or tapestry of our collective experience in ethos terms. Space and place, and space-place transformation, in all of their manifestations, is at the nexus of the planning profession. This notion particularly underpins the “What” of our ethos, woven into our “We Statements.” For no matter “what” all of us do – that makes us feel a kinship as planners – it inevitably involves the space/place nexus in one form or another, be it natural or man-made, real or imagined. We act in it, and upon it. We spend a lot of time trying to understand it and how it impacts us. We collaborate with people in helping them imagine better ‘spaces-en-route-to-places’ and, with a vision in mind, we work alongside people in helping to transform their reference spaces, as crucibles for making better places.

Imbedded in the ethos that was developed is our mission as planners to be agent-collaborateurs and, if necessary, agent-provocateurs in the co-creative process of making better places; places that restore and inspire; places that contain the social, psychological and environmental ingredients necessary for nourishing and nurturing people, families and communities; places that we, as planners, have a central role in shaping, hopefully within a value system fundamental to all races and cultures – that we staunchly defend against those who would subvert it in the name of some ideological tyranny, be it religious, political or economic.

Cities have long been regarded as the crucibles of civilization. At the root of our ethos, of what we do as Planners, is the belief that the fate of our civilization hinges in part on our ability to influence the transformation of our cities, one space at a time, into places that do not sacrifice human health, happiness and overall well-being in mute service to the activities and systems that sustain economic inequity and social injustice. We positively value places that will help incubate the sea-change necessary to extend all forms of life on Earth and inspire future generations to take up the torch in rallying to save not the Earth – which will doubtless recover – but us... ourselves, our Selves.



The ethos-making workshop was, in the great scheme of things, but a modest step. But any space that improves the quality of human interaction, even for a brief moment, moves the needle in the right direction. Resolve to make some space for some ethos-making in your professional life.

## **Noticing What I'm Noticing: The Workshop Coordinator Reflects (Ian Wight)**

This was my first foray into what has become my 'ethos-making' work. It was developed in part from a professional ethics offering at a practitioner's conference, to complement some coverage of code of ethics matters by another presenter. But its deeper origins may be traced to an extended intensive exposure to experiential learning a year or two earlier.

The experiential workshop design was strongly influenced by the experiential learning focus of a course of studies in 2008/2009 at the Centre for Human Ecology, then based at Strathclyde University, Glasgow, Scotland. This included elective courses in eco-psychology, action inquiry and spiritual activism.

This was in conjunction with some experimentation with in-depth integrally-informed journaling, in the Professional Practice course, to help students with what came to be termed their praxis-making (Friesen and Wight, 2009). The ethos-making became a form of 'shared praxis-making', initially involving only the students (in their class 'collective statement to the profession') but then involving the mix of students and practitioners that emerged Quiet Resolve.

The underlying impetus involved going beyond the conventional teaching of ethics, (using case studies and anecdotes rooted in the CIP's formal code of ethics/statement of values) into the territory of experiencing ethics-making in action. It included realizing how much this was a first-hand collective endeavor, and from there appreciating the possibility of a comparatively integrated ethos – as a bundling of relevant ethics, a supra-ethic of sorts, for those participating in its making. It also encompassed an interest in conveying the importance and value of reflective practice for professional practitioners-in-the-making, providing some experience of the 'reflective practitioner' documented in Donald Schon's work (Schon 1983; 1987), and extending this into the collective realm – of professionals communing as professionals, through ethos-making.

All this experimentation was enabled by the cumulative experience of instructing this course over many iterations (since 1994), and from the extraordinary resourcing and positioning of the course that I was able to undertake as Program Head (from 2003-2008). Such conditions might not easily be replicated. I am also realizing that there was possibly an unusually high level of relational trust among the workshop participants, largely through my own connections with many of them, as current or former students. I had taught the participating students their city-region studio in their first year – a very intensive bonding experience, and now we were connected again in their program capstone course, another 'studio' of sorts, focusing on their professional-self design.

The practitioners participating in the workshop very much shared a common planning practice context, in a sometimes challenging environment – their planning practice was primed by a particular place, and culture; it was not all-encompassing – of the whole country, nor the whole profession. It was simply theirs, and not necessarily others' – but there is still a sense of 'universality' in what emerged. They also responded positively – and perhaps bravely – to an

invitation to participate in an experience that specifically referenced an interest in ‘meshing the personal, the professional and the spiritual’. Perhaps they were not your usual ‘run-of-the-mill’ practitioners.

In terms of my own contribution to the ethos-drafting process, while I anchored the overall effort and authored the first draft, I was also responsible for weaving in the many comments from other participants in what became the final draft. One participant, Ross Mitchell (see above) provided much of the basis for the first part (the ‘what’, based on the closing circle ‘we-statements’); another, a student, Erin Huck, inspired much of the content and framing of the third section (the ‘why’). I led the development of the middle section (the ‘how’) based on some possible ‘pairings that matter’ that were introduced during the workshop, to help structure prospective elements of an ethos.

My earlier experience of ‘experiential learning’ was particularly influential in fleshing out this framing – around the pairing, and the aligning, of self and service, soul and role, and spirit and purpose. I had been helped to a ‘leadership as service’ positioning of my ‘self’, through a particular combination of elective course studies, notably one on ‘spiritual activism’. I had also been exposed to the work of Parker Palmer (2004; 2007), and was particularly inspired by his demonstration of the import in more consciously ‘joining soul and role’. The experiential emphasis – along with my increasing integral awareness – was also making it easier for me to consider the rehabilitation of ‘the spiritual’ into my own professing, as well as this possibility in relation to professional practice more generally (Wight, 2009). But this was made even easier by being in the UK at a time when there was a public policy fascination with the notion of ‘fit for purpose’.

The media buzz around ‘fit for purpose’ – at the time in the UK – is conveyed in part in this 2010 post <http://www.macmillandictionaryblog.com/fit-for-purpose> The main applicable meaning is: “of a good enough standard for someone or something”. The relevant sense of the noun *purpose* is: “the aim that ... something is intended to achieve... plainly put – good enough to do the job it was designed to do”. The pairing here (of spirit and purpose) is intended to capture, and connect, the spirit – as ultimate concern – that stands for the ‘good’ in purpose.

In a somewhat pointed response I found myself drawn to making the case for a more conscious ‘fit’ between spirit and purpose. I continue to be exercised by the challenge of meshing the personal, the professional and the spiritual – but am seeing definite possibilities for their integration in concepts such as praxis, and ethos and poiesis (Wight, 2014), helped by integral and evolutionary perspectives on spirituality.

While the Quiet Resolve featured here is clearly unique to a particular group, at a particular place and time – and is therefore probably not reproducible, the process that generated the ethos could certainly be applied in other contexts – where there is the will, and especially a collective mind and heart, to see what might be made together. This could be within a ‘community of practice’ of like-minded souls, or a new project team charged with implementing an integrated design process, or a chapter or division of a professional institute or association – wanting to go beyond a generic code of ethics, and craft an ethos together, that they own and that empowers them... that inspires them, that represents the spirit in their planning, that distils their ‘prof-essence.’

## The Why in Our How: Ethos-Meshing Theory and Practice, and More Besides

Being professional together may represent a higher calling than we have generally realized to this point, given our seeming propensity for privileging individualization and self-reverential behavior. The ethos-making being advocated here is envisaged as operating along-side this tendency, in a greater balancing act of sorts, where individual ethics operates in conjunction with a professional ethos. It calls on individual professionals to not only redouble their reflective practice efforts, but to seek opportunities to become better reflective practitioners together – to author something in common that binds them, and sustains them.

The final section of Quiet Resolve points to the importance of certain aspects of such collective professing, that might well merit more consideration in pursuit of a more evolved professionalism. It is too easy to be self-limiting – as mostly a human ‘doing’ (rather than a human ‘being’). This can lead us down an overly instrumental path, focused on technical means, and the associated narrow rationality. More reflective practice can help elicit our being-ness, especially in relation to/with others. We might begin to better appreciate the tacit knowledge that we have accumulated, that has helped us navigate the shoals of practice, but that we might have unduly kept to ourselves. The ethos-making is an opportunity to surface and share that knowledge, and all the emotional intelligence it embodies, in a ramping up of what the profession can offer.

A ‘being’ focus also takes us closer to a ‘becoming’ interest, and to the shared intention that might be associated with this positioning. An ethos can engage collective emergence concerns, around what we might want to work at – to become, to effect, to call into being (Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013). It entails a positive future regard. An ethos can directly tackle the meaning in this; it is meaning-making with an attitude, to make a positive difference together. We are makers at heart, and an ethos can be a vehicle for this making in a professional context.

But, in addition to being/becoming and meaning/making, the ‘why’ in our ‘how’ implicates something deeper in us, as we share our precious tacit knowledge, and begin to sense our shared common ground, to ground what would otherwise be simply personal theory. We leave analysis and evaluation and the like behind, and enter the realm of discernment, and invoke a spiritual dimension into our reckoning. We can ‘tap’ the spiritual more assuredly if we can do it together, acknowledging the spirit in our purpose, the soul in our role, and the self that is in service (Gayton, 1996).

An integral approach cannot but include an engagement with the spiritual dimension. It needs to be reckoned with, and acknowledged, in relation to professional-self design in particular. Admitting the spiritual into the overall calculus makes it easier to contemplate meshing the personal and the professional; in particular, it goes to the issue of ‘the why in our how’. It helps that integral framings of spirituality acknowledge multiple perspectives, within an essentially evolutionary view, that transcends narrow conventional interpretations that may be more religion-based and stasis-oriented. Useful precedents are always welcome, if not essential – for skeptics especially. Don Gayton (1996) provides compelling personal testimony to the importance of ‘acknowledging the spiritual’, even though this amounted to ‘a difficult bit of truth for a non-religious skeptic’ (p. 167). Gayton’s book of stories about ‘landscapes of the interior’, re-exploring highly-charged

interfaces of nature and the human spirit, is a powerful reminder of the value of tapping spirit in one's professing; it is at root an interior/exterior balancing act (Wight, 1999).

At its most evolved our discerning may involve a divining, as we each become more whole and more integrated within ourselves, and with one another. In this way we circle back to the origins of professing – in public declaration of a faith-fuelled mission – and bring this forward into the present, into the practice of a professionalism that is more than primal, and more than modern, but which remains essentially inspired. There is a primacy – and a potency – in ethos, that can help us transcend ethics.

## **Bridging Theory and Practice: The Good in Ethos-Making**

We are all searching for a purpose, for deeper meaning,  
and for making an impact beyond our own lives.  
(*Quiet Resolve*, March 2011 – Opening Statement)

Where do we stand? For what do we stand? How might we improve our standing, and become a greater force for good in the world? Will conventional planning and its 'it' ethics suffice? As persons professing the challenge is simultaneously very personal and very professional. We must navigate where all our ethics meet – personal, professional and, in our case, planning. Some meshing, some integration, is clearly desirable; how might this meshing be best manifested? It has been suggested here that they can meet and mesh through guided ethos-making, and manifest in a collective ethos – in this case through Quiet Resolve. Might this constitute a context for better bridging theory and practice, in relation to ethics especially, for assisting groups of professionals, in their 'communities of practice', in their 'being professional together'? Where is the good in ethos-making?

The ethos-making featured here has been informed by aspects of integral theory – an approach intrinsically favoring integration, but from a position of valuing multiple perspectives – and especially seeking to unite the 'good' in such perspectives. An integral approach also privileges whole-making, seeking to be comprehensive, inclusive and balanced. Integral ethos-making seeks to value both interior and exterior orientations (interior consciousness and exterior form) from both individual and collective perspectives. Conventional or standard ethics can too easily be reduced to individual exterior (behavior) or collective exterior (systems/institutions) territory; an integral ethos perspective is more explicitly collective, but can span both the exterior collective world – of systems and institutions, and the interior collective world – more culture-like. The former – manifested in notions such as 'institutional ethos' – is more objective, actually inter-objective, while the interior equivalent is more subjective, actually, inter-subjective. Quiet Resolve is more in the territory of the latter, but – being integral – there is a larger integration expectation, thus also engaging individuals, in terms of both exterior behavior and interior experiencing.

The practice dimension in ethos-making is very much in the 'making'. It is highly experiential, inter-personal, and interactive – across a range of states of being. It values individual sense-making (the professional persons reflecting on their particular experience and attempting to make sense of it) and common meaning-making, in relation with valued and respected peers (collective reflective practice). Together they engage in place-making – in this case making a professional development place, to work together on crafting and evolving their professional-self design. There is an

underlying whole-making imperative, bringing their whole selves to their work – body, mind, soul and spirit. This amounts to a considerable ‘presencing’ of one’s self (Senge et al., 2008) – in this case one’s professional self. Ethos-making may in fact serve as an entrée for the profession of planning into the realms of new social technology around co-presencing, including awareness-based collective action (associated with the application of Theory U) (Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013) and the emerging field of Collaborative Developmental Action Inquiry (Nicolaidis and McCallum, 2013).

Ethos-making is also very time-, place- and participant-contingent. It is best thought of as being the work of a particular ‘community of practice’ – a grouping of folks sharing some affinities, including geography, and the real possibility of at least occasional face-to-face, in-person communication. The particular grouping will influence what emerges, as will elements of the workshop design. There can be no standard template expectation, no codification; the ethos-making is a co-created, creative piece of collective art – an art of possibility. Some of this possibility may be observed in another ethos-making effort, in an inter-professional context – Agency in Communion (Wight, 2013c). In this case the ethos that emerged was framed in terms of: calling; making; communing; gifting; serving; evolving; and wholing (whole-making). Other framings may emerge from other resources, depending on group interests and workshop design. Quiet Resolve reflects ‘the new professional’ aspects of Parker Palmer’s work (Palmer, 2007) but another community of practitioners’ ethos could reflect any other resource deemed potentially congenial. For example, the Seedhouse Grid (Seedhouse, 1998) has been advanced ‘to aid practical ethical reasoning and encourage clear explanations of judgments’ (Weir, 2012, p. 101). While not a theory, it is more of ‘a mapping of the field of ethical decision, based on the four aspects of practicalities, outcomes and priorities, moral duties and basic purpose’ (p. 101). It appears to have some good organizing or framing qualities, for the raft of ‘we-statements’ that might emerge in closing plenary circle-work.

Ethos-making is clearly much more than ethics-observance, but part of the affinity of those sharing an ethos may also be their sharing of a wider, institutionalized, code of ethics and/or statement of values. Ethos-making can also help bridge some otherwise problematic divides, by facilitating some professional neighboring or communing – among public sector and private sector folks, for example, or academics and practitioners, or different generations. They may well acknowledge that, despite their differences, they at least live professionally in the same moral neighborhood, seeking to be good citizens as well as good professional workers (Gardner, 2011). And, whether essentially guardians or commercials, the ethos they make can furnish some of the moral flexibility that they might need to operate well together (Jacobs, 1991; Wight 2013b). Ethos-making in inter-generational contexts could also help resource professional mentoring programs, bringing together young and old, in common cause.

The good in ethos-making will inevitably find expression in our planning ethics. The choices we face may be a little less weighty and less onerous, if the burden is shared with others who have also reflected deeply together – and crafted a common ethos. We may find we are thereby positioned to be more discerning about the moral discretion we have in practice quandaries, and to deploy that discretion more wisely. We may even realize the possibilities – if not the imperative – for some progressive professional activism, on noble causes. Fortified with an ethos, we will also be better able to hold ourselves, and our profession, to account – to optimize the goodness we constitute together.

Ethos may be collectively made but it is ultimately enacted by and through an individual – the person planning, the person professing. Ethos may also be regarded as a key element in the design of one’s professional self – seeking to give form to what we are all searching for. It has ancient roots, but may now be usefully associated with Parker Palmer’s notion of ‘the new professional’ – the subject and object of ethos-making:

Trace the word *professional* back to its origins and you will find that it refers to someone who makes a ‘profession of faith’ in the midst of a disheartening world. Sadly, the meaning of the word became diminished as the centuries rolled by... The notion of the ‘new professional’ revives the ancient meaning of the word. The new professional is a person who can say: ‘In the midst of the powerful force field of institutional life, where so much might compromise my core values, I have found firm ground on which to stand – the ground of my own identity and integrity, of my own soul – ground from which I can call myself, my colleagues, and my workplace back to our true mission.’ (Palmer, 2007, pp 212-213)

## References

- Friedmann, J. 1987. *Planning in the public domain: Linking knowledge and action* (Princeton)
- Friesen, E. and Wight, I. 2009. ‘Integrally-informed journaling for professional self-design: Emerging experience in a graduate program context’, *Journal of Integral Theory and Practice*, 4(3), 59-86 (Fall 2009).
- Gardner, H., Csikszentmihalyi, M. and Damon, W. 2001. *Good work: When excellence and ethics meet* (New York: Basic Books)
- Gardner, H. 2011. *Truth, beauty, and goodness reframed: Educating for the virtues in the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Basic Books)
- Gayton, D. 1996. *Landscapes of the Interior: Re-explorations of nature and the human spirit* (New Society Publishers: Gabriola Island, BC, Canada)
- Jacobs, J. 1991. *Systems of survival: A dialogue on the moral foundations of commerce and politics* (New York and Toronto: Random House, 1991; Vintage 1994)
- McGettrick, B. and Su, F. 2012. ‘Introduction’, pp 1-9 in Su, F. and McGettrick, B. (eds) 2012. *Professional Ethics: Education for a Humane Society* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing)
- Nicolaides, A. and McCallum, D.C. (2013). Inquiry in action for leadership in turbulent times: Connections between transformative learning and adaptive leadership. *Journal of Transformative Education* 11(4):246-260.
- Nixon, J. 2012. ‘The ethics of academic practice: Grasping what ethics is’, Chapter 1, pp 10-24 in Su, F. and McGettrick, B. (eds) 2012. *Professional Ethics: Education for a Humane Society* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing)
- Palmer, P.J. 2004. *A hidden wholeness: The journey toward an undivided life (Welcoming the soul and weaving community in a wounded world)* (Wiley/Jossey-Bass: San Francisco)
- Palmer, P.J. 2007. *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher’s life* (10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Edition) (John Wiley and Sons: San Francisco)
- Sandercock, L. 1999. ‘Expanding the ‘language’ of planning: A meditation on planning education for the Twenty-First Century’. *European Planning Studies* 7(5), 533-544.
- Scharmer, O. and Kaufer, K. 2013. *Leading from the emerging future: From ego-system to eco-system economies (Applying Theory U to transforming business, society and self)* (Berrett-Koehler Publishers: San Francisco)

- Schon, D.A. 1983. *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
- Schon, D.A. 1987. *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco
- Seedhouse, D. 1998. *Ethics: The heart of health care* (Wiley: Chichester)
- Senge, P.M., Scharmer, C.O., Jaworski, J. and B-S. Flowers 2008. *Presence: Human purpose and the field of the future*. Random House
- Su, F. and McGettrick, B. (eds) 2012. *Professional ethics: Education for a humane society* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing)
- Weir, D. 2012. 'The ethos of business practice: A universal ethical basis for the practice of business management', Chapter 6, pp 88-107 in Su, F. and McGettrick, B. (eds) 2012. *Professional Ethics: Education for a Humane Society* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing)
- Wight, I. 1999. 'Tapping spirit in your planning: An interior/exterior balancing act' (Book Review: Gayton, 1996) *Western Planner*, October/November 1999, p.14.
- Wight, I. 2005. 'Placemaking as applied integral ecology: Evolving an ecologically-wise planning ethic'. *World Futures*, 61, 127-137
- Wight, I. 2009. 'Joining-up the spiritual and the professional in planning education: Exploring interfaces (for more spiritually-activist professing) AESOP 2009 Liverpool, UK (Paper presentation: Track 3: Planning Education – Theoretical Perspectives) (July 2009)
- Wight, I. 2011. 'Enacting ethics education as ethos-making: Meshing the personal, the professional and the spiritual' WPSC 2011 paper presentation – Perth WA (Track 12: Planning Education + Professional Practice) (July 2011)
- Wight, I. 2012. 'Place, placemaking and planning: An integral perspective with wellbeing in (body) mind (and spirit). In S. Atkinson, S. Fuller and J. Painter (Eds.) *Wellbeing and Place* (Chapter 15, 231-248). UK: Ashgate Publishing
- Wight, I. 2013a. 'Ethics in professional planning practice: Four sources of ethical obligations' *Plan Canada*, Spring 2013, 53:1, 18-21
- Wight, I. 2013b. 'Navigating our ethical obligations: Jane Jacobs' systems of survival' *Plan Canada*, Fall 2013, 38-43
- Wight, I. 2013c. 'Exploring inter-being and inter-becoming – as ethos-making: The integrally-informed pursuit of professional community wellbeing' *Journal of Integral Theory and Practice* 8 (3&4) 82-96
- Wight, I. (2014). 'Enabling professional-self design: Educating for praxis, ethos and poiesis', 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Association of Architectural Educators (aae) conference, *Living and Learning – Conference Proceedings*, pp 100 – 104 (Sheffield UK)