Introduction

The planning profession has long limited cities like San Francisco, California; Seattle, Washington; Portland, Oregon; and New York, New York as settings for original and urban planning. Similarly, there is a tendency to exclude other cities from the planning profession's purview. This exclusion is based on the perception that cities like Atlanta, Georgia; Memphis, Tennessee; and New Orleans, Louisiana are only marginally relevant to the planning profession's primary concerns. This focus may result from a lack of representation in the planning profession's literature or methodological bias, which may lead to a skewed understanding of urban issues.

Methodology

Data were derived from a meta-analysis of eleven years of peer-reviewed articles published in the Journal of American Planning Association (JAPA), Planning Theory, and Planning Practice. The meta-analysis was conducted to identify the geographic location of case studies in the literature and determine if there is significant geographic bias, particularly in the Deep South. The case studies were identified through a systematic review of the literature, and the geographic location of each case study was recorded.

Conclusion

While I do not purport to explain this regional editorial omission, a task more germane to the techniques of qualitative and quantitative methodologies familiar to professional planners. The myriad causes of this data-driven planning efforts. Moreover, public process in states like Oregon is more rigorous than in most Deep South states and data access is enhanced by both public demand and individual state funding. Planners in Deep South states have fewer resources available in the scholarly and professional literature to inform their professional development. In a result, a movement progresses of other urban planning. Deep South states would benefit from the meta-analysis of case studies presented in this study. The results of this study can be used by professional planners to inform their work and guide future research.