

Towards a Linking Activist Pedagogy: Teacher Activism for Social-Ecological Justice

Yi Chien (Jade) Ho

To answer to the perpetual crisis of our presence in this abounding and dangerous world, we have only the perpetual obligation to care....
— Wendell Berry, 1995

...I stress that those wanting to teach must be able to dare, that is to have the predisposition to fight for justice and to be lucid in defense of the need to create conditions conducive to pedagogy in schools...
— Paulo Freire, 1998

The classroom remains the most radical space of possibility in the academy.
—bell hooks, 1994

Introduction

The world is currently in the midst of a social-ecological crisis. We are suffering from more and more poverty and social isolation. People from lower-economic classes have less access to clean water and safe housing. Toxic chemicals are being dumped into the rivers that many people depend on for daily use. Landfill sites are built adjacent to poor neighbourhoods. Indigenous people are losing their lands to national or international corporations. The increase in global temperatures causing the melting of the polar ice caps has led to changes in weather and the deaths of many species. We cannot ignore that the primary cause of this change in our planet's ecological balance and the increase in social injustices is our heavy dependence on non-renewable fossil fuels and a capitalist economic system, which encourages exploitation of both human and more than human resources with no regard for the consequences. In such a reality, it is alarming that education treats knowledge as disconnected fragments and that environmental and social issues are often addressed separately in education. David Orr (2004) warns that one of the dangers of formal schooling is “it will imprint a disciplinary template onto impressionable minds and with it the belief that the world really is as disconnected as the divisions, disciplines, and subdisciplines of the typical curriculum” (p.23).

The division and compartmentalization of knowledge is symptomatic of a dominant paradigm that favours fragmented and hierarchical ways of thinking, failing to recognize humans as part of an interwoven web of life in the Earthly community. This dominant paradigm also separates and promotes mind over body, reason over emotion, the human over the more than human, creating a false conception that “humans have the right to manage, exploit, and control both other creatures and 'other' humans” (Plumwood, 2002 quoted in Martusewicz et al., 2010, p.101). In order to live in environmentally healthy and socially just communities, we need ways of thinking and

teaching that integrate rather than fragment issues. There is a need for a more “critical-holistic” approach (Gardner, 2005) and a need to recognize that “the ecological crisis is...a cultural crisis—that is, a crisis in the way people have learned to think and thus behave in relation to larger life system and toward each other” (Martusewicz, Edmundson & Lupinacci, 2011, p.8).

With the need for such an approach in mind, Morgan Gardner (2005) formulated the term “linking activism” to describe one's “blended social-ecological justice practice” when “being positioned in a single construct” (p.3). This concept was formed to reflect the experiences of thirty activists in Ontario connecting social justice issues with their environmental work (p.9). “Activism,” Gardner explains, “is...a form of calling to social change agency which is continually being connected to our values, localities, and experiences in a powerful way” (p.10). I extend this into a consideration of environmental and social-justice educators as agents of change whose daily activism works to change the current cultural paradigm and bring social-ecological order and harmony. In this sense, teaching becomes more than 'work' but, rather, an activism that is highly influenced by the teacher's sense of identity, values, and perceptions.

In this paper, I will critically examine the mainstream environmental educational field in order to critique its paradigm that is imprinted by the current dominant culture, which in turn perpetuates social-ecological oppression. Then, I will urge educators to assume the role of “linking activists” in their practices in order to challenge the status quo. A discussion to tap into an imagination of what this pedagogical idea may entail and what dispositions linking activist educators may need to possess will be presented.

Environmental Education and the Current Cultural Paradigm

Environmental education was called for in the 1970s to respond to increasing awareness of an escalating planetary ecological crisis, and the field has since gained in momentum and diversity. However, the effect has not lived up to the expectation, and environmental education remains at the periphery of education. Moreover, regardless of critical, feminist and indigenous perspectives that have started emerging in environmental education (Barron, 1995; Cajete, 1999; Greenwood, 2003; Kahn, 2010; Mies & Shiva, 1993), the mainstream approach tends to neglect socio-cultural factors and fails to recognize the interconnectedness between environmental degradation and social justice issues (Martusewicz, Edmundson & Lupinacci, 2010; Bower, 2001; Russell & Fawcett, 2013). By adopting the same tools used by the mainstream educational system, mainstream environmental education runs the danger of contributing to the homogenization of curriculum and learning. Blenkinsop and Egan (2009) posit,

Modern western education as practiced tends to represent the underlying presuppositions of its culture, and that culture tends to situate itself in competition with the non-human world...Consequently, there is a very real potential for incompatibility in trying to educate for a different environmental situation using the tools, principles, and theoretical foundations of the current educational system (p. 85).

Traces of the dominant culture can be found in the work of the quintessential mainstream environmental educator, David Orr (2004). Recognizing the peripheral status of environmental education and its common treatment as an add-on subject, Orr argues against the educational system's false emphasis on the mastery of subject matter over mastery of one's person, theory over value, abstraction over consciousness, rationalized answers over questions, and technical efficiency over conscience (p.11-13). He proposes a rethinking of the educational system, saying that "all education is environmental education" (p. 12), and calls for humility and responsibility in the way humans treat knowledge. Orr's central thesis treats ecological crisis as fundamentally a crisis of the mind and believes that in reshaping one's mind in terms of values, ideas, and perceptions (p.126), one can work towards a more sustainable planet. Although Orr sees the importance of integrating environmental education into different disciplines, the organization of knowledge remains in fragmented and value-laden subjects. His overemphasis on the reshaping of the mind is a symptom of the dominant paradigm that favours a mind-body-emotion split and a hierarchy that puts reason over emotion and human over nature. C. A. Bower (1993) affirms that "current approaches to framing the ecological crisis are conditioning us to accept the rationalist approach to problem solving, [therefore]... the human dimensions of the crisis are never really understood at the deepest levels" (p.15) Excessive confidence in rationalism is a blind spot in the dominant culture that is associated with anthropocentrism, which hides the danger of ecological crisis from plain sight.

Plumwood (2002) stresses that due to our worship of rationalism we fail to "situate dominant forms of human society ecologically" and "to situate non-humans ethically" (p.2). Rationalism based on human interests creates a human-natural dualism that flourishes in cultural ideals that propel human control of the natural world as the Other while repressing non-human cries from ethical considerations. It is a one-dimensional logic that denies the dependency on the Other in the name of human autonomy and independence. This reductionist ideology divides knowledge into "specialists" and "non-specialists" by excluding other knowers and ways of knowing and by allowing one way of knowing to become the knowledge for all (Shiva, 1993, p.24-25). Vandana Shiva (1993) further argues that reductionist rationalism is perpetuated by the interests it serves—it is the response necessary for a particular form of economic and political orientation. "The reductionist world-view, the industrial revolution and the capitalist economy are the philosophical, technological and economic components of the same process" (Mies & Shiva, 1993, p. 24). Capitalistic and neo-liberal economy requires uniformity in commodity production and in management of natural resources. Hence, reductionism reduces the more than human from a complex web of life into a single component for irresponsible and unaccountable systems of consumption that create grave ecological degradation. Besides the economic failure, in the area of the social and political, the system of neo-liberalism continually increases unequal distribution of power, which drives more and more social and ecological oppression due to decision and policy making that continues to favour the destructive status quo (Plumwood, 2002).

Under a system of unequal distribution of power, the most decision-making influence falls on the privileged "one fifth of humanity" (Plumwood, 2002, p. 237)—also

the main beneficiary of the current dominant system. This group is at the top of the class system and is privileged to live outside the dire reality facing everyone else. The educational system is one of the main drivers for such a paradigm and “the bourgeois class biases [shape] and [inform] pedagogical processes in the classroom” (hooks, 1994, p. 178). This issue of class separation is highly ignored in the environmental education literature (Haluza-DeLay, 2013). Many assume that the knowledge acquired through schooling is objective and that it provides an equal opportunity in the competitive job market. However, upholding bourgeois values, education not only contributes to deepening the class separation, but also furthers a separation of values and identities of students from themselves, their communities and the natural world. Environmental education needs to have reflexivity on the multiple layers of human complexity and social issues. Educators must consider the underlying cultural logics that inform the system as a whole in order to move toward a more holistic approach. It is through unearthing the cultural root on which educational foundations sit that one can begin to see the inconsistencies of the tools that the current educational system offers for environmental education in a world of complexity and diversity.

Therefore, dealing with the social-ecological crisis is not about gaining new specialized knowledge or developing more cutting-edge technology, but about creating a culture in which we acknowledge the values of others and the more than human as well as our interdependence. Bower (1999) warns that reliance on technology “in turn makes it more difficult to recognize that the ways in which humans interact with the environment are influenced by generally unconsciously held cultural assumptions” (p.161). Therefore, turning attention to culture shows “a contrast with the kind of reverse ecological analysis, often originating in reductionist population biology, that reads the reductionism it adopts towards nonhuman species back into the human context and discounts the vital role of cultural difference” (p.3). Also, the cultural lens provides educators the tools necessary to examine the underlying value and beliefs of the curriculum as well as their own cultural constructs and perceptions. In this way, there will be an openness to change and hopefully it will create consistency in the whole spectrum of fragmented school disciplines (Joseph, 2000).

Furthermore, Orr’s recognition that the ecological crisis as a crisis of the mind fails to acknowledge the cultural, emotional and bodily connection humans have with themselves, others and the more than human. Unfortunately, in a culture that exalts rationalism, emotion has become “a site of social control” (Boler, 1999, p. xvii), where emotion is repressed to being “irrational” and thus assigned to inferiority. Moreover, Plumwood (2002) asserts, “The ecological crisis is the crisis of a cultural ‘mind’ that cannot acknowledge and adapt itself properly to its material ‘body’, the embodied and ecological support base it draws on in the long-denied counter-sphere of ‘nature’” (p. 15). The mainstream environmental education disregards the need to engage students’ bodies, feelings, emotions, imagination, and sense of relationship to place and community. Simply trying to increase students’ knowledge of the ecological crisis will have little effect in changing their behaviour in any substantial manner. “Understanding ecologically,” Judson (2010) explains, “has an emotional core. One’s knowledge about ecological processes and principles is made meaningful and personal by an emotional attachment to the natural world” (p.1).

Another important consideration that is missing in Orr's narrative and most of the mainstream environmental education literature is the wisdom of traditional knowledge (indigenous knowledge). This exclusion of traditional knowledge in the current environmental education literature is another symptom of the dominant culture that exalts progress and change in the form of scientific and technological advancement and innovation. Traditional knowledge is considered a thing of the past that cannot offer solutions for the current disarray. However, what is not being considered is that there are many traditional cultures that have evolved in a sustainable way with the natural world. In their book, *Escaping Education: Living as Learning within Grassroots Cultures*, Madhu Suri Prakash and Gustabo Esteva (1998) describe many of the indigenous and traditional groups' resistance to a formalized education in order to thrive at the grassroots. Bower (1993, 1999) argues that there is much to be learned from traditional indigenous cultures that have evolved in an ecologically responsive way. Indigenous ways of education touch on many important aspects that modern education has neglected. Indigenous scholar Gregory Cajete (1994) urges, "Modern education and traditional education can no longer afford to remain historically and contextually separate entities" (p.18) and the educational framework needs to advocate "developing a contemporary, cultural based, educational process founded upon traditional tribal values, orientations, and principles, while simultaneously using the most appropriate concepts, technologies, and content of modern education" (p.17). Indigenous education is "the oldest environmental education" on Earth. It centers on the individual's place in the community and in the natural world, elements that the mainstream educational system needs to take into account.

In sum, it is apparent that to foster a culture that is socially-ecologically just and harmonious, environmental education cannot adopt the same rationale from the mainstream educational system. The mainstream education is an institution that upholds the current dominant culture, which stands on a reductionist philosophy to maintain a dualistic mode of thinking and a capitalist economic system that continues to unequally distribute power, alienate humans from themselves and from the natural world, and oppress human relationships and the ecosystem. There is a need to recognize that the social-ecological crisis we now face is created by a cultural paradigm that we all live in and reinforce. It is urgent that we start developing an "environmental culture" (Plumwood, 2002, p.3) in which we are responsible and reflective on our actions and are able to make decisions about how we live and the impact on both human and the more than human world.

I call on educators to start taking responsibility for fostering such a culture by taking on a linking activist pedagogy. The concept of linking activist pedagogy, which I formulated as an extension of Gardner's linking activism, bears elements of ecojustice education (Bower, 2001; (Martusewicz, et al., 2011). Martusewicz et al. describe ecojustice education as

Educational efforts of students, teachers, and members of the local community learning collaboratively while engaged in revitalizing the local commons.
EcoJustice Education is shaped by an understanding that local and global

ecosystems are essential to all life; challenging the deep cultural assumptions underlying modern thinking that undermine those systems; and the recognition of the need to restore the cultural and environmental concerns (Martusewicz, et al., 2011, p314).

Linking activist pedagogy shares these efforts with ecojustice education, but urges educators to assume the role of activist to “actively” stand as social-ecological change agents with their students in searching for an integrated approach to the separation of environmental and social justice issues and developing an “eco-conscience” (Blenkinsop, 2014, p. 156).

Teachers as Linking Activists

Educators, although not identified as activists, are working in a context larger than the delivery of the curriculum. They face students each day who suffer from injustices that are also hurting the natural world, our only dwelling. Although education has been a force supporting the status quo, it also has the potential to reverse the current social-ecological crisis. Therefore, teachers can be social change agents—their places of practice, daily activist sites. In this sense, teachers become more than the deliverers of curriculum. They are activists whose senses of identity, values, and perceptions highly influence the way they act and interact with students. “Teachers have never functioned as automatons,” argues Joseph (2000), “they weave their own expertise, interests, cultural knowledge, values, and responsiveness to individual students into the structures and routines of the prevailing culture of school” (p.163).

Teaching is a political act (Freire, 1998). Teachers need to recognize that the decisions they make concerning which subjects are taught, and how, contain a broader human and social purpose. Not only do educators need to recognize students’ imaginative lives, they must also engage their own imaginations and visions of what an empowering education could look like and what the political, social, moral and ecological consequences of such an education would be. Imagination allows us to think of and feel possibilities (Judson, 2010). It was imagination that led bell hooks to reflect critically on her experience as a student in unexciting classrooms and to see the possibilities of what an exciting and joyful class can achieve (hooks, 1994). With that imagination and vision in mind, she was able to engage in a very different pedagogical process that stretched the boundary and took into account the value of each individual in her classroom.

Nevertheless, engaging in imagination and excitement is not enough to create a classroom of engagement and empowerment. To start, educators must show care for each individual and their presence, bearing in heart that learning is done not only individually but collectively. It is also from the ground of caring, linking activists in Gardner’s (2005) study realized the importance of integrative action when addressing social-ecological issues. From her study, she further describes two important dispositions possessed by the activists—“bearing witness” and “asking questions that are

not asked”. I believe these dispositions should also be found in teachers who desire to engage in linking activist pedagogy.

Traditionally, teachers are viewed as the mere givers of knowledge, but in the teaching and learning process, teachers are also the receivers as they “bear witness” (Gardner, 2005, p. 208) to their students’ and the more than human world. This is potentially an emotionally challenging task because teachers need to find the holistic stance to understand and respond to students and humble themselves to invite the more than human as co-teacher. It requires the teachers to see beyond their mundane daily activities and to be attentive and receptive to themselves, their students and the natural world. At the same time, teachers have to learn to listen to different voices as they advocate for the value of sharing personal learning stories and experiences. hooks (1989) contributes to this line of thought when she claims that,

Within the educational institutions where we learn to develop and strengthen our writing and analytical skills, we also learn to think, write, and talk in a manner that shifts attention away from personal experience... Learning to listen to different voices...challenges the notion that we must all assimilate in educational institutions (p.77-79).

As a result, teachers like linking activists need to be willing to ask the questions that are not being asked. It means teachers need to be critically and holistically reflective and prepared to demythologize dominant assumptions, principles, and practices (Gardner, 2005).

Sean Blenkinsop (2014) in searching for “eco-teachers” draws six characteristics that might be required of teachers who are interested in doing place- and community-based education. The characteristics considered in Blenkinsop’s article resonate with Gardner’s description of the activists’ qualities and bear great potential to be the dispositions for linking activist educators. Blenkinsop’s six characteristics are drawn from observation, interaction and interviews from the successes and struggles of teachers who are working in an innovative building-less public elementary school in Maple Ridge, BC. These characteristics are “lateral thinking, holding the paradox (anticipating the unexpected), reflection, rhythm and shape, attention, and mediation of decolonization and re-inhabitation” (Blenkinsop, 2014, p 145). For this paper, I will emphasize reflection and mediation of decolonization and re-inhabitation.

As mentioned above, linking activist educators need to be able to question what is not being asked, and that requires teachers to reflect critically, holistically and continuously on the on-going teaching and learning process. Blenkinsop (2014) stresses that teachers must have a “hyperactive sense” of consciousness to allow them to reflect on the constantly changing “eco-practices” (p. 151), as well as on the relationship of their practices with the more than human world, and their efforts at cultural transformation. Such an effort is highly influenced by the teacher’s sense of identity, values and perceptions. It is also important to know that the teacher’s “teacher identity” is only one of her many identities and that these identities are not separated, but influence each other. Therefore, in order to challenge the dominant structure, educators must be

willing to first attempt to align their identities, which inform their pedagogical processes, and their situatedness and locationality. Blenkinsop suggests that one can start by inquiring into,

(a) the specifics of one's immediate practice (e.g., What am I doing? Why? Why am I choosing to do x and not y right now? How does what I am doing connect to the curricular mandates?); (b) one's present context (e.g., What do I know about this place? What can this place or community help us to learn? How am I deepening my own understanding and connection to this context?); and (c) one's personal life (e.g., How am I changing? What are my strengths and limitations with regard to the principles and values espoused? What more do I need to learn to do this job really well?) (p. 151).

He further asserts that teachers, or linking activist teachers as I consider, must possess "hyperactive pessimism", a term borrowed from Foucault, that they need to not only constantly question the status quo but also to have an alertness to recognize the many layers of an "anti-environmental culture" (p. 154).

Linking activist teachers must engage in constant "cultural-ecological analysis" (Martusewicz, et al., 2011, p 8) in order to developed a new social-cultural-ecological vision to incessantly "decolonize" (Greenwood, 2004) from the dominant cultural attitude towards social and ecological justice and to "re-inhabit" the Earthly community. Greenwood (2004) suggests that decolonization and reinhabitation are two interrelated objectives for the purpose of connecting local and place-based experiences to the larger social, cultural and ecological scene. Reinhabitation involves learning to live well in commons and in places that have been disturbed. Decolonization then involves finding out the root causes of the social and ecological disruption. The two objectives should not be enacted separately. On the one hand, one risks the danger of cultivating disconnected indoor ecologists when solely focusing on decolonization. On the other, without unpacking the colonizing effects of the dominant paradigm, one does not have the necessary tools to pursue the kind of living that recovers social and ecological disruption of places. For instance, in the building-less elementary school in Maple Ridge, it is evident that the teachers struggle to realize the concurrent projects of "decolonization" and "reinhabitation." In a school project where students build a fort village and a little society emerges, it is not difficult to observe that gradually an economic model that resembles the exploitative nature of capitalism starts to form. In a place surrounded by nature, students are still re-enacting dominant cultural behaviours. Linking teachers need to be able to respond to these situations and to set up channels for decolonization whilst simultaneously exploring paths toward reinhabitation.

Additionally, in order to challenge the dominant paradigm, teachers need to see the importance of collaborative work with other teachers who hold the same values, such as forming a professional community based in solidarity. Paulo Freire (1990) states that collaboration or "cooperation" is an important element in the "dialogical theory of action" (p. 167) and that "cooperation leads dialogical Subjects to focus their attention on the reality which mediates them and which—posed as a problem—challenges them" (p. 168). In a comparative case study, Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) found that "support

from and communication with colleagues led teachers to have greater confidence and certainty about what they [are] trying to achieve and the best ways to achieve it” (p.111). Collective culture or a sense of community recognizes that teaching has a greater purpose and commitment.

Conclusion

The Earthly community as a whole, including both human and the non-human, is in a dire state of social-ecological crisis. It is imperative that we act on it now. We need a total rethinking and reshaping of the dominant culture that perpetuates both human and more than human suffering. It is not an issue that can be fixed quickly with the technologies that we humans take so much pride in. Our heavy reliance on technology and human reason hinder us from seeing the root cultural cause of this horrific act on our only dwelling. If we want an education that will help in overcoming the crisis, it needs to step away from the tools given by the dominant culture. Change is not easy because it requires living differently within the place and orientation of people we are with. Living differently may require teachers and educators at large, who are working towards social-ecological change, to engage in the epistemological shift as mentioned above but also an ontological transformation that will distance the teacher from the mainstream.

With this kind of complexity in engaging in social-ecological change, we need to further consider the kinds of constraints linking activist pedagogy and linking educators will need to continuously confront from a personal layer to an institutional one. On the personal layer, teachers face tremendous pressure in trying to maintain their integrity in a time where the dominant culture constantly sends us messages to live and act in a fragmented and individualist way. Teachers must not only stay connected with their own mind, body, and spiritual well being but also it is crucial that they find like-minded colleagues and form a team of support. On other the hand, in order to prepare (future) teachers to be social-ecological change agents, linking activist pedagogy calls for an institutional and structural change within teacher education.

By using the tools from the mainstream paradigm, teacher education also faces a mismatch in cultivating teachers for social-ecological change. Research shows that there is a decrease in environmental education teacher training and that within the teacher education structure, “pre-service teachers were provided very little opportunity to learn whole school approach in environmental education that would take them outside the traditional school curriculum” (Ormond, Zandvliet, McClaren, Robertson, Leddy & Metcalfe, 2014, p. 3). Nevertheless, an effort was made in 2011. The Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University implemented a teacher-training program, Sustainability Education in an Environment of Diversity (SEEDs), which aimed at preparing teachers to “act as key change agents in transforming education and society towards a more sustainable future” (Ormond et al., 2014, p. 2). SEEDs was unique in that it focused on practices that were based in place and community and the program provided a range of outdoor experiences. However, the program faced difficulty in implementing a true community-based practice for environmental learning within the

structure of the larger teacher certificate program. The Faculty Sponsor for the program comments, "...pre-service teacher education, due to a bureaucratic structure, isn't the most productive venue for environmental education" (Ormond et al., 2014, p. 2). Therefore, engaging in linking activist pedagogy requires teacher education to also "decolonize" from the Western dominant paradigm that favours a hierarchical and reductionist way of being and thinking. We need to keep imagining what this restructuring will look like, not only for teacher education, but for the educational system writ large.

Work Cited

- Barron, D. (1995). Gendering environmental education reform: Identifying the constitutive power of environmental discourses. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 11, 107-120.
- Blenkinsop, S. (2014) In search of the eco-teacher: Public school edition. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 19, 145 – 159).
- Boler, M. (1999). *Feeling power: Emotions and education*. New York: Routledge.
- Bower, C. A. (1993). *Education, cultural myths, and the ecological crisis: Toward Deep Changes*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bower, C. A. (1999). Changing the dominant cultural perspective in education. In G. A. Smith & D. R. Williams (Eds.), *Ecological education in action: On weaving education, culture, and the environment*. (1999, p.161-178). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bower, C.A. (2001). *Educating for eco-justice and community*. Georgia: University of Georgia Press.
- Blenkinsop, S. & Egan, K. (2009). Three “big ideas” and environmental education. In M. Mckenzie; P, Hart; H. Bail & B. Jickling (Eds.), *Fields of green: restorying culture, environment, and education* (p.85 – 94). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Cajete, G. (1994). *Look to the mountain: An ecology of indigenous education*. Durango, CO: Kivaki Press.
- Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach*. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.
- Gardner, M. (2005). *Linking activism: Ecology, social justice, and education for social change*. New York: Routledge.
- Greenwood, D. (2003). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher*. 32 (4), 2-12.
- Haluza-DeLay, R. (2013). Educating for environmental justice. In R. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon, & A. Wals (Eds), *International handbook of research on environmental education* (p. 404-408). New York: Routledge.
- hooks, B. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge
- Joseph, P. B. (2000). *Cultures of Curriculum*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Judson, G. (2010). *A new approach to ecological education: Engaging students' imaginations in their world*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kahn, R. (2010). *Critical pedagogy, ecoliteracy and planetary crisis*. NY: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.
- Martusewicz, R., Edmundson, J. & Lupinacci, J. (2011). *EcoJustice Educaiton: Toward Diverse, Democratic and Sustainable Communities*. New York, Routledge.
- Martusewicz, R., Lowenstein, E. & Voelker, L. (2010). Developing Teachers' Capacity for Ecojustice Education and Community-Based Learning. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 37(4), 99-118.
- Mies, M., Shiva, V., & Salleh, A. (2014). *Ecofeminism*. London: Zed Books.
- Ormond, C., Zandvliet, D., McClaren, M., Robertson, P., Leddy, S. & Metcalfe, S. (2014). Environmental education as teacher education: Melancholic reflections from an emerging community of practice. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 19, 160–179.
- Orr, D. W. (2004). *Earth in mind: On education, environment, and the human prospect*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Recommended Citation

- Ho, Y. C. (J.) (2015). Towards a linking activist pedagogy: Teacher activism for social-ecological justice. *SFU Ed Review 2015*. Available online at <http://www.sfuedreview.org>.