How We Are Teaching Environmental Psychology in the Era of Global Crises?

A Debate with Environmental Education

Lucas Heiki MATSUNAGA　Jacob PETERSEN

Abstract

Environmental Psychology contributes to our understanding of human-environment interactional factors. However, the current environmental crises have made it imperative to reformulate how the subject is taught in higher education. An interdisciplinary reflection on the current debates fomented by the field of environmental education might provide new insights into how to teach environmental psychology on issues related to the understanding of the impact of human behavior regarding the current crisis. The relevance of this debate is that these are two fields with limited dialogue between them with no papers giving directions on how one can contribute to the other.

[Key words: Environmental Psychology/ Environmental Education/ Teaching/ Climate Change]

Introduction

Climate change has been of great concern over the past decades as a key challenge to global governance (Magnan et al., 2021; Otero et al., 2020). Due to this highly concerning matter, states adopted targets to reduce 70% of global emissions of CO2 and other gasses by 2030 with the use of zero-carbon solutions and new markets (United Nations, 2015). However, with the United Nations Climate Change Conference 26 held in 2021, it was possible to see that states made little or even no progress in cutting down carbon emissions. This posits major threats to a variety of countries and alerts our research community to actions that would improve the current situation. Moreover, international and domestic actors are seeking solutions for sustainable development far beyond what was imagined by giving equal consideration to social, economic, and environmental concerns, thus amplifying demands and solutions associated with the current global crises (Arora & Mishra, 2021; Adebowale, 2008).

In this scenario, teaching environmental psychology might need to reflect on its tradition and focus on how to incorporate this current scenario into the curriculum of the future generation.

This would direct researchers to contribute with more critical knowledge about the new reality when formulating hypotheses and proposing policies. Although we have already seen great care of the field within this matter in research, lessons from discussions already highly developed in environmental education might be a key contribution. Since both fields could be considered interdisciplinary and commonly deal with matters related to the environment and human interactions with it, in a broad sense, this manuscript aims to enhance debate and demonstrate the possibility of an interchangeable dialogue. This is because environmental education, through the last decades, has been questioning the current paradigm on how environmental issues should be educated, going further than the common doctrine in other environmental fields. Environmental education now understands that education should not only be *about, for,* and *in* the environment; or *for* and *about* sustainability (Forsters, 2001; Jickling, 1992). Thus, by defining the main themes and terms in environmental education and exposing the evolution of this field and its debates, we propose to bring a new discussion to teaching environmental psychology as a field with great potential for criticizing and reflecting upon human behavior and its interaction with the environment.

Environmental Education

Environmental education is a field that aims to foster critical thinking and awareness about the complex and dynamic relationship between humans and the environment, in its natural, social, and cultural dimensions, through multiple approaches. Besides, it is closely related to important modern issues such as sustainability, development, and climate change. However, the understanding of what is environmental education had constant changes in its meaning over time and is also viewed differently by different authors and entities like the UN or NGOs. These different perspectives encouraged a web of debates to reduce misunderstandings and expand critical thinking, and it was encouraged both by academics and practitioners (Jickling & Spork, 1998). Although we cannot ignore traditional indigenous and aboriginal perspectives about environmental education, which are distinguished from Western views and have a long tradition through many generations (Beckfor et al., 2010), we will start arguing that the term by itself (i.e., environmental education) was formally created after the second half of the 20th century. Moreover, a great shift happened during the 1970s and 1980s when environmental education changed its primary focus from creating awareness about ecological issues and protection of the global environment to an approach with a focus on sustainable development, which we call Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), developed firstly in the World Commission on Environment and Development of the United Nations in 1987. Later, another shift in the field was made in 2005, when The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

(UNESCO) emphasized the social and economic characteristics of sustainability which led to environmental education, in 2017, to be called Education for the Sustainable Development Goals (Kopnina, 2020). In this last case, 17 goals were presented to match the UN's SDG 2030 goals by the year 2030, which were accepted by every UN member country. Those goals covered, but were not limited to, eradicating poverty, fomenting peace, justice, inclusion, and the health of our community and environment, among others (UNESCO, 2017). From this agenda, we can see that although interchangeable, not all goals are strictly centered on the green environment that environmental education was once primarily concerned with.

The concepts of environmental education

In the field of environmental education and sustainable development, it is possible to see demands for philosophical analysis of their concepts (Jickling, 1992). Although one could argue that concepts are not perfectly precise, for this same reason, their analysis is required for better clarification in the field. One issue is that the concept of environmental education has largely transformed over the years and is still under debate, especially when associated with other terms such as sustainability, or sustainable development.

In this line of argument, concept analysis is required when isolating a subject from a specific system or theory because it is necessary to verify their application in various scenarios and people's intuition about its real or hypothetical usage. At the same time, this is necessary to delimit the influence of cognitive and emotional factors that shape reasoning (Laurence & Margolis, 2003). Thus, in the following paragraphs, we will present and discuss different perspectives regarding the concepts that integrate environmental education, especially the ones that were reviewed already by Sauvé (1996) and other authors like Jickling (1992) and Lucas (1972), who helped to start structuring the theoretical and practical field of environmental education. We organized the discussion into four different parts: (1) Education, (2) Environment, (3) Education in, for, and about the environment, and (4) Sustainable Development and Education as Sustainability.

Education

Jickling (1992) argues that environmental education should be consolidated to focus firstly on the concept of education by itself. In response to that, Sauvé (1996) points to different paradigms introduced by Yves Bertrand and Valois (1992). Sauvé (1996), discusses that environmental education is strongly related to the sociocultural paradigms and that they are also related to (a) the rational educational paradigm, where the teaching approach is formally presented to establish domination over nature and its resources, by aiming for the advance of

industrialization and productivity in the modern world; (b) the humanistic educational paradigm, that focuses on education for better harmony and respect with nature, at the same time that worries about the learner's subjective necessities and particularities; and (c) the inventive educational paradigm, that searches for critical thinking and practical measures regarding problem-solving. In more recent works, the idea of critical thinking and reflection is still encouraged as described by (Tatenhove & Hegger, 2018; Scott & Avery, 2013; Sze, 2016).

Jickling (1992) claims that the mere accumulation of knowledge without critical reflection and understanding of the relationships between each issue cannot be considered proper education. According to him, it is expected that an educated person could think for themself. Thus, to establish proper education, the educated person needs to acquire knowledge, understanding, and the ability to reflect. It is also needed to highlight those practices of education in environmental education are not narrowed to the classroom, it also can target many levels and sectors of our society by any means, from debates in constitutional courts (UNESCO/UNECE, 2007) to the creation of monuments in highly affected areas by natural hazards (UNESCO, 1990).

Environment

Sauvé (1996) argues that there are six different conceptions in terms of discourse about what environment can be represented in environmental education such as (a) environment as nature to be praised and respected; (b) environment as a resource that can be managed and needs an understanding of its limits; (c) environment as a problem, that needs solutions for its preservation; (d) environment as a place to live, where we should learn how to live in harmony; (e) environment as the biosphere, or a self-regulating organism where is possible to see the interdependence between each creature and thing, and that lead to a multidimensional analysis about the interactions with the world; and (d) environment as a community project, that needs to be evolved with critical analysis by every citizen.

Even with different definitions coexisting, these concepts about the environment can be beneficial in helping people develop a broader view of the complexity of the object in question. Each conception has a specific strand with social movements and investigative approaches over time. For example, an environmental psychologist, who will be discussed later, could be more inclined, although not limited, to view the environment as the notion of a place to live and to learn about how to live in it, because of the focus on the analysis of behavioral change and the relationship between humans and its spaces (Gifford, 2007). On the other hand, the global education movement or the earth education movement claimed to adhere to a more biospheric view of the environment. Sauvé (1996) argues that cumulative knowledge about what is the environment helps to create a more comprehensive understanding of environmental education

approaches.

Education in, for, about the environment

Originally introduced in his doctoral thesis, Lucas (1972), proposed three paths in environmental education: (a) Education about the environment; (b) education in the environment; and (c) education for the environment. This classification is very important to consider when predicting which direction teaching environmental psychology might be leading. According to Le Grange (2003), education *about* the environment is regarded as the spread of knowledge, mainly through an authority figure. The content of the knowledge is embedded in natural systems and their mechanisms, focusing on a vocational ideological position that aims to prepare learners for specific jobs and tasks for their activities. Le Grange (2003) also argues that this approach, in isolation and not critically, can also encourage social problems regarding injustice and inequalities at all levels. Education *in* the environment refers to activities mainly conducted in the fieldwork with sensory awareness and contact with specific surroundings, mostly in natural settings. In this sense, it aims to improve learners' experience with the environment through liberal and progressive remarks. These last characteristics push education as a means for preparing someone's life and its merits. Lastly, education *for* the environment on the other hand is socially critical and requires co-investigation from learners who educate them through active learning, involvement, and exploration to reach specific goals in environmental education.

According to Jickling & Spork (1998), environmental education was generally considered to be *for* the environment. Although Le Grange (2003) defends that this path is socially critical, Jickling & Spork (1998) made a critique stating that the use of environmental education *for* the environment as a slogan or promotional tool can diminish critical analysis and also associate this knowledge with a specific political agenda. Jickling (1992) also argues that education, in this case, cannot be a tool for making people act in some way. According to this author`s view, it would be necessary to be against any education *for* anything, which according to him, leads to a rigid mode of thinking. He argues that people should know about the issues that exist in the ecocentric and anthropocentric worldviews. Jickling's arguments about how education should not focus on conformity are in line with other pedagogical scholars, (Freire, 1970; Hooks, 1994; Giroux, 2001; McLaren, 2015; and Shor 1996). Therefore, in this sense, he defends that knowledge could not be oriented and the term needs a re-examination to better fit in the field of education. This might be in confronting a current focus on understanding pro-environmental attitudes and how to change those attitudes in others to promote pro-environmental behavior, which might not pass-through critical analysis while leading research in environmental psychology to correspond to a specific political agenda.

Recently, scholars have also emphasized the importance of incorporating place-based education and community-based learning into environmental education (e.g., Smith, 2007; Stevenson, 2007), while others have focused on the need to cultivate a sense of environmental responsibility and action in students (e.g., Stapp & Zint, 2005; Wals & Corcoran, 2012). Additionally, there has been increasing attention to the role of social justice and equity in environmental education (e.g., Martinez-Alier et al., 2010; Roberts, 2011). Overall, this body of discussion on environmental education has emphasized the need to connect environmental issues with social, economic, and political contexts, but primarily to promote critical thinking.

Sustainable Development and Education as Sustainability

The relationship between sustainable development and environmental education has to do with its aim for better strategies to deal with natural resources and valorization of equity and durability (Sauvé, 1996). In this sense, the international community sees that since sustainable development is the main goal for humankind, environmental education should be oriented towards this aim and provide efforts to achieve it. But both the concept of sustainable development and the definition regarding the relationship between it and environmental education are diverse.

Separately, sustainable development can be described as continuous development based on free trade and advances in technology and legislation. Moreover, sustainable development can also be seen from three different perspectives: (a) the development dependence on production and order, where free market and the advance of technology will bring necessary development, but needs concomitantly the rearrangement of political and social structure; (b) an alternative development, which changes the focus from consumerist society into a more environmental centered community that should be started from a regional process; or (c) an autonomous development, which is based on the respect of the indigenous collective view regarding development, centered in their cultural practices and traditional knowledge (Sauvé, 1996). Furthermore, Sauvé (1996) highlights differences in the relationship between the concept of sustainable development and environmental education as follows (a) sustainable development as the main goal for environmental education; (b) sustainable development as specific objectives that should be considered by environmental education; (c) sustainable development as part of the implicit meaning in environmental education; and (d) education about sustainable development where this last one is the focus of critical analysis.

Forster (2001) includes another possible alternative when he titled one work as education as sustainability. The initial argument is that despite the many attempts and necessities to operationalize the term and create a range of indicators to measure sustainability, the

baseline criterion of authors towards this concept is that humans, because of their actions and characteristics, demand constant natural regeneration of their environment. Indicators by themselves need interpretations and to be put in context, also they are not based on a cultural void. Thus, in complementation with Jickling (1992), Foster (2001) argues that education cannot be an instrument for sustainability or sustainable development goals. The author promotes a form of a constant learning society for making environmental education culturally and institutionally mature as a means for sustainability. Universities are an example of that because they provide a central locus for critical and sustainable environmental thinking and might have a natural dialogue with external institutions to improve decision making (Foster, 2001). In that sense, education by itself is sustainable if we aim for a society with constant learning, adding that education can also be an end by itself, not as a means for any goal.

A Short History of Environmental Psychology and Its Concepts

In general terms, we could define environmental psychology as a branch of behavioral sciences that aims to develop investigations regarding the relationship between a person and the socio and physical environment, being the last either natural or built (Russell & Ward, 1982, Stokols and Altman, 1987). But Günther (2009) points out that in the field, like environmental education, the definition is not in its final form. At some points in history, the field lacked definition as he quotes a phrase from Proshansky, Ittelson & Rivlin (1970) that "*Environmental psychology is what environmental psychologists do*". Along with that, the author also argues that there is a debate if more theoretical or empirical work is necessary for its development as a field of science. Other names for the field of environmental psychology would also appear, for example, Moser and Uzzell (2003) argue that there could not be a difference between the psychology of space and environmental psychology.

The term by itself started in some way with *Psychologie der umwelt*, with Willy Hellpach (1924), one of the students of Wilhelm Wundt, father of experimental psychology. However, according to Günther (2009), Hellpach tried to keep a distance from the experimental approach in psychology, which lacked focus on the "factual environment". His works consisted of analyses regarding the effects of climatic and geographical effects on human activities. Moreover, he also studied the effects of extreme environments, crowding, overstimulation, and other interesting topics with a large number of manuscripts (Günther, 2009). But it can be seen that the movement of investigations was not towards the environment, or a certain "pro-environmental" psychology. They were to verify the effects of the environment on human behavior and psychology. Nowadays, instead, we could argue that science is more worried about investigating the impact of human behavior on the environment. Thus, we could understand the field as not

rigid and with potentialities for change, especially in its form for teaching and corresponding to current demands, especially from global environmental crises, which are related to human behavior.

One important thing to note is that environmental psychology is not the only field that studies the relationship between environment and behavior as postulated by Günther (2009). Other fields have the same line of study such as environmental sociology, urban anthropology, social geography, urban planning, economics, and, especially, environmental education. But at the time of Günther's paper, these fields did not pay much attention to the experience of users of those environments. In contrast with these other fields, the main subjects of research in environmental psychology include cognition, attitudes, performance, and group behavior, for example (Altman, 1976). Because of that, according to Günther (2009), environmental psychology can be defined as "a conglomerate of setting variates, each of which represents a reciprocal relationship between a group of variables that describes the behavior and a group of variables that describe environments" (p. 2).

Also, because many publications in environmental psychology aim for concrete changes in human behavior through environmental design, Günther (2009) criticizes some definitions of environmental psychology as only problem-centered, by recapitulating Kurt Lewin's (1951) quote that "*There is nothing so practical as a good theory*", or in other words, that theory is essentially needed to be well designed in the field before real implications for practical reality.

Environment and Places in Environmental Psychology

Like in environmental education, the clarification of what is the "environment" in environmental psychology is an important step to understanding how it aligns with environmental education. To begin with, in the early stages, environmental psychology had a holistic viewpoint due to influences from Gestalt Psychology which made impressions on authors such as Kurt Lewin, previously mentioned, where authors in this field considered the configuration of the environment as the most important aspect of how we act in the world (Pol, 2006). Günther (2009) also highlights that the concept of environment comes in different levels, from physical objects of our daily life to specific spaces in which people act; the author continues by arguing that there is not a linear continuum across these levels, because they also estimate reciprocal relationships where physical objects could delimit spaces and vice versa.

David Canter (1997), although also inclined towards an environmental psychology term, also calls one of his books about environmental psychology "The Psychology of Place". In the preface, he argues that his investigation wants to make comprehension on "*how people make sense of and cope with their surroundings, whether it be nature trails or nursery schools,*

crowded kitchens or city centers… the notions which we have of the places we experience"(*p.* ix). In this sense, we are discussing the places where people make their existence and transform them also with mental processes such as "*mental maps*" and "*urban images*". Thus, investigations about the environment, in this field, should also take into account the representations that people have about their surroundings.

Behavioral analysis or "behaviorism" is a classical branch of psychology that commonly defines the environment as a setting where the behavior occurs and produces consequences, but that can also be a stimulus for immediate responses (Skinner, 1966). This view does not take into account cognition because of the particular epistemological reasons of this branch. But we could consider that environmental psychology does not share the same bases, being more related to cognitive sciences, considering how the world is perceived and processed is an important factor for analysis and contribution to the development of the field. At the same time, it is distinct from basic experimental psychology, which examines environmental cognition in terms of object perception, colors, and other characteristics (Canter, 1997). Thus, environmental psychology is centered on the meaningfulness of places, where people act and have specific activities in their daily lives. Places, in this case, impact our perception and behavior, and how we perceive the changes in our actions. Canter (1997), made a distinction between places and objects, where context shapes our experience, but at the same time, our way of thinking about it modifies our perception of the context.

An important idea in environmental psychology is the theory of affordances developed by James Gibson in the late 1970s. Although Gibson could not be considered an environmental psychologist, because, at the time he was not participating in this new branch, he did exercise great influence in the theoretical part of the field (Pol, 2006). Pol (2006) continues to argue that there is a property in the environment, called affordance, that offers or provides something for the being that interacts with it. Man changes matter for a purpose and his purpose is to change its affordance, to make the environment more beneficial instead of damaging it. Thus, what we call an artificial environment is no less an environment that is modified by man for his convenience. The same goes for the social-cultural environment, highlighting that the author has a holistic view of what is the environment. Gibson (1977) also gives a view that humans intrinsically depend on the world where they live and they need constant interactions with it.

To provide more arguments for this concept, humans when interacting with objects, do not pay attention to their qualities, but their affordance. For example, before examining the fundamental characteristics of a chair, its color, shape, and material, we are guided by the meaning of the object, by its affordance that could be to rest but may go beyond. Gibson (1977) gives the example of a simple surface that affords posture, locomotion, collision, et cetera. Other

people also can generate affordance by simply behaving, in other words, someone will behave in a certain way because of the perceived behavior of others that affords him, i.e. a person sitting on the previously described chair that others are using to sit on as well. Gibson posits that other humans are ecological objects too, but of course, different from ordinary objects. A place, as Canter (1977) mentioned, is also different from a simple object and is where the habitat of beings is placed. And each place can have its affordance. For example, some places could be regions where someone can find comfort and warmth, others not. Objects or places can also afford both negative and positive things. A knife, as an example by Gibson (1997), both affords to cut as a tool but also affords injuries if not used properly.

Environmental Psychology and Sustainability

Günther (2009) suggests that the future of environmental psychology should rely on turning the aim of its investigations into global thinking at the same time he argues that environmental psychology, because of its interdisciplinary and multi-methodological position, can greatly explain the impact of behavior on environmental transformations. Environmental psychology, according to him, also has a special task of clarifying which behavioral changes should be done to achieve sustainability. Thus, environmental psychology has a link with environmental education, but in terms of focusing on behavior and its interaction with the environment. However, it should be discussed if its direction might be seen as more normative, than critical. In other words, environmental psychology might be concerned with how to modify behavior in a certain way, and not mainly focused on potentializing critical thinking and behaviors that are based on this rationalization. As an example, recent publications for example, in the Journal of Environment Psychology, stress its focus on seeking solutions for sustainability, pro-eventual behavior, and climate issues (e.g. Maertens et al, 2020; Puntiroli & Bezençon, 2020). But, according to Pol (2007), the question of environmental concern is not something new in environmental psychology, with research being made with this intersection since the ’60s. Furthermore, it was between 1987 and 1992 that the volume of literature and conferences with this intersection increased with articles investigating attitudes and behaviors towards the use of limited environmental resources.

Another point is that because of the interest of students and professors regarding ecology and environmental management, environmental psychology as a field spread and developed with modern demands of sustainability. After the Rio Summit and the Brundtland report, Pol (2007) verified that environmental psychology was leading *for* sustainability. In other words, the field was challenged to help create a sustainable world and the focus now began to understand people's behavior and its relation to deterioration at the same time that research findings could

provide strategic solutions to overcome these problems.

Discussion

We verified that education only exists with beings that reflect upon knowledge. The aim of many environmental sciences like environmental psychology center education to mediate or improve how to understand the relationship between humans and environments, or also, the experience of understanding the influence of one another. With that, environmental psychology can provide better ways to improve people's lives and solve practical problems related to human-environment interactions. Along with that, environmental psychology might need more academic discussions on how to make teaching environmental psychology sustainable and how to improve critical thinking about the current world in our area. A search on databases shows the lack of reflection in which the curriculum is taking. This can be visualized more practically when thinking about teaching environmental psychology to the new generation of scientists in the field, who should not only formulate studies based on the current international agenda (e.g., studies for SDGs) but also by critical thinking of its practices and understanding of the constant changes in our word. This also includes education of the past generations that should question which direction they were conducting the field so far. Thus, based on the current debates on environmental education, in a morally diverse world and this critical moment, how we could solve ethical, social, and environmental challenges needs reflection on the values that we carry before any decision. Thus, as in the field of environmental education, where this kind of teaching might have various directions (i.e., education *for, in, about*, and as sustainability), we need to encourage more debate about what are the directions in teaching environmental psychology, which includes systematization of the syllabus in various representatives universities in the world or thematizing international conferences on this issue. Finding these meanings would help to guide the development of environmental psychology not only for concrete solutions to our current world but at least to encourage a plural and critical debate about where we are heading. Table 1 summarizes the main discussion regarding environmental education and environmental psychology.

Some authors in environmental education, like Kopnina (2020), have argued that the

Table 1.

Summary of findings and discussion about Environmental Education and Environmental Psychology.

Aspect	Environmental Education	Environmental Psychology
Education	There are different approaches on how to teach like in the environment, for the environment, about the environment, and as sustainability.	Focuses on the role of education in understanding and improving human-environment interactions
Understanding of the environment	Has multiple conceptions of the environment, such as nature, resource, problem, place, biosphere, and community project.	Has a holistic view of the environment as a place where behavior interacts with, including physical, social, and cultural aspects, and considers the affordances and meanings of places.
Approach	Has a critical and diverse perspective by questioning, challenging, and reflecting on environmental issues, problems, and solutions, and considering multiple perspectives, values, and evidence for the education of current and future generations	Has a problem-solving and applied perspective on the concept of sustainability and its implications for environmental behavior. The ability to reason, judge, and decide about human-environment interactions, while including notions about cognition, affection, and social factors that influence environmental behavior.
Contribution to each other field	Environmental education can contribute to environmental psychology by providing insights into the debates and challenges of educating for sustainability, the diversity of worldviews and values that shape environmental issues, and the need to question the assumptions and goals of environmental psychology research and practice.	Environmental psychology can contribute to environmental education by providing theories and methods to understand and measure human-environment interactions, the cognitive and affective processes that influence environmental attitudes and behaviors, and the effects of environmental design and feedback on learning and action.
Contribution to climate change mitigation	Promotes critical thinking and reflection on the human-environment interaction and the values and goals of sustainability, while stimulating awareness through quality-based argumentation and constant debate about the current crisis.	Promotes evidence-based prescriptions and descriptions of human-environmental behavior towards the climate and pro-environmental issues.

term Education for Sustainable Development Goals should be considered carefully, due to its "*unreflective acceptance of the SDGs as a universal good*". Although reached through international consensus and with clear benefits for our current world, we should remember that this attempt to universalize what is good or bad for our future has become a noncritical mainstream discourse. Moreover, we should remember that this idea passed through many changes over time and also gives an opportunity for new reformulations for advancement. In other words, although the end goal of SDGs seems important for the maintenance of our community and planet, their strategies and means also need to be questioned because of the

role of education itself, which if sustainable, should encourage constant critical thinking even towards ideas that seems as universally accepted. This is especially needed when thinking about the current global challenges that impose a constant need to reformulate our strategies for dealing with environmental problems, for example.

Kopnina (2020) recalls how nature is an educator per se and how many other worldviews, theories, and approaches exist as alternatives that also aim for better relations between us and the environment. Thus, educators, when teaching environmental psychology and how it can contribute to our current environmental concerns, might be interested in exploring diversity, reflection, and encouraging debate on how we understand the experience between human behavior and the environment while questioning its tradition, not to delegitimize it, but to make teaching also sustainable for the future of our field.

Conclusions

In this manuscript, it was highlighted how environmental education has been developed as a field of constant debate and critical thinking, with careful examination of the paths of education taken by practitioners. We argued that this examination in the field of environmental psychology is also beneficial to teaching the subject in universities and other places, to potentialize academics, researchers, practitioners, and interested ones to develop hypotheses, studies, and solutions more consonant with reality's challenges that are transformed constantly each day due to our global and alarming challenges. Thus, although not the case, a static acceptance of education in environmental psychology, when discussing the current global challenges, as a subject only for SDGs or for the environment, without questioning other paths, might not open new reformulations needed. As viewed before, environmental psychology is a field with great interdisciplinary attributions with a complex evolution that is preoccupied with reality transformation along with academic advancement. However, we open the debate for reflections on what paths education in environmental psychology is being taken and foment awareness of debates done in environmental education to improve the education in our field. In that sense, we take the initiative to encourage transdisciplinary bridges between environmental education and environmental psychology.

References

Adebowale, M. (2008). Understanding environmental justice: Making the connection between sustainable development and social justice. In G. Craig, T. Burchardt, & D. Gordon (Eds.), Social Justice and Public Policy: Seeking Fairness in Diverse Societies (pp. 251-275). Bristol University Press. doi:10.46692/9781847423535.013

Altman, I. (1976). Environmental psychology and social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 2*(2), 96-113.

Arora, N. K., & Mishra, I. (2021). COP26: more challenges than achievements. *Environmental Sustainability, 4,* 585-588.

Bertrand, Y. & Valois, P. (1992). École et sociétés. Montréal: Éditions Agence d'Arc.

Canter, D. (1977). *The psychology of place.* St Martin's Press.

Foster, J. (2001). Education as sustainability. *environmental education Research, 7*(2), 153-165.Russell, J. A., & Ward, L. M. (1982). Environmental psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology, 33*(1), 651-689.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Continuum.

Gibson, J. J. (1977). The theory of affordances. The People, Place, and Space Reader. *Hilldale, USA, 1*(2). p.56-60.

Gifford, R. (2007). Environmental psychology: Principles and practice.

Günther, H. (2009). The environmental psychology of research. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 29*(3), 358-365.

Hellpach, W. (1924). Psychologie der umwelt. Urban & Schwarzenberg.

Jickling, B., & Spork, H. (1998). Education for the environment: A critique. *Environmental education Research, 4*(3), 309-327.

Jickling, B. (1992). Why I don't want my children to be educated for sustainable development. *The Journal of Environmental Education, 23*(4), 5-8.

Kopnina, H. (2020). Education for the future? Critical evaluation of education for sustainable development goals. *The Journal of Environmental Education,* 1-12.

Laurence, S., & Margolis, E. (2003). Concepts and conceptual analysis. *Philosophy and phenomenological research, 67*(2), 253-282.

Le Grange, L. (2003). Opportunities that the South African OBE curriculum framework provides for addressing environmental concerns. *Education as change, 7*(1), 34-49.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science: selected theoretical papers (Edited by Dorwin Cartwright.).

Maertens, R., Anseel, F., & van der Linden, S. (2020). Combating climate change misinformation: Evidence for the longevity of inoculation and consensus messaging effects. *Journal of environmental psychology,* 101455.

Magnan, A. K., Pörtner, H. O., Duvat, V. K., Garschagen, M., Guinder, V. A., Zommers, Z., ... & Gattuso, J. P. (2021). Estimating the global risk of anthropogenic climate change. *Nature Climate Change, 11*(10), 879-885.

Martinez-Alier, J., Pascual, U., Vivien, F. D., & Zaccai, E. (2010). Sustainable de-growth: Mapping the context, criticisms, and prospects of an emergent paradigm. Ecological Economics, 69(9), 1741-1747.

McLaren, P. (2015). Pedagogy of Insurrection: From Resurrection to Revolution. New York: Peter Lang.

Moser, G., & Uzzell, D. (2003). Environmental psychology. In: I.B. Weiner (Series Ed.), Th. Millon, M.J. Lerner (Vol. Ed.), Handbook of psychology: Vol 5. Personality and social psychology (pp. 419–445). New York: Wiley.

Otero, I., Farrell, K. N., Pueyo, S., Kallis, G., Kehoe, L., Haberl, H., ... & Pe'Er, G. (2020). Biodiversity policy beyond economic growth. *Conservation letters, 13*(4), e12713.

Pol, E. (2006). Blueprints for a history of environmental psychology (I): From first birth to American transition. *Medio ambiente y comportamiento humano, 7*(2), 95-113.

Pol, E. (2007). Blueprints for a history of environmental psychology (II): From architectural psychology to the challenge of sustainability. *Medio Ambiente y Comportamiento Humano, 8*(1/2), 1-28.

Puntiroli, M., & Bezençon, V. (2020). Feedback devices help only environmentally concerned people act pro-environmentally over time. *Journal of environmental psychology, 70*, 101459.

Roberts, J. T. (2011). Environmental justice and environmentalism. In T. L. Richardson & W. T. Coates (Eds.), Environmental justice and market mechanisms: Key challenges for environmental laws and policy (pp. 21-44). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Sauvé, L. (1996). Environmental education and sustainable development: A further appraisal. Canadian *Journal of Environmental Education, 1*, 7-34.

Scott, J. C., & Avery, D. (2013). Foreword. In D. J. Friesen, D. L. Anderson, & A. J. Roberts (Eds.), Environmental education: Encountering the other of nature (pp. xi–xiii). SUNY Press.

Smith, G. A. (2007). Place-based education: Learning to be where we are. Phi Delta Kappan, 89(1), 14-20.

Sommer, R., & Olsen, H. (1980). The soft classroom. *Environment and Behavior, 12*(1), 3-16.

Stapp, W. B., & Zint, M. T. (2005). Educating for a sustainable future: The role of transformative learning. In P. C. Ryan (Ed.), Cross-curricular approaches to teaching and learning (pp. 75-93). Sage Publications.

Stevenson, R. B. (2007). Schooling and environmental education: Contradictions in purpose and practice. environmental education Research, 13(2), 139-153.

Skinner, B. F. (1966). What is the experimental analysis of behavior? *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior, 9*(3), 213.

Stokols, D., Altman, I. (Eds.), Handbook of environmental psychology, Introduction, vol 1, Wiley, New York (1987), pp.1-4

Sze, J. (2016). Noxious New York: The racial politics of urban health and environmental justice. MIT Press.

Tatenhove, J. V., & Hegger, D. L. T. (2018). Environmental governance: Power and knowledge in a local–global world. Routledge.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (n.d.). What is Climate Change? Retrieved from https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/what-is-climate-change [Accessed on 19th January 2023].

United Nations. Paris Agreement to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Dec. 12, 2015, T.I.A.S. No. 16-1104.

UNESCO/UNECE (2007) Good Practices in Education for Sustainable Development in the UNECE region, Education for Sustainable Development in Action Good Practices.

UNESCO. (2017). Education for sustainable development goals. Retrieved from https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/report/2017/thesustainabledevelopmentgoalsreport2017.pdf

Uzzell, D. (2015). Obituary: Terry Lee. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 44, 160-161.

Wals, A. E. J., & Corcoran, P. B. (Eds.). (2012). Learning for sustainability in times of accelerating change. Wageningen Academic Publishers.

（Matsunaga, Lucas Heiki Department of International Environment and Resources Policy, GSICS）

（Petersen, Jacob Department of International Environment and Resources Policy, GSICS）