

 Open access • Journal Article • DOI:10.1080/13504622.2011.633162

Learning from sustainable development: education in the light of public issues

— [Source link](#) 

Katrien Van Poeck, Joke Vandenabeele





Institutions: Catholic University of Leuven

Published on: 04 Jul 2012 - Environmental Education Research (Routledge)

Topics: Education for sustainable development, Sustainable development, Sustainability and Environmental education

Related papers:

- [Globalization and environmental education: looking beyond sustainable development](#)
- [On the need to repoliticise environmental and sustainability education: rethinking the postpolitical consensus](#)
- [Between Knowing What Is Right and Knowing that Is It Wrong to Tell Others What Is Right: On Relativism, Uncertainty and Democracy in Environmental and Sustainability Education.](#)
- [Education for sustainable development \(ESD\): the turn away from 'environment' in environmental education?](#)
- [It Takes Two to Tango: Studying How Students Constitute Political Subjects in Discourses on Sustainable Development.](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/learning-from-sustainable-development-education-in-the-light-2su8h7mbx0>

To cite this article: Katrien Van Poeck & Joke Vandenabeele (2012): Learning from sustainable development: education in the light of public issues, *Environmental Education Research*, 18:4, 541-552

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2011.633162>

Learning from sustainable development. Education in the light of public issues.

Education for sustainable development (ESD) plays an increasing role in environmental education policy and practice. In this article, we show how sustainable development is mainly seen as a goal that can be achieved by applying the proper processes of learning and how this learning perspective translates sustainability issues into learning problems of individuals. We present a different perspective on education for sustainable development and emphasize the importance of presenting issues of sustainable development as 'public issues', i.e. as matters of public concern. This shifts the focus from the competences that citizens must acquire to the democratic nature of the spaces and practices in which participation and citizenship can develop.

Keywords: ESD; democracy; participation; citizenship; socialization; subjectification

Introduction

Since the publication of the Brundtland Report (WCED 1987), sustainable development has played an increasing role in environmental education policy and practice. Education for sustainable development (ESD)ⁱ is primarily policy-driven, highly influenced by decisions made in international institutions (Jickling and Wals 2007; Nomura and Abe 2009). Nevertheless, opinions concerning the desirability of ESD as a new focal point for environmental education are sharply divided (e.g. Jickling 1994; Sauvé 1996; Sauvé 1999; Smyth 1999; González-Gaudio 1999; Huckle 1999; Gough and Scott 1999; Foster 2001; Scott 2002; Sauvé and Berryman 2005; Selby 2006; Jickling and Wals 2007; Chapman 2007; Sumner 2008; Gadotti 2008; Bajaj and Chiu 2009; Mogensen and Schnack 2010). Critics have raised the concern that education *for* sustainable development – like education *for* anything else – reduces education to a mere instrument for promoting a specific kind of

‘sustainable’ behaviour (Jickling 1994). At the core of this debate is the problematic relationship between democracy and sustainable development (Læssøe 2007). In February 2010, this journal devoted a special issue to the meaning of democracy and values in relation to environmental and sustainability education. Sustainability issues are situated in a field of tension between the personal and the political, as almost every ‘private’ decision has ‘public’ consequences and social conditions affect individuals’ freedom of choice. They have far-reaching implications and require a democratic approach based on participation. Yet it is by no means obvious that citizen participation will enhance sustainability and serve ‘the common good’. Læssøe (2007) emphasizes that there are no simple and obvious ways in which this tension may be resolved. Wals (2010) highlights this as a paradox between the sense of urgency emerging from a deep concern about the state of the planet and the conviction that it is wrong to persuade people to adopt pre- and expert-determined ways of thinking and acting. In this article, we address the issue of democracy in ESD, focusing on how educational practices can deal with this unsolvable tension.

As part of a PhD study on the challenge posed to environmental education practices by growing policy attention for ESD, we conducted an exploratory study of the literature in order to grasp the academic debate between advocates and opponents of ESD. We analyzed 64 references, for the most part articles published in disciplinary journalsⁱⁱ but also papers from journals with an interdisciplinary or educational sciences focus, conference papers, and books. References were selected in those disciplinary journals as well as by consulting the Web of Science, using key words such as ‘ESD’, ‘education for sustainable development’, ‘sustainable development’ or ‘sustainability’ combined with ‘education’ or ‘learning’, ‘DESD’ and ‘Decade of education for sustainable development’. Furthermore, the reference lists of

selected sources yielded additional references. This analysis did not only clarify the diverse points of view on the relationship between environmental education and ESD, but it also drew our attention to the argument advanced by many authors that education in the context of sustainable development is closely linked to citizenship and requires both an individual and a collective focus (Jickling and Wals 2007; Breiting 2009; Mogensen and Schnack 2010; Jensen and Schnack 1997; Rätzkel and Uzzell 2009; Huckle 1993; Huckle 1999; Orr 2002; Gadotti 2008). The latter is particularly relevant in the context of this PhD research, which is part of ongoing research at the Laboratory for Education and Society, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. The aim of the Laboratory is to articulate new and highly diverse societal challenges through the development of theory (by forming concepts and language). Research at the Laboratory starts from the observation that fundamental transformations are taking place in society as well as in educational sciences and its disciplines. As a consequence, educational theory and practice face important challenges. The educator is confronted with developments and practices in which the question on how to live, both individually and socially, is posed anew. The Laboratory discusses problems and questions related to education, not as private and individual matters, but always as public concerns.

From this perspective, we want to contribute to the debate on the democratic paradox in ESD. As we will explain below, we did not find the necessary concepts and arguments in the ESD and environmental education literature. Therefore, we explored the literature about democracy, citizenship and civic learning. This analysis is theoretically anchored in the distinction made by Lawy and Biesta (2006) between a ‘citizenship-as-achievement’ and ‘citizenship-as-practice’ approach. We first show how the dominant discourse on ESD translates issues of sustainable development into

the traditional concept of ‘citizenship-as-achievement’, defining these issues as learning problems faced by individuals and reinforcing an instrumental relationship between learning, citizenship, and democracy. In the second part of this article, we analyze how Biesta but also Todd and Säfström criticize this ‘citizenship-as-achievement’ perspective. Drawing on Jacques Rancière’s and Chantal Mouffe’s democracy theories, they present vital insights for a radically different perspective that is based on a process of subjectification rather than socialization. Third, we show how these insights can offer a new perspective for ESD. We argue that presenting sustainable development issues as ‘public issues’, as matters of public concern, allows educational practices to move beyond socialization and to experiment with the tension between a sense of urgency and the need for democratic participation.

Citizenship-as-achievement

There is a tendency in contemporary society to frame processes of social change as a challenge for individuals to acquire the proper knowledge, behaviour and competences (Simons and Masschelein 2010; Biesta 2004). Education experts are deployed and the learning of individuals as well as groups and communities emerges as a solution for numerous problems (Wildemeersch and Vandenabeele 2007). This applies to sustainable development in particular. UNESCO’s (2005) International Implementation Scheme for the Decade of ESD (DESD) states that the general target of ESD is to foster the values and principles of sustainable development and to promote corresponding behavioural changes.

The overall goal of the DESD is to integrate the principles, values, and practices of sustainable development into all aspects of education and learning. This educational effort will encourage changes in behaviour that will create a more sustainable future in terms of environmental integrity, economic viability, and a just society for present and future generations.” (UNESCO 2005, 6)

A similar interpretation is reflected in the UNECE Strategy for ESD, which defines ESD as a ‘prerequisite for achieving sustainable development’ (UNECE 2005, 1). In the international policy discourse on ESD, issues of sustainable development are thus mainly seen as matters of individual learning, as problems that can be tackled by applying the proper learning strategies.

The view that ESD is an effective tool in changing individual behaviour (Paden and Chhokar 2007) is equally prevalent in the academic literature, which suggests that educators should develop “strategies to help [...] people to choose more sustainable options” (Monroe 2007, 108). Nevertheless, others argue that the purpose of education is not to contribute to solving specific sustainability problems here and now by promoting particular behavioural outcomes but that it should aim at the ‘empowerment’ of active, critical, and independent citizens that are able to decide for themselves and to participate in democratic decision-making (Jickling and Wals 2007; Breiting 2009; Mogensen and Schnack 2010; Jensen and Schnack 1997; Huckle 1999; Huckle 2008). Breiting (2009, 200) distinguishes between these two approaches as follows:

We still see major research contributions in the environmental education research field building on the idea that environmental education is about ‘manipulating’ learners and grownups into becoming individuals exhibiting ‘correct attitudes and behaviours’ related to the environment following a ‘treatment’ or an ‘intervention’ with the necessary tools by the teacher or through an environmental education programme. While the terms used here are deliberately stark, the key issue they articulate is the discrepancy between the idea that environmental education should foster active, critical and independent citizens and other views that position learners as marionettes for the good intentions of environmentalists or environmental educators.

However, within this scope of active citizenship the emphasis is also on qualification and on fostering particular outcomes. Here, this is articulated in the expectation that education can qualify people for the role of active participant and provide them with the proper learning experience to democratically achieve

sustainability. This is particularly – though not exclusively – the case in the ‘action competence approach’ to environmental education and ESD (Jensen and Schnack 1997; Breiting 2009; Mogensen and Schnack 2010).

[...] one key role for ESD in an action competence approach becomes that of developing the students’ ability, motivation and desire to play an active role in finding democratic solutions to problems and issues connected to sustainable development. The challenge for ESD in this perspective is to identify what kind of learning can qualify the learners’ sound choices in a reality that is often characterised by complexity and uncertainty, and which also motivates them to be active citizens who are able to set the agenda for changes if necessary. In this sense, sustainable development is more a matter of democratic citizenship than compliance and individual behaviour – and ESD is in a never-ending process of learning about how to qualify the participants to cope with this citizenship role in a sensible way. (Mogensen and Schnack 2010, 68-69)

However, translating education into a process of qualification and of teaching people how to behave as active participants in a democratic society is not unproblematic.

This learning perspective is closely linked to what Lawy and Biesta (2006) have called ‘citizenship-as-achievement’, i.e. the idea that citizenship is a status that individuals can only achieve by moving through a particular learning trajectory.

Citizenship is thus pinned down to a particular set of knowledge, attitudes and skills and a lack of these can serve as a ground for excluding people from involvement. At the core of this view is what Biesta (2011a) calls a ‘socialization conception’ of civic learning. Everyone has to be socialized into the same standard and this standard is ultimately based on a cluster of knowledge claims: “knowledge about what a good citizen is; knowledge about what a good citizen needs to learn; and knowledge about how individuals can learn to become good citizens” (Biesta 2011a, 142). The meaning of citizenship as an essentially contested concept is ignored, and the space for marginalized voices and for alternative arguments and points of view is limited.

In the next section of the paper, we explore the views put forward by Biesta, Todd and Säfström, who developed a concept of education and citizenship that turns this dominant socialization perspective upside down. Whereas the argument proposed

by the socialization approach to civic learning is that we need proper learning as individual citizens in order to develop a better democracy, Biesta suggests “that we need more and better democracy in order to get better citizens” (Biesta 2011b, 8) Within such a ‘citizenship-as-practice’ perspective (Lawy and Biesta 2006), the focus is no longer on the competences that citizens must achieve, but on the democratic nature of the spaces and practices in which citizenship can develop.

Citizenship-as-practice

In a special issue of ‘Studies in Philosophy and Education’ on ‘Education, Conflict and the Political’ (Ruitenberg 2011), Biesta, Todd and Säfström draw on the democracy theories developed by Jacques Rancière and Chantal Mouffe as they try to move beyond a socialization perspective on citizenship education. Vital to this attempt is (1) Rancière’s radical interpretation of equality, (2) both authors’ understanding of democracy as a disruption of the existing order and (3) their emphasis on the importance of dissensus. Within the context of this article, we draw on these three crucial theoretical aspects but do not discuss these theories extensively.

Rancière’s egalitarian view is reflected in his definition of democracy as “the power of those who have no specific qualification for ruling, except the fact of having no qualification” (Rancière 2004, 305 in Simons and Masschelein 2010, 593). Mouffe and Rancière both emphasize the limitations of an ‘ordered’ understanding of democratic politics (Biesta 2011a). For Rancière (1999; 1995b), democratic politics should be understood as a process of ‘subjectification’ through which new ways of doing and being come into existence. Subjectification differs from identification, which is a process of taking up an identity within the existing order. Subjectification, on the other hand, always involves ‘disidentification’, embracing a way of being that

had no place in the existing order of things. Subjectification is therefore a supplement to this order (Rancière 2003), because it adds something to it and, in doing so, also divides the existing order. Although Mouffe (1993) recognizes the importance of order for the everyday democratic conduct of our lives, she stresses that any political order can only exist because of a division between 'inside' and 'outside'. This division is itself the most fundamental political 'moment'. Those placed outside the political community, Mouffe (2005) argues, are not excluded because they lack rationality or morality but because their political values are different from those held by insiders. The fact that some are included and others are excluded is thus political in nature. It is the effect of power, of the particular hegemonic construction of inside and outside. However Mouffe (2005, 120) does not advocate "pluralism without any frontiers", considering all demands in a given society legitimate. The boundaries of the democratic community, she argues, are based on a conflictual "consensus about the ethico-political values of liberty and equality for all" (Mouffe 2005, 120), i.e. a consensus about those values and the possibility of dissent about the interpretation of them. Mouffe thus separates those who plainly reject these values and those who recognize them but are willing to struggle about the interpretation. Rancière is more radical, in claiming that the essence of democratic politics is the participation of those on the outside, who even hold values that are not recognizable for those on the inside (Panagia 2009). Or as he puts it: "It makes visible what had no business being seen, and makes heard a discourse where once there was only a place for noise" (Rancière 2003, 30 in Biesta 2011b, 2). By engaging in this act of impropriety, they become political subjects and disrupt "the framing forces that sustain continuity within a system". Both Mouffe and Rancière thus reject a consensual understanding of democratic politics. For Rancière, politics is 'dissensus'. Mouffe (2005) criticizes a

rationalist approach that denies the ineradicable character of antagonism and the existence of conflicts for which a rational solution can never be found. Democratic politics always requires making choices between conflicting alternatives. It is matter of passion and commitment, arising from people's dreams and desires. Its aim is to transform antagonism into agonism. Antagonism is a struggle between enemies who do not have any common basis whereas agonism is a struggle between conflicting parties who acknowledge the legitimacy of their adversaries even though they realise that there is no rational solution for the conflict at stake. Transforming antagonism into agonism requires a common symbolic space where conflict can emerge.

The theories put forward by Mouffe and Rancière have inspired Biesta, Todd and Säfström to develop ideas about citizenship education corresponding to what we have referred to as a 'citizenship-as-practice' perspective, which challenges the assumption of a linear, instrumental relationship between learning, citizenship, and democracy. Citizenship education is then a civic learning that is intrinsically related to the experiment of democracy in a non-linear way, that is: "it does not lead [...] from a state of not being a citizen to being a citizen, but fluctuates with people's actual experiences of citizenship and with their engagement in democratic experiments" (Biesta 2011b, 6). This creates a space for a 'subjectification conception' of civic learning (Biesta 2011a) that is opposed to the dominant socialization conception in many respects. Civic learning as subjectification is not aimed at the acquisition of particular knowledge, skills, competences, or dispositions but has to do with an exposure to and engagement with practices where "public solutions are sought, negotiated and agreed for private troubles" (Bauman 2000, 39 in Biesta 2011b, 6). Those solutions cannot be determined in advance but require, again and again, an experimental engagement. Past experiences of engagement continue to play a role in

future experiences and actions, and in this sense it is also cumulative process.

Learning, then, stems from a ‘desire for democracy’, from the will to engage in debates and actions that may enhance the quality of our society. From this point of view, learning *for* participation is not the first aim in democratic processes.

Nevertheless, individuals will most probably learn *from* democratic participation. It is this very engagement that is ‘subjectifying’: it is a process in and through which subjectivity is established and new ways of doing and being come into existence.

Säfström (2011) develops an analogous argument by distinguishing between ‘schooling’ and ‘education’. Schooling, he argues, is based on the assumption that teaching and learning reveal the inner truth of society, in which one is supposed to occupy a predetermined place corresponding to that truth. Through schooling, the individual is introduced into a certain regularity and social order. Education, in contrast, enables us to emancipate ourselves, that is, it offers us the possibility of disidentification from the existing order. This freedom, Säfström emphasizes, is not total freedom but one that is always bound to un-freedom and always negotiated in ambiguous contexts where a plurality of views is articulated. This requires a space for conflict as an integral part of learning. Todd and Säfström (2008) argue that “education needs to be infused with a new ethical and political language for taking conflict seriously”. This involves turning antagonism into agonism and providing a space for learners to express a plurality of views and, at the same time, to connect these views to larger political articulations. However, as the authors emphasize, this is not an ‘everything goes’ approach.

This does not mean accepting, acquiescing to, agreeing with, or merely tolerating different views; this would be absurd. However, it does require a sustained openness to listen to other perspectives and to counter and respond. It requires treating each other as legitimate adversaries who are engaged in debate and struggle over meaning within a set of contesting norms and competing perspectives. (Todd 2010, 226)

What is needed, then, is an openness to what is new, foreign, and totally different (Todd 2001).

Citizenship-as-achievement	Citizenship-as-practice
Socialization	Subjectification
Identification	Dis-identification
Reproduction of existing order	Interruption of existing order
Consensus oriented	Conflict oriented
Antagonism	Agonism
Inequality	Equality
Linear process	Cumulative process
Schooling	Education

Table 1: citizenship-as-achievement and citizenship-as-practice

Learning *from* sustainable development

Also in environmental education and in the ESD literature, the notion of ‘schooling’ is increasingly challenged (Wals 2010). Researchers point at the widely accepted observation that we do not and cannot know what the most sustainable way of living is. They emphasize the importance of a pluralistic approach that aims at acknowledging, stimulating, and engaging divergent perspectives, views and values (e.g. Öhman 2006; Rudsberg and Öhman 2010; Sandell and Öhman 2010; Jickling and Wals 2007; Wals 2010). Yet, as was mentioned at the beginning of this article, a plea for pluralism presents a paradox. A search for pluralism does not self-evidently enhance sustainability. If all learning outcomes are considered equally valid as long as they have emerged from a pluralistic process, this might even lead to an ‘anything goes’ relativism (Wals 2010). This is problematic since it prevents legitimate criticism of erroneous views and opinions. As Læssøe (2007; 2010) emphasizes, many of the

practices of citizen participation and ESD do not even experiment with this tension between pluralism and relativism as they are oriented towards teaching a consensus. Conflicts relating to the values implied in sustainable development are marginalized. This exclusion of dissent and space for collective debate not only neglects the far-reaching impact of sustainability issues but also prevents the learners' knowledge, values and perceptions from being reflected on *and* challenged. In the remainder of this article, we show how a 'citizenship-as-practice' perspective considers this tension between pluralism and relativism at the core of educational practices and thus offers new insights for ESD, both on a theoretical and a practical level.

As both Rancière and Mouffe argue, democracy always involves contrasting options, dilemmas or conflicts. This demands public channels through which collective passions can express themselves on issues. In the context of sustainability, transparent and uncontested facts are rare: experts lack insight into the complex web of causes and effects and it is not clear who (or which groups) will suffer from the consequences (Dijstelbloem 2007). Nevertheless, those consequences are utmost far-reaching and cause social controversies. Researchers as Marres (2005), Dijstelbloem (2007), Simons and Masschelein (2009) indicate that because these issues cannot be dealt with by existing institutions nor by the available expertise, they can develop as 'public issues'. The concept of 'public' is in line here with Dewey (1954, 15-16), who defined it as "all those who are affected by the indirect consequences of transactions, to such an extent that it is deemed necessary to have those consequences systematically cared for". For Latour (2005) such issues are 'matters of concern' rather than 'matters of fact'. The people raising concerns about these issues are transformed into a 'public of equals' (Marres 2005; Simons and Masschelein 2009). A lack of particular competences can no longer serve as a ground for excluding

individuals and groups from being involved, from being acknowledged as a legitimate part of the public. Such issues therefore demand educational processes where citizens engage with, respond to, and act in confrontation with the issues at stake. Starting from this perspective of ‘citizenship-as-practice’ learning *from* sustainable development is gaining significance in comparison with learning *for* sustainable development.

Learning *from* sustainable development shifts the focus from the competences that citizens must acquire to the democratic nature of educational spaces and practices. Issues of sustainability are invariably situated in a field of tension between ‘trajectories of issue formation’ aimed at either ‘public-ization’ or at ‘privatization’ (Marres 2005). Privatization prevents the involvement of ‘outsiders’ and makes these issues inaccessible. Such threats to public-ization can stem from ‘the logic of the market,’ from ‘the private domain’ (Biesta 2011b) or from scientific claims that ignore the debatable nature of expertise. In contrast, a sustained effort to public-ize sustainability issues, acknowledges the democratic paradox described above. This alternative approach to ESD focuses on how people may learn, again and again, in response to the ambiguities and differences they encounter when facing contemporary sustainability issues. This is not a process of schooling but an educational practice, acknowledging the plurality of voices and the controversy surrounding many sustainability issues without resorting to an ‘anything goes’ relativism. Both Mouffe and Rancière’s understanding of democracy as a disruption of the existing order can inform educational processes to address, explore, and articulate tensions between, on the one hand, a plurality of views, values and knowledge claims concerning the issues at stake and, on the other hand, the sense of urgency brought about by their far-reaching effects. Learning from sustainable development is then a process in which

people are willing to be surprised by others' points of view and to face the ambivalences that result from this.

ESD has at least in three different ways an important role to play in making sustainability issues public. Firstly, public-ization is related to whether – and how – a 'public of equals' organizes itself, i.e. to which actors and points of view are considered legitimate and which are not. Educational practices aiming at public-ization continuously strive for opening up issues for public involvement and prevent the exclusion of individuals, groups, opinions, and arguments. This implies continuously balancing between diverse voices. It requires a sustained attentiveness in order to prevent that actors either claim the issue at stake or shirk responsibility by rejecting involvement. Secondly, public-ization has to do with the extent to which practices of interaction provide space for divergent opinions, values, and points-of-view. An openness to listen to other perspectives and to counter and respond is not something that one can learn through instruction, yet it is possible to be attentive to those moments in which such an openness emerges, to the moments where learners "respond to another's passionate position with generosity and welcome – even when, and perhaps especially when, they disagree with this very position" (Todd and Säfström 2008). This implies that conflicts are articulated rather than resolved or avoided and that they are dealt with in political terms ('power', 'hegemony', 'conflict') instead of in moral ('good' vs. 'bad') or rational ('right' vs. 'wrong') terms. Thirdly, public-ization is affected by the extent to which sustainability issues are claimed through specific expertise incorporated in educational tools and instruments or in the discourses on the issue at stake. Such claims in the form of, for instance, standardized procedures, exhibition displays presenting expertise-based information, blanks exercises or concepts such as the ecological footprint, diminish the

opportunities for the learners to voice their own stories, opinions, and values and prevents them from contributing to the learning process from their own perspective. Instead of universally applicable, sustainability claims are always contextual and subject to social and political struggle. Public-izing sustainability issues is a matter of representing them as a continuous quest rather than as indisputable targets that can be anticipated, planned, and regulated according to predetermined guidelines. Learning processes, then, are not aimed at predetermined outcome, for instance in the form of knowledge, skills, or behaviour but rather understood as ‘posing difficult questions’ (Biesta 2006) with regard to the issue at stake.

Learning <i>for</i> sustainable development	Learning <i>from</i> sustainable development
Indisputable matters-of-fact	Puzzling matters-of-concern
Driven by clear knowledge	Driven by concern and commitment
Moral/rational language	Ethical and political language
Conflict resolution/aversion	Conflict articulation
Indisputable targets	Continuous quest
Universal sustainability claims	Contextual sustainability claims
Predetermined answers	Difficult questions

Table 2: ‘learning *for* sustainable development’ and ‘learning *from* sustainable development’

Conclusion

This article aims to contribute to an important debate in the field of environmental education and ESD, i.e. the discussion about the tension between a normative and a pluralistic approach (Rudsberg and Öhman 2010). We have tried to fertilize this debate by presenting an alternative view on the relation between education, citizenship, and democracy and by proposing a democratic perspective that emphasizes concrete issues and the importance of creating spaces and practices in which a public of equals can emerge. The scope of this paper is limited to the

articulation of an alternative theoretical way of looking at environmental education and ESD . We wanted to emphasize the importance of analyzing the democratic character of educational *practices* instead of merely focusing on the acquisition of individual *competences*. With the elaborated theoretical perspective we aim to inspire environmental education and ESD researchers to further empirically explore the issue of democracy in educational processes that address sustainability issues. It can stimulate researchers to understand how the use of particular educational tools, the kind of interaction and the diversity of voices stimulate ‘public-izing’ as well as ‘privatizing’ tendencies within practices of ESD.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank the three anonymous reviewers of this paper for their very helpful suggestions.

References

Bajaj, M. and B. Chiu. 2009. Education for Sustainable Development as Peace Education. *Peace & Change* 34, no. 4: 441-5.

Bauman, Z. 2000. *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Biesta, G. 2004. Democracy – A problem for education or an educational problem? In *Five Professors on Education and Democracy*, ed. T. Englund, 89-109. Örebro: Örebro University.

Biesta, G. 2006. *Beyond learning. Democratic education for a human future*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Biesta, G. 2011a. *Learning democracy in school and society: Education, lifelong learning and the politics of citizenship*. Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Biesta, G. 2011b. Learning in Public Places: Civic Learning for the 21st Century. Inaugural Lecture on the Occasion of the Award of the International Francqui Professorship, Ghent, 17th February 2011.

Breiting, S. 2009. Issues for environmental education and ESD research development: looking ahead from WEEC 2007 in Durban. *Environmental Education Research* 15, no. 2: 199-207.

Chapman, D. 2007. Environmental Education/Education for Sustainability: What is the difference? New Zealand Association for Environmental Education. <http://www.nzaee.org.nz/index.asp?pageID=2145880172>.

Dewey, J. 1954. *The Public and Its Problems*. New York: Holt. (Original work published 1927)

Dijstelbloem, H. 2007. De democratie anders: politieke vernieuwing volgens Dewey en Latour. PhD diss., University of Amsterdam.

Foster, J. 2001. Education as Sustainability. *Environmental Education Research* 7, no. 2: 153-65.

Gadotti, M. 2008. Education for Sustainability: A Critical Contribution to the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development. *Green Theory & Praxis: The Journal of Ecopedagogy* 4, no. 1: 15-64.

González-Gaudiano, É. 1999. Environmental Education and Sustainable Consumption: The Case of Mexico. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education* 4, no. 1: 176-92.

Gough, S. and W. Scott. 1999. Education and Training for Sustainable Tourism: Problems, Possibilities and Cautious First Steps. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education* 4, no. 1: 193-212.

Huckle, J. 1993. Environmental education and sustainability: A view from critical theory. In *Environmental education: a pathway to sustainability*, ed. J.Fien, 43-68. Geelong: Deakin University.

Huckle, J. 1999. Locating Environmental Education Between Modern Capitalism and Postmodern Socialism: A Reply to Lucie Sauvé. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education* 4, no. 1: 36-45.

Huckle, J. 2008. Sustainable Development. In *The Sage Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy*, eds. J. Arthur, I. Davies and C. Hahn, 342-54, London: Sage Publications.

Jensen, B. B. and K. Schnack. 1997. The Action Competence Approach in Environmental Education. *Environmental Education Research* 3, no. 2: 163-78.

Jickling, B. 1994. Why I don't want my children to be educated for sustainable development: sustainable belief. *Trumpeter* 11, no. 3: 2-8.

Jickling, B. and A.E.J. Wals. 2007. Globalization and environmental education: looking beyond sustainable development. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 40, no. 1: 1-21.

Læssøe, J. 2007. Participation and sustainable development: The post-ecologist transformation of citizen involvement in Denmark, *Environmental Politics* 16, no. 2: 231-50.

Læssøe, J. 2010. Education for sustainable development, participation and socio-cultural change. *Environmental Education Research* 16, no.2: 39-57.

Latour, B. 2005. From Realpolitik to Dingpolitik or How to Make Things Public. In: *Making Things Public. Atmospheres of Democracy*, eds. B. Latour and P. Weibel, Karlsruhe: ZKM and Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Lawy, R. and G. Biesta. 2006. Citizenship-as-practice: The educational implications of an inclusive and relational understanding of citizenship. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 54, no. 1: 34-50.

Marres, N. 2005. No issue, no public. Democratic deficits after the displacement of politics, PhD diss., University of Amsterdam.

Mogensen, F. and K. Schnack. 2010. The action competence approach and the 'new' discourses of education for sustainable development, competence and quality criteria. *Environmental Education Research* 16, no. 2: 59-74.

Monroe, M. C. 2007. A Priority for ESD Research: Influencing Adult Citizens. *Journal of Education for Sustainable Development* 1, no. 1: 107-13.

Mouffe, C. 1993. *The Return of the Political*. London: Verso.

Mouffe, C. 2005. *On the Political*. London & New York: Routledge.

Nomura, K. and O. Abe. 2009. The education for sustainable development movement in Japan: a political perspective. *Environmental Education Research* 15, no. 4: 483-96.

Öhman, J. 2006. Pluralism and criticism in environmental education and education for sustainable development: a practical understanding. *Environmental Education Research* 12, no. 2: 149-63.

Orr, D. W. 2002. Four Challenges of Sustainability. *Conservation Biology* 16, no. 6: 1457-60.

Paden, M. and K.B. Chhokar. 2007. Exploring Research Priorities for the DESD. *Journal of Education for Sustainable Development* 1, no. 1: 73-5.

Panagia, D. 2009. The improper event : on Jacques Rancière's mannerism. *Citizenship Studies* 13, no. 3: 297-308.

Rancière, J. 1995. Politics, identification, and subjectivization. In *The identity in question*, ed. J. Rajchman, 63-70. New York/London: Routledge.

Rancière, J. 1999. *Dis-agreement. Politics and philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rancière, J. 2003. *The philosopher and his poor*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Rancière, J. 2004. Who is the Subject of the Rights of Man, *South Atlantic Quarterly* 103, no.2/3: 297–310.

Räthzel, N. and D. Uzzell. 2009. Transformative environmental education: a collective rehearsal for reality. *Environmental Education Research* 15, no. 3: 263-77.

Ruitenbergh C.W., eds. 2011. Education, Conflict and the Political. Special issue, *Studies in Philosophy & Education* 30, no. 2.

Rudsberg, K. and J. Öhman. 2010. Pluralism in practice – experiences from Swedish evaluation, school development and research. *Environmental Education Research* 16, no. 1:95-111.

Säfström, C.A. 2011. Rethinking Emancipation, Rethinking Education. *Studies in Philosophy & Education* 30, no. 2:199–209.

Sandell, K. and J. Öhman. 2010. Educational potentials of encounters with nature: reflections from a Swedish outdoor perspective. *Environmental Education Research* 16, no. 1: 113-32.

Sauvé, L. 1996. Environmental Education and Sustainable Development: A Further Appraisal. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education* 1, no. 1: 7-34.

Sauvé, L. 1999. Environmental Education Between Modernity and Postmodernity: Searching for an Integrating Educational Framework. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education* 4, no. 1: 9-35.

Sauvé, L. and T. Berryman. 2005. Challenging a "Closing Circle": Alternative Research Agendas for the ESD Decade. *Applied Environmental Education and Communication* 4, no. 3: 229-32.

Scott, W. 2002. Education and Sustainable Development: challenges, responsibilities, and frames of mind. *The Trumpeter* 18, no. 1: 1-12.

Selby, D. 2006. The Firm and Shaky Ground of Education for Sustainable Development. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 30, no. 2: 351-65.

Simons, M. and J. Masschelein. 2009. The Public and Its University: beyond learning for civic employability. *European Educational Research Journal* 8, no. 2: 204-17.

Simons, M. and J. Masschelein. 2010. Governmental, political and pedagogic subjectivation: Foucault with Rancière. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 42, no. 5/6: 588-605.

Smyth, J. 1999. Is there a Future for Education Consistent with Agenda 21? *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education* 4, no. 1: 69-83.

Sumner, J. 2008. From Academic Imperialism to the Civil Commons: Institutional Possibilities for Responding to the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development. *Interchange* 39, no. 1: 77-94.

Todd, S. 2001. On Not Knowing the Other, or Learning from Levinas, *Philosophy of Education yearbook*, 67-74.

Todd, S. 2010. Living in a Dissonant World: Toward an Agonistic Cosmopolitics for Education. *Studies in Philosophy & Education* 29, no. 2:213-28.

Todd, S. and C.A. Säfström. 2008. Democracy, Education and Conflict: Rethinking Respect and the Place of the Ethical. In *Journal of Educational Controversy*. <http://www.wce.wvu.edu/Resources/CEP/eJournal>.

UNECE 2005. *UNECE strategy for Education for Sustainable Development adopted at the High-level meeting of Environment and Education Ministries (Vilnius, 17-18 march 2005)*, 1-15. New York: UN.

UNESCO 2005. *United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (2005-2014): International Implementation Scheme*, Paris: UNESCO.

Wals, A.E.J. 2010. Between knowing what is right and knowing that it is wrong to tell others what is right: on relativism, uncertainty and democracy in environmental and sustainability education. *Environmental Education Research* 16, no.1: 143-51.

WCED 1987. *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wildemeersch, D. and J. Vandenabeele. 2007. Relocating social learning as a democratic practice. In *Democratic Practices as Learning Opportunities*, eds. R. van der Veen, D. Wildemeersch, V. Marsick, and J. Youngblood, 23-36. Rotterdam: Sense.

ⁱ The notion 'Education for sustainable development' (ESD) is highly contested in academic literature. Different authors use more than twenty distinct terms to point to learning processes in the field of sustainability issues: 'education for sustainable development', 'education about sustainable development', 'education as sustainability', 'learning as sustainability', 'education for sustainability', 'learning for sustainability', 'sustainable education', 'sustainable learning', 'environment and development education', 'education for environment and sustainable development', 'education for environment and development', 'environmental education for sustainable development', 'education for sustainable futures', 'education for a sustainable future', 'environmental education for equitable and sustainable societies', 'environmental education for sustainable societies and global responsibility', 'environmental education for the development of responsible societies', 'education for a better world', 'education for sustainable contraction', 'education consistent with Agenda 21', 'education 21', 'ecopedagogy', etc. Each (slight) distinction refers to differences in opinion and/or interpretation. It is beyond the scope of this article to consider this discussion extensively. Instead, we pragmatically use the term ESD since we address the increasing influence of sustainable development on environmental education as a policy-driven tendency and ESD is the word used in policy discourse. In our conclusion, yet, we put forward the idea of 'learning from sustainable development' as an alternative perspective that takes into account several concerns that play a part in this debate.

ⁱⁱ e.g. 'Environmental Education Research', 'Journal of Environmental Education', 'Southern African Journal of Environmental Education, Ethics and Action', 'International Research in Geographical & Environmental Education', 'Canadian Journal of Environmental Education', 'The journal of the Australian Association for Environmental Education', 'Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education' and 'Applied Environmental Education and Communication'