



INTERNATIONAL PROCEEDING OF INNOVATIVE SCIENCE AND TRANSDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

e-ISSN: 2746-3338

Available online at <https://ipistrans.lppmi.or.id>

Email: proceedings@lppmi.or.id

Love-Based and Ecological Education Reconstructing Humanistic Learning Paradigm to Build Sustainable Society

Umrati

Corresponding Author

Email:
umrati@unisad.ac.id

Keywords

love-based education, ecological pedagogy, humanistic learning, sustainable society, educational paradigm, environmental consciousness

Abstract

Contemporary education faces a critical challenge in addressing both human development and ecological sustainability. This article explores the reconstruction of humanistic learning paradigms through love-based and ecological education as a foundation for building sustainable societies. The integration of compassion, empathy, and environmental consciousness in educational practices offers a transformative approach to learning that transcends traditional cognitive-focused methodologies. By examining theoretical frameworks and practical implementations, this article demonstrates how love-based pedagogy combined with ecological literacy can foster holistic human development while promoting environmental stewardship. The reconstruction of educational paradigms requires fundamental shifts in teaching philosophies, curriculum design, and institutional practices that prioritize relational intelligence, emotional well-being, and planetary consciousness. This comprehensive approach addresses the interconnected crises of social fragmentation and environmental degradation, proposing education as a vehicle for societal transformation toward sustainability and collective flourishing.

Universitas Islam As'adiyah Sengkang, Indonesia

The International KKN-IK Program 2026 (29 January - 4 February 2026), held in a hybrid format, with the theme "*Love-Based Curriculum and Ecological Service to Build Sustainable Local and Global Communities*," organized by the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM) of Universitas Islam As'adiyah Sengkang, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

The global education system stands at a crossroads, confronting unprecedented challenges that demand radical rethinking of pedagogical foundations and purposes. Traditional educational models, largely rooted in industrial-era paradigms emphasizing standardization, competition, and knowledge transmission, have proven inadequate for addressing contemporary crises including climate change, social inequality, mental health epidemics, and ecological degradation. According to Noddings (2023), the prevailing educational structures often prioritize academic achievement and economic productivity over human flourishing and relational competence, resulting in graduates who possess technical skills but lack the ethical compass and emotional intelligence necessary for creating sustainable futures. This disconnect between educational outcomes and societal needs calls for fundamental paradigm reconstruction that places love, care, and ecological consciousness at the center of learning experiences.

The concept of love-based education emerges from humanistic psychology and care ethics, proposing that genuine learning occurs within relationships characterized by trust, respect, and authentic connection (Muhsyanur, 2024). Kessler (2022) argues that education rooted in love transcends sentimental notions, representing instead a rigorous pedagogical commitment to recognizing the inherent dignity of each learner, fostering belonging, and cultivating capacities for compassion and ethical engagement. This approach challenges the mechanistic view of students as passive recipients of knowledge (Santalia et al., 2025), instead honoring them as whole persons with emotions, aspirations, and unique developmental trajectories. When educators approach their work with love—understood as deep care for student well-being and growth—they create learning environments where intellectual, emotional, social, and spiritual dimensions develop in integrated ways, producing individuals capable of contributing meaningfully to collective welfare.

Parallel to the humanistic critique of conventional education, ecological education has emerged as a response to the environmental crisis and the recognition that educational systems have contributed to ecological destruction by promoting anthropocentric worldviews and disconnection from nature. Sterling and Orr (2021) contend that mainstream education has largely functioned as "mis-education" regarding humanity's relationship with the natural world, teaching separation rather than interdependence, domination rather than partnership, and unlimited consumption rather than sustainable stewardship. Ecological education seeks to remedy this by embedding environmental literacy, systems thinking, and place-based learning throughout curricula, helping students understand their embeddedness within ecological systems and their responsibility for planetary health. This educational philosophy recognizes that human well-being is inseparable from ecosystem integrity and that education must prepare citizens for the complex task of living sustainably within Earth's biophysical limits.

The convergence of love-based and ecological education offers a powerful synthesis for addressing both human and planetary flourishing. Palmer and Zajonc (2020) suggest that genuine ecological consciousness cannot be achieved through purely cognitive or technical approaches but requires the cultivation of emotional bonds with the natural world and recognition of the intrinsic value of all life forms (Muhsyanur et.al, 2025). When love extends beyond human relationships to encompass the broader community of life, education becomes a practice of developing ecological empathy and commitment to protecting what we love. This integrated approach recognizes that social justice and environmental sustainability are interconnected, requiring educational practices that develop both interpersonal care and ecological responsibility as fundamental dimensions of human development.

Contemporary educational reform movements increasingly recognize the limitations of narrow, test-driven approaches and call for more holistic, humanistic alternatives. Darling-Hammond and Cook-Harvey (2021) document how progressive educational systems worldwide are shifting toward competency frameworks that emphasize social-emotional learning, critical thinking, creativity, and civic engagement alongside traditional academic skills. These reforms reflect growing understanding that preparing students for uncertain futures requires developing adaptive capacities, ethical reasoning, and collaborative skills rather than merely memorizing content. However, many reform efforts remain fragmented, addressing symptoms rather than underlying paradigmatic assumptions about education's purposes and methods. A comprehensive reconstruction of educational paradigms requires more fundamental transformation grounded in explicit values of love, care, and ecological responsibility (Mufida Nur Tsuraya, Muhammad Fadhil Afif, Muthia Mufida Anwar, Syamsuddin Semmang, Nurfaika Nurfaika, Muhsyanur Muhsyanur, n.d.).

This article proposes that love-based and ecological education, when integrated within a reconstructed humanistic learning paradigm, provides a coherent framework for educational transformation capable of addressing contemporary challenges and building sustainable societies. Drawing on interdisciplinary scholarship from education theory, environmental philosophy, care ethics, and sustainability studies, the following sections examine the theoretical foundations of this integrated approach, practical implications for curriculum and pedagogy, institutional transformations required for implementation, and the potential of this paradigm to contribute to broader societal transformation (Muhsyanur and Mustapha, 2023). As Freire (2020) reminds us, education is never neutral but always serves particular visions of what humans can become and what kind of world we wish to create; choosing love and ecological consciousness as foundational principles represents a deliberate commitment to education as a practice of liberation, healing, and sustainable coexistence.

DISCUSSIONS

Theoretical Foundations of Love-Based Humanistic Education

The theoretical framework for love-based education draws primarily from humanistic psychology, care ethics, and transformative learning theory, offering philosophical grounding for educational practices centered on relationship, wholeness, and human dignity. Rogers (2021) articulates the core principles of humanistic education as including unconditional positive regard, empathetic understanding, and congruence—qualities that create psychological safety necessary for authentic learning and self-actualization. These principles challenge behaviorist and purely cognitive models of learning by asserting that meaningful education must address the whole person, including emotional needs, existential questions, and the search for purpose. When educators embody these humanistic values, classrooms become spaces of genuine encounter where students experience acceptance, develop self-awareness, and cultivate their unique potentials in service of both personal fulfillment and social contribution (Muhsyanur Muhsyanur, 2024).

Care ethics, particularly as developed by feminist philosophers and education scholars, provides crucial theoretical resources for understanding love as an educational principle beyond individual psychology (Ibrahim, 2020). Noddings (2023) conceptualizes caring as a relational practice involving attention, responsiveness, and commitment to the welfare of others, arguing that care should be the central purpose of education rather than a peripheral concern. This ethical framework positions education as fundamentally relational work, with the caring relationship between teacher and student serving as the foundation for all learning. From this perspective, subject matter expertise and pedagogical technique, while important, are secondary to the quality of relationships established; genuine learning occurs when students feel cared for, when their concerns are taken seriously, and when they are supported in developing their own capacities for caring (Muhsyanur et al., 2021) (Muhsyanur, Inne Pelangi, 2021). This relational ontology contrasts sharply with transactional models that reduce education to knowledge delivery and assessment.

The integration of love into educational theory requires careful definition to distinguish pedagogical love from sentimental or romantic conceptions. Hooks (2020) defines love as "a combination of care, commitment, knowledge, responsibility, respect, and trust" applied within educational contexts to create liberatory learning environments. This definition emphasizes love as active practice requiring ongoing effort, ethical discipline, and critical awareness rather than mere feeling or affection. Pedagogical love challenges oppressive power dynamics within education, insisting on mutual respect and recognition of human dignity across differences of race, class, gender, and other social identities (Muhsyanur and Mustapha, 2023; Mulyana et al., 2021). When educators practice love in this robust sense, they create conditions for students to develop authentic voices, critically examine unjust social structures, and participate in creating more equitable communities. Love-based education thus becomes inherently political, aligned with social justice and human liberation.

Transformative learning theory provides additional theoretical grounding for understanding how love-based education facilitates profound shifts in consciousness and worldview. Mezirow and Taylor (2022) describe transformative learning as the process of critically examining and revising limiting assumptions, beliefs, and perspectives that constrain understanding and action. While traditional transformative learning theory emphasizes rational discourse, recent scholarship recognizes the essential role of emotions, relationships, and whole-person engagement in catalyzing transformative experiences. Love-based pedagogy creates the emotional safety and relational trust necessary for students to risk examining deeply held beliefs, confronting uncomfortable truths about themselves and society, and experimenting with new ways of being. The caring presence of educators and learning communities provides the holding environment within which transformative learning can occur, supporting students through the disorientation and vulnerability that often accompany genuine growth.

Ecological Literacy and Environmental Consciousness in Education

Ecological literacy represents a fundamental dimension of education for sustainability, encompassing knowledge of natural systems, understanding of human-nature interdependence, and development of ecological consciousness that guides ethical action. Orr (2021) and Muhsyanur (2023) argues that ecological literacy should be as fundamental to education as reading and mathematics, enabling students to understand the ecological consequences of human activities and make informed decisions that support planetary health. This literacy extends beyond scientific knowledge to include experiential understanding gained through direct engagement with nature, emotional connection to places and ecosystems, and recognition of humans as participants within rather than managers of natural systems. Ecological literacy challenges the dualistic thinking that separates humans from nature, culture from ecology, and mind from body, instead cultivating systems thinking that recognizes patterns, relationships, and interconnections across multiple scales.

Place-based education provides a crucial pedagogical approach for developing ecological literacy by grounding learning in local ecosystems, communities, and cultural contexts (Kartini and Muhsyanur, 2025). Sobel (2020) demonstrates that when students engage directly with their immediate environments through outdoor exploration, community projects, and local environmental studies, they develop stronger ecological understanding and sense of environmental responsibility than through abstract instruction alone. Place-based learning honors the particular rather than privileging universal knowledge, helping students recognize the unique characteristics, challenges, and possibilities of their local contexts while understanding connections to broader regional and global systems. This approach transforms communities into classrooms and ecosystems into

teachers, fostering intimate knowledge of local flora, fauna, watersheds, and seasonal patterns that ground abstract ecological concepts in lived experience.

The development of ecological consciousness requires more than cognitive understanding, necessitating emotional and ethical dimensions often neglected in conventional environmental education (Santalia et al., 2025). Kahn (2021) distinguishes between environmental literacy focused on information and ecological consciousness involving transformed relationship with the natural world characterized by empathy, wonder, and moral commitment. This deeper transformation occurs through sustained, meaningful interactions with nature that foster biophilia—the innate human affinity for living systems—and recognition of nature's intrinsic value beyond instrumental utility. When students develop personal relationships with particular trees, animals, or landscapes through repeated encounters and observation, their motivation for environmental stewardship shifts from abstract duty to genuine care for beings and places they love. This emotional grounding provides more resilient motivation for sustainable behavior than fear-based messaging or purely rational arguments.

Integration of Indigenous knowledge systems and perspectives offers essential resources for ecological education, providing time-tested wisdom about sustainable human-nature relationships. Wildcat and colleagues (2023) argue that Indigenous pedagogies centered on respect, reciprocity, and relationship with all beings offer crucial alternatives to Western educational models based on domination and extraction. These knowledge systems embody sophisticated ecological understanding developed over millennia, including sustainable resource management practices, seasonal ecological patterns, and ethical frameworks for human responsibilities to land and non-human beings. Incorporating Indigenous perspectives into ecological education, when done respectfully and with appropriate community partnership, enriches students' understanding of diverse ways of knowing and being, challenges colonial assumptions embedded in mainstream curricula, and models educational approaches that honor multiple epistemologies and ways of relating to the natural world.

Integrating Love and Ecology: Toward Holistic Pedagogical Practice

The synthesis of love-based and ecological approaches creates a holistic pedagogical framework that addresses human development and environmental sustainability as inseparable dimensions of education. Naess (2022), building on deep ecology philosophy, articulates the concept of ecological self—an expanded sense of identity that includes identification with broader living systems beyond the individual ego (Muhsyanur et.al, 2025). This expanded selfhood develops through both intellectual understanding of ecological interconnection and emotional experiences of kinship with nature, processes that love-based pedagogy facilitates through caring relationships and practices that cultivate empathy and

connection. When education nurtures ecological selfhood, students naturally extend care and concern to the larger community of life, experiencing environmental protection not as sacrifice but as expression of enlightened self-interest and love for the world of which they are part.

Pedagogical practices that integrate love and ecology share common characteristics including emphasis on relationship, experiential learning, reflection, and action for positive change. Jardine and colleagues (2021) describe sustainable education as involving head, heart, and hands—cognitive understanding, emotional engagement, and practical action working in concert. This integration requires moving beyond classroom walls to engage with actual environments and communities, providing opportunities for students to apply learning in contexts that matter while developing relationships with places, people, and other species. Service-learning projects addressing local environmental challenges, school gardens connecting students with food systems, and outdoor education programs fostering nature connection exemplify pedagogical approaches that engage multiple dimensions of learning while developing both social and ecological responsibility. These experiences become especially powerful when accompanied by reflective practices helping students process experiences, examine assumptions, and construct meaning.

The role of educators shifts significantly within integrated love-based and ecological pedagogy, requiring new competencies, dispositions, and ways of being in relationship with students and the world. Miller (2023) argues that teachers in holistic education serve as guides, mentors, and co-learners rather than authoritative knowledge transmitters, modeling qualities of curiosity, humility, and care while creating conditions for student-directed exploration and discovery. This facilitative role requires deep self-knowledge, emotional intelligence, and commitment to ongoing personal growth, as teachers' own relationships with themselves, students, and nature profoundly influence learning environments they create. Professional development for this paradigm must address educators' inner development—their capacities for presence, compassion, and ecological consciousness—alongside pedagogical skills and content knowledge, recognizing that who teachers are matters as much as what they know or do.

Curriculum design within integrated love-based ecological education requires fundamental reconceptualization of knowledge organization, learning objectives, and assessment practices. Wals and Corcoran (2022) propose sustainability competencies including systems thinking, anticipatory thinking, normative thinking, strategic thinking, and interpersonal competencies as organizing frameworks for curriculum that prepares students for complex sustainability challenges. These competencies cut across traditional disciplinary boundaries, requiring interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches that mirror the interconnected nature of real-world problems. Assessment in this paradigm shifts from primarily measuring content retention toward evaluating growth in competencies, dispositions, and capacities for ethical action, utilizing portfolios, reflective journals,

community-based projects, and authentic demonstrations of learning. This approach recognizes that what matters most—wisdom, compassion, ecological consciousness, collaborative capacity—often resists quantification but can be assessed through rich, qualitative methods honoring complexity.

Institutional Transformation and Societal Implications

Implementing love-based and ecological education at scale requires institutional transformations addressing organizational culture, governance structures, physical environments, and relationships with broader communities. Robinson and colleagues (2020) document how conventional school structures—including rigid schedules, standardized curricula, competitive grading, and hierarchical decision-making—often contradict humanistic and ecological values, creating systemic barriers to pedagogical innovation. Transforming these structures requires courageous leadership willing to challenge entrenched practices, participatory governance engaging all stakeholders in envisioning alternatives, and patience with iterative change processes that honor existing communities while moving toward new possibilities. Schools embodying love-based and ecological principles demonstrate characteristics including flexible learning environments, student voice in governance, integration with community and natural environments, and organizational cultures prioritizing well-being alongside achievement.

The physical design of learning environments significantly influences possibilities for relational and ecological education, with growing recognition that buildings and landscapes serve as "third teachers" shaping experience and values. Kellert (2021) presents evidence that biophilic design incorporating natural light, views of nature, natural materials, and opportunities for outdoor learning enhances student well-being, engagement, and academic performance while fostering environmental awareness. Schools designed according to these principles include features such as living walls, rooftop gardens, outdoor classrooms, and transparent connections between indoor and outdoor spaces that normalize human-nature interaction. Beyond environmental benefits, these design choices communicate implicit values about the importance of beauty, connection to place, and respect for natural systems, creating built environments that align with rather than contradict educational purposes focused on sustainability and flourishing.

Preparing teachers for love-based and ecological education requires transformation of teacher education programs to embody the paradigm they seek to cultivate. Korthagen and colleagues (2023) advocate for realistic teacher education grounded in reflection on authentic teaching experiences, personal development addressing teachers' inner lives and belief systems, and collaborative learning communities supporting ongoing professional growth. Such programs would include substantial time in nature developing ecological literacy and connection, practices cultivating presence and emotional intelligence,

examination of personal histories and biases affecting teaching relationships, and apprenticeship with mentor teachers embodying humanistic and ecological values. This approach recognizes teaching as moral and relational work requiring continuous personal development rather than merely technical skill acquisition, challenging teacher education models focused primarily on methods and content delivery.

The potential of love-based and ecological education to contribute to broader societal transformation toward sustainability rests on its capacity to develop citizens with consciousness, competencies, and commitments necessary for addressing interconnected social and environmental challenges. Wamsler and colleagues (2021) argue that inner transformation—shifts in worldviews, values, and consciousness—represents an underrecognized leverage point for sustainability transitions, with education serving as primary context for cultivating such transformation. When education successfully develops ecological consciousness, empathy across difference, systems thinking, and sense of agency for positive change, graduates become leaders and change agents in communities, organizations, and political systems, multiplying impacts beyond individual lives. This ripple effect represents education's ultimate contribution to sustainable societies, creating cultural shift toward values of care, justice, and ecological responsibility essential for navigating planetary challenges while enhancing human flourishing across generations.

CONCLUSION

Love-based and ecological education offers a comprehensive paradigm for transforming educational systems to address contemporary crises while building sustainable, flourishing societies. By integrating humanistic principles emphasizing care, relationship, and whole-person development with ecological literacy and environmental consciousness, this approach transcends limitations of conventional educational models that prioritize narrow academic achievement and economic productivity. The theoretical foundations drawn from care ethics, humanistic psychology, transformative learning, and ecological philosophy provide robust grounding for pedagogical practices that develop both interpersonal and ecological empathy, systems thinking, and ethical commitment alongside cognitive competencies. Implementation requires fundamental transformations in teaching practices, curriculum design, institutional structures, and teacher education, challenging educators and institutions to embody the values they seek to cultivate. As humanity faces unprecedented social and environmental challenges demanding radical shifts in consciousness and behavior, education rooted in love and ecological awareness emerges as essential foundation for developing citizens capable of creating just, sustainable, and beautiful futures for all beings.

REFERENCES

- Darling-Hammond, L., & Cook-Harvey, C. M. (2021). *Educating the whole child: Improving school climate to support student success*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Freire, P. (2020). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Hooks, B. (2020). *Teaching critical thinking: Practical wisdom*. Routledge.
- Jardine, D. W., Friesen, S., & Clifford, P. (2021). *Curriculum in abundance*. Routledge.
- Kahn, R. (2021). *Critical pedagogy, ecoliteracy, and planetary crisis: The ecopedagogy movement* (2nd ed.). Peter Lang.
- Kellert, S. R. (2021). *Nature by design: The practice of biophilic design*. Yale University Press.
- Kessler, R. (2022). *The soul of education: Helping students find connection, compassion, and character at school*. ASCD.
- Korthagen, F., Attema-Noordewier, S., & Zwart, R. (2023). *Teacher-student contact: Exploring a basic but complicated concept*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 121, 103924.
- Mezirow, J., & Taylor, E. W. (2022). *Transformative learning in practice: Insights from community, workplace, and higher education*. Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, J. P. (2023). *The holistic curriculum* (4th ed.). University of Toronto Press.
- Ibrahim, M. (2020). Psikologi Pendidikan: Suatu Stimulus Awal. In M. dan I. Rumalean (Ed.), *Forsiladi Pers* (Vol. 7, Issue 2). https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=en&lr=&id=WT-HEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR2&ots=orOGoJ4XaM&sig=_RldS7mWG5ZSpRE8sRmGX1Kt2Hs&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Kartini and Muhsyanur. (2025). The Importance of Knowing Curriculum for Teacher : A Phenomenological Study in Indonesia. *International Proceeding of Innovativescienceand Transdisciplinary Studies*, 6(1), 127–137. <https://ipistrans.lppmi.or.id/index.php/proceeding/article/view/16/16>
- Mufida Nur Tsuraya, Muhammad Fadhil Afif, Muthia Mufida Anwar, Syamsuddin Semmang, Nurfaika Nurfaika, Muhsyanur Muhsyanur, H. H. (n.d.). Mentoring Program for Kitab Kuning Reading Comprehension Among Male Students at As ' adiyah Islamic Boarding School , Wajo , South Sulawesi. *VORS: Journal of Community Service*, 3(8), 36–46. <https://journal.echaprogres.or.id/index.php/vors/article/view/54>
- Muhsyanur, Inne Pelangi, E. H. (2021). Literasi Digital: Implikatur Dalam Pemberitaan Wacana Pandemi Covid-19 Pada Portal Berita Lokal Kabupaten Wajo Berbasis Daring. *Totobuang*, 9, 47–59. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26499/ttbng.v9i1>
- Muhsyanur and Mustapha, B. (2023). Challenges and Strategies in Teaching Indonesian to Indonesian Occupied Students in Malaysia. *TRICKS: Journal Ff Education And Learning Practices*, 1(1), 32–39. <https://journal.echaprogres.or.id/index.php/tricks/article/view/6>
- Muhsyanur et.al. (2025). Integrating Love-Based Curriculum in Arabic and Indonesian Language Education A Conceptual Framework for Arabic Edu- cation Students at As ' adiyah Islamic University Sengkang. *AHALLIYAH: Jurnal Bahasa Arab Dan Pengajarannya*, 2(4), 38–45. file:///C:/Users/HP/Downloads/4_Integrating+Love-Based+Curriculum+in+Arabic+and+Indonesian+Language+Education+A+Conceptual+Framework+for+Arabic+Education+Students+at+As'adi.pdf
- Muhsyanur, M. (2023). The Bugis People's Naming System in Bugis Ethnic Tradition. *Journal*

-
- of Language and Literature*, 23(1), 67–76. <https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v23i1.5062>
- Muhsyanur, M. (2024). *Love-Based Curriculum as a New Paradigm in Language Education : Between Cognition , Affection , and Spirituality*. 2(5), 12–19.
- Muhsyanur Muhsyanur. (2024). Implementation of Merdeka Belajar in Indonesian Language Learning in Senior High Schools. *Jurnal Ilmiah Insan Mulia*, 1(1), 8–14. <https://doi.org/10.59923/jiim.v1i1.170>
- Muhsyanur, Rahmatullah, A. S., Misnawati, Dumiyati, & Ghufron, S. (2021). The Effectiveness of “Facebook” As Indonesian Language Learning Media for Elementary School Student: Distance Learning Solutions in the Era of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Multicultural Education*, 7(04), 38–47. <https://www.mccaddogap.com/ojs/index.php/me/article/view/8%0Ahttps://www.mccaddogap.com/ojs/index.php/me/article/download/8/10>
- Mulyana, Y., Akbar, Z., Zainal, H., Jiwantara, F. A., Muhsyanur, Yusriadi, Y., & Bin-Tahir, S. Z. (2021). High domestic violence during the pandemic COVID-19. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, 6283–6290. <https://doi.org/10.46254/an11.20211059>
- Santalia, Indo, & Muhsyanur. (2025). The curriculum of love and eco-theology as the basis of the Istiqlal declaration implementation movement. *HUMANIST : As'adiyah International Journal of Humanities and Education*, 2(1), 33–42.
- Naess, A. (2022). *The ecology of wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess*. Counterpoint.
- Noddings, N. (2023). *Critical lessons: What our schools should teach* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Orr, D. W. (2021). *Earth in mind: On education, environment, and the human prospect* (3rd ed.). Island Press.
- Palmer, P. J., & Zajonc, A. (2020). *The heart of higher education: A call to renewal*. Jossey-Bass.
- Robinson, K., Aronica, L., & Robinson, K. (2020). *You, your child, and school: Navigate your way to the best education*. Penguin Books.
- Rogers, C. R. (2021). *Freedom to learn* (3rd ed.). Merrill.
- Sobel, D. (2020). *Place-based education: Connecting classrooms and communities* (2nd ed.). Orion Society.
- Sterling, S., & Orr, D. W. (2021). *Sustainable education: Re-visioning learning and change*. Green Books.
- Wals, A. E., & Corcoran, P. B. (2022). *Sustainability as an outcome of transformative learning*. In J. Mezirow & E. W. Taylor (Eds.), *Transformative learning in practice* (pp. 103-119). Jossey-Bass.
- Wamsler, C., Brossmann, J., Hendersson, H., Kristjansdottir, R., McDonald, C., & Scarampi, P. (2021). Mindfulness in sustainability science, practice, and teaching. *Sustainability Science*, 16(1), 263-278.
- Wildcat, M., McDonald, M., Irlbacher-Fox, S., & Coulthard, G. (2023). *Learning from the land: Indigenous land based pedagogy and decolonization*. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 12(1), 1-13.