

Rapid #: -11435588

CROSS REF ID: **955567**

LENDER: **GZN :: Main Library**

BORROWER: **ORE :: Main Library**

TYPE: Article CC:CCL

JOURNAL TITLE: International journal of sustainability in higher education

USER JOURNAL TITLE: International journal of sustainability in higher education.

ARTICLE TITLE: Higher education for sustainability: seeking affective learning outcomes

ARTICLE AUTHOR: Kerry Shephard

VOLUME: 9

ISSUE: 1

MONTH:

YEAR: 2008

PAGES: 87-98

ISSN: 1467-6370

OCLC #:

Processed by RapidX: 1/23/2017 10:01:33 AM



This material may be protected by copyright law (Title 17 U.S. Code)



International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education

Higher education for sustainability: seeking affective learning outcomes

Kerry Shephard

Article information:

To cite this document:

Kerry Shephard, (2008), "Higher education for sustainability: seeking affective learning outcomes", International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, Vol. 9 Iss 1 pp. 87 - 98

Permanent link to this document:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14676370810842201>

Downloaded on: 23 January 2017, At: 08:56 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 49 other documents.

To copy this document: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 6532 times since 2008*

Users who downloaded this article also downloaded:

(2008), "Achieving transformative sustainability learning: engaging head, hands and heart", International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, Vol. 9 Iss 1 pp. 68-86 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14676370810842193>

(2007), "Developing key competencies for sustainable development in higher education", International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, Vol. 8 Iss 4 pp. 416-430 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14676370710823582>

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm:235655 []

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

Higher education for sustainability: seeking affective learning outcomes

Higher education
for sustainability

87

Kerry Shephard

*Higher Education Development Centre, University of Otago,
Dunedin, New Zealand*

Received 19 December 2006
Revised 2 March 2007
Accepted 25 May 2007

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to interpret aspects of education for sustainability in relation to educational theories of the affective domain (values, attitudes and behaviours) and suggest how the use of these theories, and relevant experience, in other educational areas could benefit education for sustainability.

Design/methodology/approach – An analysis based on a literature review of relevant educational endeavours in affective learning.

Findings – This paper suggests that most teaching and assessment in higher education focus on cognitive skills of knowledge and understanding rather than on affective outcomes of values, attitudes and behaviours. Some areas of higher education, however, have effectively pursued affective outcomes and these use particular learning and teaching activities to do so. Key issues for consideration include assessing outcomes and evaluating courses, providing academic credit for affective outcomes, key roles for role models and designing realistic and acceptable learning outcomes in the affective domain.

Practical implications – Educators for sustainability could use this relevant theoretical underpinning and experience gained in other areas of education to address the impact of their own learner-support activities.

Originality/value – Educators have traditionally been reluctant to pursue affective learning outcomes but often programmes of study simply fail to identify and describe their legitimate aims in these terms. This paper emphasises the application of a relevant theoretical underpinning to support educators' legitimate aspirations for affective learning outcomes. It will also help these educators to reflect on how the use of these approaches accords with the liberal traditions of higher education.

Keywords Education, Teaching methods, Learning, Attitudes, Behaviour, Value analysis

Paper type Conceptual paper

1. Introduction

A recent issue of the USA's *The Chronicle of Higher Education* focused on the sustainable university (20 October 2006) and produced a wealth of information on institutional attempts to promote environmental awareness, social responsibility, and sound economic stewardship. In the UK, the sector's key funding body Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE, 2006a, b) has developed its own sustainability strategy and seeks buy-in by the HE sector. The Australian Government may be particularly committed to help ensure that the needs of education for sustainability across Australia are being met, as evidenced most strongly through their influential AIRES (2006) research agenda. Higher education institutions from around the world are involved in various ways in promoting sustainability. By any measure, the range of higher education-based initiatives accomplished in the name of sustainability is truly remarkable.



International Journal of Sustainability
in Higher Education
Vol. 9 No. 1, 2008
pp. 87-98
© Emerald Group Publishing Limited
1467-6370
DOI 10.1108/14676370810842201

Central to all of these developments is the core concept recently restated by University of Florida's President J. B. Machen "I graduate 15,000 students a year. If I could turn out half of them with a sensitivity to sustainability and turn them loose on the world, that's a hell of a contribution" (Carlson, 2006). Perhaps, higher education has a particular and specific function, to graduate influential citizens who value their environment and appreciate that they have a responsibility to help to sustain it. To achieve this, Machen and other leaders in this higher-education-led transformation appear to be seeking far-reaching curriculum and institutional changes of the order identified by the Talloires Declaration and exemplified by Toyne's (1996) greening of the curriculum approaches of the 1990s in the UK. More recently Tilbury *et al.* (2005, p. 15) have emphasised that "Curriculum change offers the opportunity to embed the principles of learning for sustainability such that all students can address sustainability."

But what are these principles of learning for sustainability and how do these projects relate to students' learning outcomes and educational theory? How effectively do they impact on student learning? What curriculum changes are envisaged, what do they attempt to achieve and in what way might they be different from what has come before? Is there an existing educational theoretical framework within which Tilbury *et al.*'s need for all students to address sustainability, and Machen's aim for at least half of them to be sensitive to sustainability, can be addressed?

It is possible to separate what students learn about sustainability during their experience of higher education, from what they learn to value during this same period. Relevant theory separates affective learning from cognitive learning. Affective learning relates to values, attitudes and behaviours and involves the learner emotionally. Cognitive learning relates more to knowledge and its application. It is possible to construct an argument that the essence of education for sustainability is a quest for affective outcomes. This paper constructs this argument and identifies how interpreting aspects of education for sustainability as education in the affective domain will allow educators to categorise the multiplicity of sustainability projects, determine their limitations and acceptability, and benefit from the theoretical framework of affective learning in designing new sustainability interventions. A key element of this process is to explore how other branches of higher education seek and achieve affective outcomes, in an attempt to apply the learning that all branches of education have achieved, to the needs of educators for sustainability.

2. Theoretical foundations of educating for values, attitudes and behaviours

Bloom and Krathwol (1956) and Krathwohl *et al.* (1973) systematically examined domains of learning in the last century. It would be fair to say that educators, particularly higher educators, have traditionally focused on the cognitive domain of learning; what we know and understand, and how we describe, comprehend, apply, analyse, synthesise and evaluate this knowledge and understanding. But Bloom *et al.* also identified levels of learning in the affective domain. The affective domain is about our values, attitudes and behaviours. It includes, in a hierarchy, an ability to listen, to respond in interactions with others, to demonstrate attitudes or values appropriate to particular situations, to demonstrate balance and consideration, and at the highest level, to display a commitment to principled practice on a day-to-day basis, alongside a willingness to revise judgement and change behaviour in the light of new evidence.

Students' motivation to learn and their emotional state whilst learning are also elements of the affective domain (Beard *et al.*, 2007). Bloom and Krathwol categorised the affective domain, but a range of theories, based in a range of disciplinary contexts, address how educators contribute to the development of student attitudes and values. These include learning theories (based around positive reinforcement and cognitive dissonance) and social learning theories (based around social constructivism) as reviewed by Miller (2005). Miller emphasises that even where they are not explicitly stated, affective objectives are pervasive in education.

Since, Bloom *et al.*'s early work, other taxonomies of learning outcomes have been developed, often for discrete elements of higher education. For example, Carter (1985) in summarising the work of many others after Bloom *et al.*, conceptualised the attainment of values and attitudes within the category of personal qualities (alongside knowledge and skill) for professional education. Although it seems intuitive that some elements of both cognitive and affective domains should be easier for students to acquire than others, and this approach has underpinned the development of level-based curricular throughout higher education in recent years, not all analyses place elements of affective learning in a hierarchy. Some reviews emphasise the difficulties that educators will always face when teaching affective outcomes. Indeed, education has often avoided these affective goals. It is quite possible for learners to learn about their subject and be able to describe, comprehend, apply, analyse, synthesise and evaluate to the extent that they can pass their exams, without actually changing their attitudes as indicated by the way they respond or behave afterwards. Bloom *et al.* (1971) discussed this educational failure in a general context. They suggested that educators avoid being too open about their affective objectives because they are concerned about charges of indoctrination or brainwashing. In addition, many educators regard these matters as "private" rather than public and also express concern that affective outcomes are far too long term to be assessed within the timescale of any particular learning programme. These issues have not yet been resolved by higher education practitioners and it not unknown for educators to be accused of indoctrinating practices (see Carlson, 2006, for an example in the area of college sustainability). In addition, it is still relatively rare in education for attainment of these values and attitudes to be openly assessed or for programmes that attempt to, or inadvertently, develop values to be evaluated on this basis. The term "hidden curriculum" has been used to describe these and related anomalies (Atherton, 2005; Margolis, 2001; Rowntree, 1981).

3. Education for sustainability seeks knowledge, skills and affective outcomes

Higher education initiatives that seek outcomes related to environmental sustainability are extremely diverse. They may involve taught elements with conventional knowledge-based learning outcomes directly related to environmental studies. They may involve taught elements in subjects not directly related to environmental studies, but within which environmental themes are developed. They may also involve the institution making business decisions relating to energy conservation or recycling, or even leadership of, and influence on, local, national and international networks. In most cases, there is an explicit or implicit intention to not only inform groups and individuals but also to influence them to subsequently behave in a particular manner:

... Higher Education's most valuable contribution to sustainability lies in providing large numbers of graduates with the knowledge, skills and values that enable business, government and society as a whole to progress towards more sustainable ways of living and working (Chalkley, 2006).

Chalkley expresses the view that education for sustainability must seek outcomes that involve not only knowledge and skills but also the values that underpin sustainable behaviour by businesses, government and society. Chalkey's categories of knowledge, skills and values (linking as they do with Carter's and Bloom *et al.*'s categories described above) indicate that education for sustainability seeks three primary outcomes; graduates should know about sustainability issues, they should have the skills to act sustainably if they wish to and they should have the personal and emotional attributes that require them to behave sustainably. In some cases, however, higher education specifically avoids situations that may appear to influence students to subsequently behave in a particular manner. Lemkowitz *et al.* (1996), for example, provide an example of a long-established first-year course for science and engineering students that stimulates critical and creative thought in sustainability (and assess its attainment), but does not attempt to teach any particular viewpoint or assess students on their attainment of particular values and attitudes.

The hierarchical nature of affective learning outcomes, as proposed by Bloom *et al.*, may prove to be important as it emphasises that, as with cognitive skills, some outcomes may be easier to achieve than others. This hierarchy is relatively straightforward to apply to the developing environmentally aware learner. We start with a willingness to listen, to read and to acquire information. We progress to discuss environmental issues with others and then formulate our own views on the issues to develop opinions that shape our own interactions with others, and with our environment. Later, we start to make life choices and experiment with prioritising "good for us" "good for our dependants" and "good for our descendants". At some point, and at the top of this particular hierarchy, we emerge showing self-reliance, an ability to cooperate or even lead, the confidence to live our life in the way that we chose and a commitment to constantly seek new ways to achieve and to reassess our decisions. The hierarchy also allows higher educators to address values, attitudes and behaviours to different extents, depending on their own stance towards these complex issues. Many educators are comfortable with teaching processes that emphasise a willingness to listen, to discuss and to acquire information. But, they may not be comfortable with a quest for higher order outcomes relating to opinions and behaviours, as described by Lemkowitz *et al.* (1996).

Initiatives also operate at several levels. In the UK, for example, HEFCE funds higher education institutions and seeks to influence these institutions, or members of them, to themselves seek environmental sustainability:

We recognise that we need to continue our own transition to sustainable development. We cannot hope to influence the sector in a significant way, if we are not an exemplar of good practice ourselves (HEFCE, 2006a, b).

At all levels, it should be apparent that knowing how to perform sustainably, and having the skills to do so, are not on their own sufficient to ensure that individual and group behaviours are in fact sustainable.

Research in the area suggests that leaders in higher education should not underestimate the difficulties involved in achieving affective outcomes or in encouraging teachers to seek these outcomes. The Toyne (1996) and Ali Kahn (1996) initiatives in the UK in the early

1990s produced very few examples of “greening of the curriculum” in higher education. More recently, phenomenographic research in Australia has demonstrated that sustainability and teaching tend to be seen by university teachers as separate entities with little appreciation of the role of university teachers in promoting sustainability (Reid and Petocz, 2006). These authors suggest that teachers in higher education do not yet share a common language about sustainability and are actually far from this state.

4. Which disciplines and interdisciplinary areas openly seek affective learning outcomes and how do they achieve these?

Higher education may find affective education difficult to “roll out” but there are some areas within higher education where affective attributes have been valued and sought after for many years. The paragraphs below briefly describe some of these areas and interdisciplinary activities with a view to identifying successful approaches to yield affective outcomes and identifying some of the key factors that promote or limit attainment of affective outcomes. Experience has suggested that certain teaching and learning activities are most successful in encouraging students to move through the affective domain’s hierarchy. In a general learning and teaching context – discussion, open debate, peer involvement, role playing, problem-based learning, engaging with role models, simulations, games, group analysis of case studies, expert engagement, perspective sharing via reflection, appropriate use of multimedia to trigger responses – all provide the mainstay of learning activities in those areas of higher education where affective outcomes are sought and respected (Ornstein and Lasley, 2000; Woolfolk, 1998; Leng, 2002; Shephard, 2005, Howe, 2003; Deyer and Bongero, 1994).

One area where affective outcomes are now openly and successfully sought is health sciences. Doctors, nurses and related health professionals are trained to heal but their training also seeks to ensure that they display caring attitudes towards their patients. Educating professionals to care involves setting learning outcomes that include affective attributes and using learning and teaching activities that promote their attainment (Howe, 2003); ensuring that role models act appropriately (Gagne, 1985; Paice *et al.*, 2002); and using appropriate and effective assessment practices (Howe, 2003). Selection processes may eliminate those with embedded inappropriate attitudes, but educational processes are now openly employed to enhance appropriate attitudes. Inter-professional education is also developing as a major educational advance in the health sciences in an attempt to break down attitudinal barriers between professions during training. In one large-scale project in the UK, extensive use is made of online communication within groups of mixed professions to promote inter-professional dialogue and improved inter-professional attitudes (Macleod Clark *et al.*, 2005).

Some educators have developed a formal interest in those aspects of the affective domain of learning that relate to character development. There is, for example, a peer-reviewed *Journal of College and Character* published by the Center for the Study of Values in College Student Development at Florida State University (2006) with a focus on moral and civic learning in higher education. This source provides a wealth of information about how this sector of higher education views the role of higher education in developing a specific range of affective outcomes in its graduates. An editorial summarises a range of higher education-based activities that are promoted to achieve attainment of affective learning outcomes. These include: community service and service learning; religious and spiritual activities; leadership education;

diversity education; peer advising and leadership; disciplinary and judicial programs; participation in student governance organizations and activities; recreational coaching, refereeing, and judging; student activities programming; and travel (Dalton and Crosby, 2006).

It is worth exploring one of these areas in more detail; that of service learning and community-based teaching. There are many facets to these developments, but most relate to utilising experiential learning (learning by doing) to achieve affective learning outcomes. As defined by Maas Weigert (2006, p. 6):

Community-based learning is an academic course-based type of experiential learning in which the student provides some meaningful work for and with disadvantaged individuals or groups, and where such work meets a need defined by a community, is rooted in the course objectives, integrated into the course by means of assignments that require some form of reflection on the work in light of the course objectives, and is assessed and evaluated accordingly.

Typically, such courses seek affective outcomes that include a range of values, attitudes and behaviours such as a commitment to promote racial understanding and social justice. Maas Weigert (2006) cites significant research evidence that course-embedded community-work does contribute to the attainment of affective outcomes.

Affective outcomes also underpin some of the generic attributes that many higher education institutions claim to instil in their graduates. Indeed, the graduate attribute statements of some higher education institutions suggest that they are in optimum positions to influence the values and attitudes of their students. The University of Sydney (2006) for example, suggests that:

Graduates of the Faculty of Veterinary Science will hold personal values and beliefs consistent with their role as responsible members of local, national, international and professional communities. (E.g. protect the natural environment, maintain biodiversity and conserve endangered species).

Institutions may then broadly formulate how they will encourage the development of these values in students in an institutional learning and teaching strategy or plan. There is some data on how well institutions actually deliver graduates with the required attributes (Phillips and Bond, 2004; Bath *et al.*, 2004) but not when the attributes relate to attitudes and behaviours rather than to discrete abilities. There is a clear need for institutions to reinterpret the learning domain of their desired graduate attributes (as described by Barrie *et al.*, 2003; Barrie, 2004, at the University of Sydney). Measuring graduates' critical thinking, problem solving, group work and communication abilities may not be enough without clearer articulation of the link between ability and behaviour.

Academic development is a different category of discipline whose reason for existence is understood by many to be to change the professional practice of educators. Gosling (2001), for example, surveyed members of the Heads of Educational Development Group in the UK and reported, "all the respondents agreed that it was their role to encourage innovation and change in teaching and learning". Arguably, the essence of intended change relates to a teacher's conception of teaching; often from a teacher-centred to a student-centred perspective. Other substantial changes include enthusiasm for the introduction of learning technologies (Shephard, 2004). In both cases, educational development succeeds if learners change their attitude and resultant teaching behaviours.

These are undoubtedly affective outcomes, and although they are rarely recognized as such, educational developers make use of a distinctive range of teaching approaches to achieve them. Changes in educational professional practice may be directed from above, but more often appear to be produced by progression starting with educational research, moving through academic development and ending in evaluated changes in teaching practice (Shephard, 2006). Academic staff developers and educational evaluators may be pivotal in this sequence (Tilbury *et al.*, 2005; Shephard, 2005) but are probably no more likely than university teachers to change behaviour as a result of research and learning. Baume addresses the likely effectiveness of educational evaluation and educational research. Baume (2003, p. 86) quotes Miller and Partlett (1974) to note that:

It is little exaggeration to assert that educational research has had negligible impact on the workings of educational institutions and on the ways in which academic men and women reflect on their professional activities'. Almost 30 years later on this is still mostly true, and probably as true for educational evaluation as for educational research.

One study demonstrated the potential of e-learning (specifically, online synchronous tutorials using role-play) in achieving affective outcomes in this group (Shephard *et al.*, 2004). Affective changes of this nature are easily missed unless specifically assessed or evaluated.

There remains an eclectic mixture of activities and enterprises that have been developed in higher education and, at least in part, are seen as contributing to the attainment of affective outcomes at the individual or group level. Two examples will suffice to illustrate the range, complexity and current status of this mixture. Reid *et al.* (2006, p. 90) describe how art may have a particular role.

... the engagement of artists in corporate environmentalism has a deeper value – one we would argue is critical to the mainstreaming of tertiary environmental programmes. As previously stated, art – as purposeful creativity – forces the viewer to adopt a normative position, it forces the individual to assess his or her own environmental values. By extension, art can foster a corporate morality – a set of values – that are more critical than financial benefits or legislative compliance in drawing environmental issues into mainstream. It can act as a catalyst for the development of individual and corporate ecological stewardship.

It will be interesting to see education-based evidence to support this assertion in the future. Another example is based on an acceptance that the learning goals associated with education for sustainability are more complex than those in many areas of study. They often include group processes, contexts based in science and society, and competencies that involve judgement that integrate conflicting experiences and incomplete information sets. A learning framework that is becoming widely used in sustainability education and research is the trans-disciplinary case study (TCS) approach (Scholz *et al.*, 2006). Stauffacher *et al.* (2006) argue that this use of TCS is based on both functional socio-cultural constructivism and project-based learning and that students become enabled to tackle complex real-world examples. It remains to be demonstrated that behaviours developed by students during TCS-based learning activities are replicated in real-world examples, but this condition almost certainly applies to all forms of teaching for affective learning outcomes.

5. How may interpreting sustainability outcomes as affective outcomes help education for sustainability?

The examples described in Section 4 add to the literature on teaching and learning in the affective domain and result in an expanding professional understanding of the domain. One purpose of this paper is to draw some generic conclusions from this multidisciplinary literature to identify key aspects of affective domain teaching that could apply to education for sustainability. Based on the literature included here, the author of this review identifies, in particular, four areas of interest; assessment and evaluation, academic credit for affective outcomes, roles for role models and designing learning outcomes in the affective domain.

5.1 Assessment and evaluation

Even where affective learning outcomes are clearly articulated and obviously valued, it is notoriously difficult for teachers to assess performance and give credit for achievement. Traditionally, difficulties relate to the practicality of determining a student's values so that changes may be monitored. Howe (2003) describes, in the caring professions, how portfolios are increasingly used as vehicles to relate experience to learning via reflection. Howe also points out that objective-structured clinical examinations (OSCEs) are now widely and summatively used in clinical education and that they are designed to specifically assess the attainment of some affective learning outcomes. Several groups are currently developing virtual or mock digital OSCEs to prepare students for face-to-face examinations (University of Bristol, 2006). There are many examples in the literature, however, where the validity of assessments in the affective domain have been in doubt (Gratton, 1996).

The early work of Bloom *et al.* (1971) also provides suggestions of how courses that promote the acquisition of values, attitudes and behaviours can be evaluated to measure the degree to which they enable students to acquire the required outcomes. They advise that evaluation can be achieved on a group-wide basis and that this approach avoids some of the really difficult issues in assessing the attainment of values. The situations, tools and techniques involve the use of surveys, questionnaires and semantic differential techniques.

5.2 Credit for attaining affective outcomes

Many authors have deplored the tendency for affective outcomes to carry little or no weight in summative assessment (see for example, Howe, 2003, in relation to teaching medicine; and Maas Weigert, 2006, in a discussion on community-based learning). These authors point out that where institutions provide credit to students who attain openly indicated affective outcomes, the reward for doing so justifies the involvement that is necessary to succeed. There are strong links between this issue and that of the hidden curriculum. There is a clear need for consistency in learning cultures so that students' understanding of what their course is seeking to achieve is underpinned by the structures and processes that play an important part in shaping their learning experience (Ottewill *et al.*, 2005). There is also a need for consistency between the attitudes and values implicit in an educational curriculum and those characteristic of a particular profession (Carter, 1985). Arguably, the best approach to forge this consistency is for educators to be open about their intended learning outcomes and to reward attainment of these outcomes accordingly.

5.3 Key roles for role models

There is little doubt that the literature on affective learning in higher education emphasises the importance of appropriate role models. Early work on the conditions for learning by Gagne (1985) emphasised the importance of role models in teaching affective outcomes and the literature also identifies how poor role models may lead to the acquisition of the wrong values (Paice *et al.*, 2002). Paice *et al.* (2002) even imply that some health care practitioners are such bad role models that students should not be exposed to them least they receive conflicting messages. More recently, in some highly quantitative research, Q methodology was used by educational psychologists Ray and Montgomery (2006) to measure the subjective views of students, staff and faculty towards current and ideal character education. The research emphasized the overwhelming importance of appropriate role models in affective learning in all forms of learning identified by these researchers.

5.4 Climbing the hierarchy

Early research by Bloom *et al.* suggests that the design of teaching and learning activities does need to ensure that learners progress through the hierarchy of affective outcomes so as to avoid values being entrenched rather than developed (Krathwohl *et al.*, 1973). It is also possible to use Bloom *et al.*'s affective domain to design realistic and assessable learning outcomes in the affective domain in the same way as educators use the cognitive domain to design cognitive outcomes (see for example Leng's (2002) taxonomy of affective objectives in an e-learning context.

This hierarchy is also a great asset to enable teachers to consider the acceptability of their approach to their profession, their institution and to the liberal traditions of higher education. Most teachers probably find it acceptable to encourage their students to be willing to listen, to read, to acquire information, and to discuss environmental issues with others. In these ways, they are happy to create opportunities for students to formulate their own views on the issues based on their experience and learning. But, some teachers are apparently prepared to go further. They require students to develop particular attitudes and to behave in particular ways, often in relation to the stated values of their future profession, and assess them on their ability, and willingness, to do so.

6. Conclusion

This paper suggests that a central element of education for sustainability is a quest for affective learning outcomes of values, attitudes and behaviours. It describes the theoretical foundations of this form of education and interprets a range of educational endeavours in these terms. It supports this analysis by identifying other areas of higher education that attempt to achieve affective learning outcomes and by describing how they do this. The paper proceeds to consider key aspects of teaching and learning in the affective domain that potentially have application in education for sustainability. These include the need to design particular approaches for assessment and evaluation, the need to give academic credit for affective outcomes, the pivotal role of role models, and the need to achieve realistic, assessable and acceptable learning outcomes in the affective domain. These examples and this analysis asserts that some disciplines in higher education actively seek particular attitudes and behaviours as student learning outcomes whereas in many areas, teachers attempt to stimulate critical analysis without seeking particular values, attitudes or behaviours. By categorising the range of affective outcomes in a hierarchy or other form

of taxonomy, it is possible for teachers to address the acceptability of their approaches to their profession, their institution and to the liberal traditions of higher education. This area of study is particularly important to higher education for sustainability as an emerging field of enquiry. Research that contributes to epistemology and contextualisation in this field was recently identified as one of several priorities by a cohort of higher education for sustainability experts (Wright, 2007). To benefit from this analysis and from the experience of other educators who attempt to achieve affective outcomes, educators for sustainability need to identify which of their intended learning outcomes are indeed affective outcomes of values, attitudes and behaviours.

References

- AIRES (2006), Australian Research Institute in Education for Sustainability, available at: www.aries.mq.edu.au (accessed 10 November 2006).
- Ali Khan, S. (1996), *Environmental Responsibility: A Review of the 1993 Toyne Report*, HMSO, London.
- Atherton, J.S. (2005), "Teaching and learning: hidden curriculum", available at: www.doceo.co.uk/tools/hidden.htm (accessed 7 November 2006).
- Barrie, S.C. (2004), "A research-based approach to generic graduate attributes policy", *Higher Education Research and Development*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 261-75.
- Barrie, S.C., Jain, P. and Carew, A. (2003), "Generic graduate attributes: a research based framework for a shared vision", *Journal of Staff and Educational Development International*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 191-9.
- Bath, D., Smith, C., Stein, S. and Swann, R. (2004), "Beyond mapping and embedding graduate attributes: bringing together quality assurance and action learning to create a validated and living curriculum", *Higher Education Research and Development*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 277-94.
- Baume, D. (2003), "Monitoring and evaluating staff", in Kahn, P. and Baume, D. (Eds), *A Guide to Staff and Educational Development*, Kogan Page, London, pp. 76-95.
- Beard, C., Clegg, S. and Smith, K. (2007), "Acknowledging the affective in higher education", *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 235-52.
- Bloom, B.S. and Krathwol, D.R. (1956), *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals*, David McKay, New York, NY.
- Bloom, B.S., Hastings, J.T. and Madaus, G.F. (1971), *Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Carlson, S. (2006), "The sustainable university", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 20.
- Carter, R. (1985), "A taxonomy of objectives for professional education", *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 135-49.
- Chalkley, B. (2006), "Education for sustainable development: continuation", *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 235-6.
- Dalton, J. and Crosby, P. (2006), "Ten ways to encourage ethical values in beginning college students", *Journal of College & Character*, Vol. 7 No. 7.
- Deyer, C.A. and Bongero, A.A. (1994), "Trigger films for teaching in the affective domain", *Journal of Continuing Education for Nursing*, Vol. 25 No. 5, pp. 209-12.
- Florida State University (2006), "Home page", *Journal of College and Character*, available at: www.collegevalues.org/journal.cfm (accessed 10 November 2006).
- Gagne, R. (1985), *The Conditions of Learning*, 4th ed., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, NY.

- Gosling, D. (2001), "Educational development units in the UK: what are they doing five years on?", *International Journal for Academic Development*, Vol. 6, pp. 74-90.
- Gratton, M. (1996), "Care studies – a learning method and an assessment tool", *Radiography*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 65-71.
- HEFCE (2006a), Sustainable Development Action Plan, available at: www.hefce.ac.uk/lgm/sustain/ (accessed November 10, 2006).
- HEFCE (2006b), Sustainable Development, available at: www.hefce.ac.uk/lgm/sustain/ (accessed November 10, 2006).
- Howe, A. (2003), "Twelve tips for developing professional attitudes in training", *Medical Teacher*, Vol. 25 No. 5, pp. 485-7.
- Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S. and Bertram, B.M. (1973), "Taxonomy of educational objectives, the classification of educational goals", *Handbook II: Affective Domain*, David McKay, New York, NY.
- Lemkowitz, M., Bibo, B.H., Lameris, G.H. and Bonnet, J.A.B.A.F. (1996), "From small scale, short term to large scale, long term: integrating 'sustainability' into engineering education", *European Journal of Engineering Education*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 353-86, available at: www.tudelft.nl/live/binaries/95ebf155-9796-4156-ad00-dc5a3becd101/doc/TenS_article.pdf (accessed March 5, 2007).
- Leng, Y.L. (2002), "Learner analysis in learner design: the affective domain", *CDTLink*, Vol. 6 No. 3, available at: www.cdtl.nus.edu.sg/link/nov2002/tech2.htm (accessed November 10, 2006).
- Maas Weigert, K. (2006), "Justice, integrity and action: individuals and institutions", Improving University Teaching. paper presented at 31st International Conference, available at: www.iutconference.org/2006/pdfs/MaasWeigert.pdf (accessed November 7, 2006).
- Macleod Clark, J., Humphris, D. and Hean, S. (2005), "New generation project longitudinal study: they said it couldn't be done", available at: www.hciu.soton.ac.uk/3_research/1_projects/ngpls/pub2WorkPapers.asp (accessed November 10, 2006).
- Margolis, E. (2001) in Margolis, E. (Ed.), *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*, Routledge, New York, NY.
- Miller, M. (2005), "Learning and teaching in the affective domain", in Orey, M. (Ed.), *Emerging Perspectives on Learning, Teaching and Technology*, College of Education eBook University of Georgia, Athens available at: www.coe.uga.edu/epltt/affective.htm (accessed March 12, 2007).
- Miller, C.M.L. and Partlett, M. (1974), *Up to the Mark London*, SRHE, London.
- Ornstein, A.C. and Lasley, T.J. (2000), *Strategies for Effective Teaching*, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill, Boston, MA.
- Ottewill, R., Leah, J. and McKenzie, G. (2005), "Integration and the hidden curriculum in business education", *Education & Training*, Vol. 47 No. 2, pp. 89-97.
- Paice, E., Heard, S. and Moss, F. (2002), "How important are role models in making good doctors?", *BMJ*, Vol. 325, pp. 707-10.
- Phillips, V. and Bond, C. (2004), "Undergraduates' experiences of critical thinking", *Higher Education Research and Development*, Vol. 277, p. 294.
- Ray, C.M. and Montgomery, D.M. (2006), "Views in higher education toward methods and approaches for character development of college students", *Journal of College & Character*, Vol. 7 No. 5, available at: www.collegevalues.org/pdfs/Ray%20Views.pdf (accessed November 9, 2006).
- Reid, A. and Petocz, P. (2006), "University lecturers' understanding of sustainability", *Higher Education*, Vol. 51, pp. 105-23.

- Reid, J., Carpenter, D. and Meehan, B. (2006), "Art for earth's sake: creative and interdisciplinary collaborations for sustainability in the tertiary sector", in Filho, W.L and Carpenter, D. (Eds), *Sustainability in the Australasian University*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 81-90.
- Rowntree, D. (1981), *A Dictionary of Education*, Harper & Row, London.
- Scholz, R.W., Lang, D.J., Wiek, A., Walter, A.I. and Stauffacher, M. (2006), "Transdisciplinary case studies as a means of sustainability learning: historical framework and theory", *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 226-51.
- Shephard, K. (2004), "The role of educational developers in the expansion of educational technology", *International Journal for Academic Development*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 67-83.
- Shephard, K.L. (2005), "Higher education's contribution to sustainable development: a guide for teachers with an emphasis on e-learning", available at: [www.clt.soton.ac.uk/LTID/Briefing Papers/sustainable development.pdf](http://www.clt.soton.ac.uk/LTID/BriefingPapers/sustainable%20development.pdf) (accessed November 7, 2006).
- Shephard, K.L. (2006), "How does educational development lead to empowered learners?", paper presented at Improving university teaching, 31st International Conference July, Dunedin, available at: www.iutconference.org/schedule.htm (accessed November 10, 2006).
- Shephard, K., Haslam, P., Hutchings, M. and Furneaux, C. (2004), "Synchronous on-line tutorials for staff development?", *Proceedings of the 4th International Networked Learning Conference Lancaster April 2004*.
- Stauffacher, M., Walter, A.I., Lang, D.J., Wiek, A. and Scholz, R.W. (2006), "Learning to research environmental problems from a functional socio-cultural constructivism perspective; the transdisciplinary case study approach", *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 252-75.
- Tilbury, D., Keogh, A., Leighton, A. and Kent, J. (2005), *A National Review of Environmental Education and its Contribution to Sustainability in Australia: Further and Higher Education*, Australian Government Department of the Environment and Heritage and Australian Research Institute in Education for Sustainability – ARIES, Canberra.
- Toyne, P. (1996), *The Toyne Review*, cited in British Government Panel on Sustainable Development Third Report 1997, available at: www.sd-commission.org.uk/panel-sd/panel3/10.htm (accessed November 10 2006).
- University of Bristol (2006), "Who's doing what?", available at: www.medicis.bris.ac.uk/staff/elearning/whowhat.html (accessed November 10 2006).
- University of Sydney (2006), "Veterinary graduate attributes", available at: www.vetsci.usyd.edu.au/future_students/undergraduate/graduate_attributes.shtml (accessed November 10, 2006).
- Woolfolk, A. (1998), *Educational Psychology*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, MA.
- Wright, T.S.A. (2007), "Developing research priorities with a cohort of higher education for sustainability experts", *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 34-43.

About the author

Kerry Shephard is a Professor and Director of the University of Otago's Higher Education Development Centre, New Zealand. He has a research and teaching background in the biological sciences. Kerry Shephard can be contacted at: kerry.shephard@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

This article has been cited by:

1. PoonJoanna Joanna Poon joannalkpoon@hotmail.com University of Salford, Manchester, UK . 2017. Engaging sustainability good practice within the curriculum design and property portfolio in the Australian higher education sector. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* **18**:1, 146-162. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
2. Petra Molthan-Hill, Helen Puntha, Aldilla Dharmasmita, Kirsty Hunter, Beverley LaweAddressing Food Waste Through University and Community Partnerships 399-413. [[CrossRef](#)]
3. Lorraine LanderEducation for Sustainability: A Wisdom Model 47-58. [[CrossRef](#)]
4. B. Sharma, B. Steward, S.K. Ong, F.E. Miguez. 2017. Evaluation of teaching approach and student learning in a multidisciplinary sustainable engineering course. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **142**, 4032-4040. [[CrossRef](#)]
5. Nayyer Iqbal Ali ChandellaBelieving in the Power of the Child: Reggio Recognizing the Affective 261-286. [[CrossRef](#)]
6. Joyner ArmstrongCosette M. Cosette M. Joyner Armstrong cosette.armstrong@okstate.edu Cosette M. Joyner Armstrong is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Design, Housing and Merchandising at Oklahoma State University. Her research has been focused on sustainability education in the apparel and textiles discipline. HustvedtGwendolyn Gwendolyn Hustvedt gh21@txstate.edu Gwendolyn Hustvedt is an Associate Professor in the School of Family and Consumer Sciences and Graduate Advisor for the Interdisciplinary Master's in Sustainability Studies. Her consumer science research focuses on household behavior, resource consumption and adaptation to climate change. LeHewMelody L.A. Melody L.A. LeHew lehew@ksu.edu Melody L.A. LeHew, Professor in Apparel, Textiles and Interior Design Department at Kansas State University, teaches fashion theory and retail strategy. Her current research focus is sustainable consumption and sustainable retail strategy. AndersonBarbara G. Barbara G. Anderson barbara@ksu.edu Barbara G. Anderson is an Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Apparel, Textiles and Interior Design at Kansas State University. Her professional background is in architecture with an emphasis in American architectural history and historic preservation. Hiller ConnellKim Y. Kim Y. Hiller Connell kyhc@ksu.edu Kim Y. Hiller Connell is an Associate Professor in the Department of Apparel, Textiles and Interior Design at Kansas State University. Her scholarship focuses on sustainability of the fiber, textiles and clothing supply chain and the infusion of sustainability science content into apparel and textiles higher education curricula. Department of Design, Housing, and Merchandising, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, USA School of Family and Consumer Sciences, Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas, USA Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, USA . 2016. When the informal is the formal, the implicit is the explicit. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* **17**:6, 756-775. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
7. ThomasIan Ian Thomas ian.thomas@rmit.edu.au Ian Thomas is an Honorary Associate Professor who has previously taught undergraduate and postgraduate environmental policy programs at RMIT University in Melbourne, Australia. In addition, he has written on environmental impact assessment, environmental policy and environmental management systems. In his research, Ian Thomas has investigated the issues of embedding environmental education and sustainability education in the curricula of universities, examined the status of tertiary environmental programmes and investigated employment of graduates from these programmes. His recent research has focused on capacity building of academics to support Education for Sustainability curriculum, and the graduate capabilities sought by employers, in relation to sustainability. DepasqualeJames James Depasquale james.f.depasquale@gmail.com James Depasquale

completed his Bachelor of Social Science (Environment) at RMIT in 2012. He has worked for the past seven years in the organics industry, both in Australia and the UK. Subsequently, he has worked with Victorian local government authorities, and currently, James Depasquale is the Resource Recovery Officer at Whittlesea City Council where he works with community groups and schools to implement federal, state and local government recycling and composting initiatives. School of Urban, Global and Social Studies, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia . 2016. Connecting curriculum, capabilities and careers. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 17:6, 738-755. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]

8. Larrán Jorge Manuel Manuel Larrán Jorge Manuel Larrán Jorge is a Professor at Department of Finance and Accounting in University of Cadiz. He is currently the Dean of the business school. He was the coordinator of the Strategic Plan of the University of Cadiz when he was Vice Chancellor for planning in this institution (2005-2010). On the other hand, he is a member of the Commission of the Ministry of Education which has developed the manual on corporate social responsibility at universities. He has published more than 80 papers in national and international prestigious journals and 12 books. He is a researcher in charge of various research projects related to valuation of listed companies, the efficiency of SMEs and social responsibility in SMEs and universities. Herrera Madueño Jesús Jesús Herrera Madueño Jesus Herrera Madueño (PhD) is a professor at the Financial Economics and Accounting Department, University of Cadiz. He has BA in Business Administration from the University of Cadiz and PhD in Social Business. His research covers the areas of family firms and corporate social responsibility. He is a member of several research projects. He has participated in conferences in different national and international congresses and has been a member of the organizing committee of different workshops on Social Responsibility at Universities (SRU). He has published four books and has published papers in refereed national and international prestigious journals. Calzado Yolanda Yolanda Calzado Yolanda Calzado (PhD) is an Associate Professor of Business at the University of Cadiz. She holds BA in Business Administration, Universidad de Málaga (1988) and PhD in Economics and Business, Universidad de Cadiz (2004). She got the first prize for her doctoral research (best honors thesis, 2004). Among her academic positions, she has been Director of the Financial Economics and Accounting Department, Universidad de Cadiz (5/11/2004-3/4/2008), and Vice-dean for Planning and Teaching Innovation (from 4/4/2008 to 12/7/2011) and Vice-dean for Quality. In relation to her scientific activity, she has more than 14 contributions to national and international congresses. She has published six books, seven chapters in Books and some Conference volumes. Also, she has published papers in refereed national and international journals. She has been a member of the organizer committee on different national and international congresses. She has also been an evaluator and reviewer of journals. Andrades Javier Javier Andrades Javier Andrades is an Assistant Professor at Department of Finance and Accounting in University of Cadiz. His research interest is focused on higher education for sustainability from several perspectives (reporting, planning, tools and teaching). He is member of the research group related to the value of accounting information in the business management context and is part of different res research projects related to corporate social responsibility. He has published several papers in national and international journals specialized in research on sustainability (Journal of Cleaner Production, Environmental Education Research, International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, among others). Department of Finance and Accounting, University of Cadiz, Cadiz, Spain . 2016. A proposal for measuring sustainability in universities: a case study of Spain. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 17:5, 671-697. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
9. Jeevan Jyoti Department of Commerce, University of Jammu, Jammu, India Sonia Bhau Department of Commerce, University of Jammu, Jammu, India . 2016. Empirical investigation of moderating and mediating variables in between transformational leadership and related outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Management* 30:6, 1123-1149. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]

10. Gretchen R. Miller, Kelly Brumbelow. 2016. Attitudes of Incoming Civil Engineering Students toward Sustainability as an Engineering Ethic. *Journal of Professional Issues in Engineering Education and Practice* D4016002. [[CrossRef](#)]
11. Keren Mintz, Tali Tal. 2016. The place of content and pedagogy in shaping sustainability learning outcomes in higher education. *Environmental Education Research* 1-23. [[CrossRef](#)]
12. Natkin Lisa W. Lisa W. Natkin Lisa W. Natkin, MS, is working toward a PhD in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the University of Vermont (UVM). She is the Curriculum and Community Connections Graduate Assistant for UVM's Office of Sustainability. Natkin has teaching experiences that range from early childhood education to teaching environmental education to middle school students to teaching undergraduate courses. She managed residential environmental education programs and early education centers. Her research interests include integrating sustainability principles into curriculum and evaluating educational effectiveness. Kolbe Tammy Tammy Kolbe Tammy Kolbe, EdD, is an Assistant Professor of educational leadership and policy studies at the University of Vermont. Her research examines the allocation of resources in schools, the cost effectiveness of educational programs and policies and program evaluation and survey research. Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies and the Office of Sustainability, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, USA Department of Educational Leadership and Developmental Sciences, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, USA . 2016. Enhancing sustainability curricula through faculty learning communities. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 17:4, 540-558. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
13. Cláudia V. Viegas, Alan J. Bond, Caroline R. Vaz, Miriam Borchardt, Giancarlo Medeiros Pereira, Paulo M. Selig, Gregório Varvakis. 2016. Critical attributes of Sustainability in Higher Education: a categorisation from literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 126, 260-276. [[CrossRef](#)]
14. Sue Gordon, Ian Thomas. 2016. 'The learning sticks': reflections on a case study of role-playing for sustainability. *Environmental Education Research* 1-19. [[CrossRef](#)]
15. Joseph Pierce, Holly Widen. 2016. Visceral Pedagogy: Teaching Challenging Topics Emotionally as Well as Cognitively. *Journal of Geography* 1-10. [[CrossRef](#)]
16. Stephanie Kaza, Lisa Watts Natkin, Tarah Rowse. 2016. Developing sustainability leadership through faculty professional development. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences* 6:2, 437-444. [[CrossRef](#)]
17. Altomonte Sergio Sergio Altomonte Dr Sergio Altomonte is an Associate Professor at the Department of Architecture and Built Environment, University of Nottingham, where he teaches and researches in the field of architecture and sustainability. He is currently Department Director of Teaching and Learning and member of the University Quality and Standards Committee. A Fellow of the UK Higher Education Academy, he holds a MArch in Architecture and a PhD in Environmental Design from the University La Sapienza (Rome, Italy) and a Master in Sustainable Architecture from the EPFL (Lausanne, Switzerland). He has held academic positions in Italy and Australia, and has been a visiting scholar at the University of California Berkeley (USA) and the Royal Danish Academy (Copenhagen, Denmark). Among several other research initiatives, he was the Coordinator of the European project EDUCATE. Logan Brian Brian Logan Dr Brian Logan is an Associate Professor at the School of Computer Science, University of Nottingham. Prior to coming to Nottingham, he was a lecturer in Artificial Intelligence in the School of Computer Science at the University of Birmingham, and also worked at the University of Cambridge Martin Centre for Architectural and Urban Studies on architectural CAD systems and the Computer Laboratory on computational models of belief revision, and at the Department of Artificial Intelligence at the University of Edinburgh on design support systems. His research interests lie in the area of agent systems, and span the specification, design and implementation of agents, including agent architectures, agent programming languages and logics and theories for agent-based systems. He is also interested in

applications of agents, particularly in virtual environments and in simulation. Feisst Markus Markus Feisst Dr Markus Feisst received his PhD at the University Louis Pasteur (Strasbourg, France) in 2006 and his MSc in Communication and Media Engineering at the University of Applied Sciences Offenburg (Germany) in 2000. After a period spent as a research staff in the Mobile Communication and Waves Lab at the University of Applied Sciences Offenburg, between 2009 and 2012, he held the position of Research Assistant and Software Engineer at the School of Computer Science, University of Nottingham. He is currently Team Leader Product Development at Meyle+Müller GmbH+Co. KG. Rutherford Peter Peter Rutherford Dr Peter Rutherford is an Associate Professor at the Department of Architecture and Built Environment, University of Nottingham. He obtained from the University of Strathclyde his BSc in Architecture in 1993, his MSc in Computer-Aided Design in 1994 and his PhD on Architectural and Psychoacoustics in 1997. After his doctoral studies, he worked as an applications engineer for a major acoustics company as well as spending three years as a postdoctoral research fellow in the Medical School at the University of Leeds. Many of his teaching techniques were gleaned from the interdisciplinary and applied nature of medical training. With Dr Robin Wilson, he has published on creativity within an integrated environmental design curriculum, their efforts rewarded in 2007 through the receipt of the University of Nottingham's Lord Dearing Award for excellence in teaching. Wilson Robin Robin Wilson Dr Robin Wilson is currently the Head of the Department of Architecture and Built Environment at the University of Nottingham. He holds a BSc in Building and a PhD in Architectural Acoustics from Heriot-Watt University. After having spent periods of research as a post-doctoral research associate at Heriot-Watt University and the University of Hull, he joined the University of Nottingham in 1995 where he engaged with the teaching of environmental design to architecture and engineering students. He was responsible for setting up a master course in renewable energy and architecture, and later served as the course director to an innovative undergraduate master programme in architecture and environmental design accredited by both the architectural and engineering professional bodies in the UK. Department of Architecture and Built Environment, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK School of Computer Science, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK Department of Architecture and Built Environment, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK . 2016. Interactive and situated learning in education for sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 17:3, 417-443. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]

18. Hubscher-Davidson Séverine Séverine Hubscher-Davidson Séverine Hubscher-Davidson is a Lecturer in Translation Studies at Aston University, Birmingham. She teaches both translation theory and practice, and her research interests are in the areas of the translation process and translators' individual differences more generally. She has recently taken an interest in language students' awareness and understanding of sustainable development and how this affects cross-cultural communication. She is currently working on a book on the topic of emotions in translation. Panichelli-Batalla Stéphanie Stéphanie Panichelli-Batalla Stéphanie Panichelli-Batalla is a Lecturer of Spanish and Latin American Studies at Aston University, Birmingham. She teaches Spanish language and thematic modules related to Latin American culture, society and politics. She has published in the areas of Cuban literature and she is currently finishing a book on the testimony in Reinaldo Arenas' *Pentagon*. Her most recent research focuses on the use of oral history to explore the construction of alternative, subaltern narratives of Cuban identity "from below". School of Languages and Social Sciences, Aston University, Birmingham, UK . 2016. Educating for sustainability in language degrees: a tale of 2 case-studies. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 17:3, 404-416. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
19. Debby Cotton, Chris Shiel, Arminda Paço. 2016. Energy saving on campus: a comparison of students' attitudes and reported behaviours in the UK and Portugal. *Journal of Cleaner Production* . [[CrossRef](#)]

20. Elham Faham, Ahmad Rezvanfar, Seyed Hamid Movahed Mohammadi, Meisam Rajabi Nohooji. 2016. Using system dynamics to develop education for sustainable development in higher education with the emphasis on the sustainability competencies of students. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* . [[CrossRef](#)]
21. Luiza de Sousa and Alex Tubawene Kanyimba Daniel Etse Department of Purchasing and Supply, Kumasi Polytechnic, Kumasi, Ghana Coral Ingley Department of Management, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand . 2016. Higher education curriculum for sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 17:2, 269-280. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
22. Tobias Svanström. 2016. Time Pressure, Training Activities and Dysfunctional Auditor Behaviour: Evidence from Small Audit Firms. *International Journal of Auditing* 20:1, 42-51. [[CrossRef](#)]
23. Susan Jagger, Erin Sperling, Hilary Inwood. 2016. What's growing on here? Garden-based pedagogy in a concrete jungle. *Environmental Education Research* 22:2, 271-287. [[CrossRef](#)]
24. Chamila Roshani Perera Faculty of Business and Law, Swinburne Business School, Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia Chandana Rathnasiri Hewege Faculty of Business and Law, Swinburne Business School, Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia . 2016. Integrating sustainability education into international marketing curricula. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 17:1, 123-148. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
25. Ricardo O. San Carlos, Olga Tyunina, Yuki Yoshida, Aimee Mori, Giles Bruno Sioen, Jiaqi Yang Assessment of Fieldwork Methodologies for Educational Purposes in Sustainability Science: Exercise on Resilience, Tohoku Unit 2015 67-91. [[CrossRef](#)]
26. Carsten Reise, Luan Phan. 2016. Sustainable Manufacturing in Vietnamese Engineering Education – Approaches from the Vietnamese-German University. *Procedia CIRP* 40, 341-346. [[CrossRef](#)]
27. Fitra A. BACHTIAR, Eric W. COOPER, Gunadi H. SULISTYO, Katsuari KAMEI. 2016. Student Assessment Based on Affective Factors in English Learning Using Fuzzy Inference. *International Journal of Affective Engineering* 15:2, 101-108. [[CrossRef](#)]
28. Alexandra Bekiari, Theodota Tsaggopoulou. 2016. Verbal Aggressiveness and Affective Learning in Physical Education. *Advances in Physical Education* 06:04, 406-418. [[CrossRef](#)]
29. Manuel Larrán Jorge, Jesús Herrera Madueño, Francisco Javier Andrades Peña. 2015. Factors influencing the presence of sustainability initiatives in the strategic planning of Spanish universities. *Environmental Education Research* 21:8, 1155-1187. [[CrossRef](#)]
30. Professor Harry Matlay Lynne Wyness Pedagogic Research Institute and Observatory (PedRIO), Plymouth University, Plymouth, UK Paul Jones Plymouth Business School, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, UK Rita Klapper Manchester Business School, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK . 2015. Sustainability: what the entrepreneurship educators think. *Education + Training* 57:8/9, 834-852. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
31. Louisa Tomas, Sarah Girgenti, Cliff Jackson. 2015. Pre-service teachers' attitudes toward education for sustainability and its relevance to their learning: implications for pedagogical practice. *Environmental Education Research* 1-24. [[CrossRef](#)]
32. Manuel Larrán Jorge, Jesús Herrera Madueño, María Yolanda Calzado Cejas, Francisco Javier Andrades Peña. 2015. An approach to the implementation of sustainability practices in Spanish universities. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 106, 34-44. [[CrossRef](#)]

33. Ulisses Miranda Azeiteiro, Paula Bacelar-Nicolau, Fernando J.P. Caetano, Sandra Caeiro. 2015. Education for sustainable development through e-learning in higher education: experiences from Portugal. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **106**, 308-319. [[CrossRef](#)]
34. Paola Schmitt Figueiró, Emmanuel Raufflet. 2015. Sustainability in higher education: a systematic review with focus on management education. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **106**, 22-33. [[CrossRef](#)]
35. Sara Arnon, Nir Orion, Nurit Carmi. 2015. Environmental literacy components and their promotion by institutions of higher education: an Israeli case study. *Environmental Education Research* **21**:7, 1029-1055. [[CrossRef](#)]
36. Michelle Lasen, Louisa Tomas, Angela Hill. 2015. Potential of service-learning to promote sustainability competencies in pre-service teachers: a case study. *Teaching Education* **26**:4, 341-365. [[CrossRef](#)]
37. Carolyn Young, John Reid, Bart Meehan. 2015. Taking action: researching an innovative pedagogy for an aesthetic visual approach to environmental issues. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* **16**, 64-72. [[CrossRef](#)]
38. Nelson Soares MIT-Portugal Program, EFS Initiative, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal AND ADAI, LAETA, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal AND ISISE, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal. Luísa Dias Pereira MIT-Portugal Program, EFS Initiative, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal AND ADAI, LAETA, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal. João Ferreira MIT-Portugal Program, EFS Initiative, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal AND GEMF, Faculty of Economics, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal. Pedro Conceição Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal. Patrícia Pereira da Silva MIT-Portugal Program, EFS Initiative, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal AND INESC-Coimbra, Faculty of Economics, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal. . 2015. Energy efficiency of higher education buildings: a case study. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* **16**:5, 669-691. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
39. Emma Savage College of Sustainability, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada. Tara Tapics College of Sustainability, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada. John Everts College of Sustainability, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada. Jeffrey Wilson College of Sustainability, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada. Susan Tirone College of Sustainability, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada. . 2015. Experiential learning for sustainability leadership in higher education. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* **16**:5, 692-705. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
40. Kerry Shephard, John Harraway, Brent Lovelock, Miranda Miroso, Sheila Skeaff, Liz Slooten, Mick Strack, Mary Furnari, Tim Jowett, Lynley Deaker. 2015. Seeking learning outcomes appropriate for 'education for sustainable development' and for higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* **40**:6, 855-866. [[CrossRef](#)]
41. Kerry Shephard, John Harraway, Tim Jowett, Brent Lovelock, Sheila Skeaff, Liz Slooten, Mick Strack, Mary Furnari. 2015. Longitudinal analysis of the environmental attitudes of university students. *Environmental Education Research* **21**:6, 805-820. [[CrossRef](#)]
42. Kerry Shephard, Pete Dular. 2015. Why It Matters How We Frame "Education" in Education for Sustainable Development. *Applied Environmental Education & Communication* **14**:3, 137-148. [[CrossRef](#)]
43. Fitra A. Bachtiar, Gunadi H. Sulisty, Eric W. Cooper, Katsuari Kamei Fuzzy Inference System Based on a Model of Affective-Cognitive Criteria 343-348. [[CrossRef](#)]
44. Egle Katiliute, Asta Daunoriene. 2015. Dissemination of Sustainable Development on Universities Websites'. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* **191**, 865-871. [[CrossRef](#)]

45. Jelena Stankevičienė, Justina Pilelytė. 2015. Investment Management in Higher Education Institutions. *Mokslas - Lietuvos ateitis* 7:2, 141-149. [[CrossRef](#)]
46. Zoe P. Robinson. 2015. Are geography students good “environmental citizens?” A comparison between year of study and over time. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 39:2, 245-259. [[CrossRef](#)]
47. Mary McCormick Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA Angela R. Bielefeldt Department of Civil, Environmental and Architectural Engineering, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA Christopher W. Swan Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA Kurtis G. Paterson Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI, USA . 2015. Assessing students’ motivation to engage in sustainable engineering. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 16:2, 136-154. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
48. Gaurav Chawla, Parikshat Singh Manhas. 2015. Sustainability in Higher Education: An Exploratory Investigation of Hospitality Management Courses. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Innovation in Hospitality and Tourism (APJIHT)* 4:1. . [[CrossRef](#)]
49. Zehui Zhan, Patrick Fong, Hu Mei, Xuhua Chang, Ting Liang, Zicheng Ma. 2015. Sustainability Education in Massive Open Online Courses: A Content Analysis Approach. *Sustainability* 7:3, 2274-2300. [[CrossRef](#)]
50. Stephen G. Sutton School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, James Cook University Townsville, Australia Emma Gyuris School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, James Cook University Townsville, Australia . 2015. Optimizing the environmental attitudes inventory. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 16:1, 16-33. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
51. Kerry Shephard A Grounded Theory about ES/ESD in Higher Education 34-53. [[CrossRef](#)]
52. Kerry Shephard The Challenges of Education for Critical Action 101-114. [[CrossRef](#)]
53. Alex Tubawene Kanyimba, E. N. M. Katewa, Pamela Claassen. 2015. The Contribution of Education for Sustainable Development to Transformational Leadership among Selected Namibian School Principals. *Open Journal of Social Sciences* 03:03, 186-196. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Kerry Shephard Educational Research to Find a Way Forward: Methods and Results 20-33. [[CrossRef](#)]
55. Farhana Wan Yunus, Sharifah Muzlia Syed Mustafa, Norsidah Nordin, Melissa Malik. 2015. Comparative Study of Part-time and Full-time Students’ Emotional Intelligence, Psychological Well-being and Life Satisfaction in the Era of New Technology. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 170, 234-242. [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Yu-Wei Lin, Holger A Volk, Jacques Penderis, Andrea Tipold, Jan P Ehlers. 2015. Development of learning objectives for neurology in a veterinary curriculum: part I: undergraduates. *BMC Veterinary Research* 11:1, 2. [[CrossRef](#)]
57. Kerry Shephard Affect, Cognition and Criticality: Some Educational Theory for University Teachers and for Educational Developers 59-87. [[CrossRef](#)]
58. Elizabeth Sidiropoulos. 2014. Education for sustainability in business education programs: a question of value. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 85, 472-487. [[CrossRef](#)]
59. Paul Murray, Julie Goodhew, Sheran Murray. 2014. The heart of ESD: personally engaging learners with sustainability. *Environmental Education Research* 20:5, 718-734. [[CrossRef](#)]
60. Keren Mintz, Tali Tal. 2014. Sustainability in higher education courses: Multiple learning outcomes. *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 41, 113-123. [[CrossRef](#)]

61. Ian Thomas School of Global, Urban and Social Science, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia
Teresa Day School of Global, Urban and Social Science, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia .
2014. Sustainability capabilities, graduate capabilities, and Australian universities. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 15:2, 208-227. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
62. O. Lee McCabe, George S. Everly, Lisa M. Brown, Aaron M. Wendelboe, Nor Hashidah Abd Hamid, Vicki L. Tallchief, Jonathan M. Links. 2014. Psychological First Aid: A Consensus-Derived, Empirically Supported, Competency-Based Training Model. *American Journal of Public Health* 104:4, 621-628. [[CrossRef](#)]
63. Tim Jowett, John Harraway, Brent Lovelock, Sheila Skeaff, Liz Slooten, Mick Strack, Kerry Shephard. 2014. Multinomial-Regression Modeling of the Environmental Attitudes of Higher Education Students Based on the Revised New Ecological Paradigm Scale. *The Journal of Environmental Education* 45:1, 1-15. [[CrossRef](#)]
64. Charlotte Hesselbarth, Stefan Schaltegger. 2014. Educating change agents for sustainability – learnings from the first sustainability management master of business administration. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 62, 24-36. [[CrossRef](#)]
65. Orana Jade Sandri. 2013. Threshold concepts, systems and learning for sustainability. *Environmental Education Research* 19:6, 810-822. [[CrossRef](#)]
66. Kerry Shephard, Mary Furnari. 2013. Exploring what university teachers think about education for sustainability. *Studies in Higher Education* 38:10, 1577-1590. [[CrossRef](#)]
67. Omar S. LópezOccupational Education Program, College of Applied Arts, Texas State University at Round Rock, Round Rock, Texas, USA. 2013. Creating a sustainable university and community through a Common Experience. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 14:3, 291-309. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
68. Ian Thomas, Matthias Barth, Teresa Day. 2013. Education for Sustainability, Graduate Capabilities, Professional Employment: How They All Connect. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education* 29:01, 33-51. [[CrossRef](#)]
69. Benjamin Karatzoglou. 2013. An in-depth literature review of the evolving roles and contributions of universities to Education for Sustainable Development. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 49, 44-53. [[CrossRef](#)]
70. Ki-Hoon Lee, Michelle Barker, Agata Mouasher. 2013. Is it even espoused? An exploratory study of commitment to sustainability as evidenced in vision, mission, and graduate attribute statements in Australian universities. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 48, 20-28. [[CrossRef](#)]
71. Tracy Kennedy School of Design, Otago Polytechnic, Forth St Campus, Private Bag 1910, Dunedin, New Zealand, tracy.kennedy@op.ac.nz Caroline Terpstra School of Design, Otago Polytechnic, Forth St Campus, Private Bag 1910, Dunedin, New Zealand, caroline.terpstra@op.ac.nz . 2013. A Stitch in Time Saves Nine: Identifying Pedagogies for Teaching Sustainability Issues to Fashion Students. *Research Journal of Textile and Apparel* 17:2, 127-135. [[Abstract](#)] [[PDF](#)]
72. Wendy StubbsSchool of Geography and Environmental Science, Monash University, Clayton, Australia. 2013. Addressing the business-sustainability nexus in postgraduate education. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 14:1, 25-41. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
73. S. MannDepartment of Information Technology, Otago Polytechnic, Dunedin, New Zealand J. HarrawayDepartment of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand F. Broughton-AnsinDepartment of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand L. DeakerHigher Education Development Centre, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand K.

- Shephard Higher Education Development Centre, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand. 2013. Seeking richer descriptions of learners' sustainability attributes and learning needs. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 14:1, 90-100. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
74. Pere Lavega, Gema Filella, Francisco Lagardera, Mercé Mateu, Jordi Ochoa. 2013. Juegos motores y emociones. *Cultura y Educación* 25:3, 347-360. [[CrossRef](#)]
75. Zhigang Shen, Wayne Jensen, Timothy Wentz, Bruce Fischer. 2012. Teaching Sustainable Design Using BIM and Project-Based Energy Simulations. *Education Sciences* 2:4, 136-149. [[CrossRef](#)]
76. Robert L. Nagel, Eric C. Pappas, Olga Pierrakos. 2012. On a Vision to Educating Students in Sustainability and Design—The James Madison University School of Engineering Approach. *Sustainability* 4:12, 72-91. [[CrossRef](#)]
77. Azmahani Abdul Aziz, Sharipah Norbaini Syed Sheikh, Khairiyah Mohd Yusof, Amirmudin Udin, Jamaludin Mohamad Yatim. 2012. Developing a Structural Model of Assessing Students' Knowledge-Attitudes towards Sustainability. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 56, 513-522. [[CrossRef](#)]
78. Susan Cholette, Theresa Roeder. 2012. Embedding a Sustainability Module Into Quantitative Business Courses. *INFORMS Transactions on Education* 13:1, 44-56. [[CrossRef](#)]
79. Jolita Horbačauskienė. 2012. Liberaliojo ugdymo dimensija technologinio universiteto studijose. *Santalka* 20:1, 36-48. [[CrossRef](#)]
80. Malik Naeem School of Management, COMSATS University, Islamabad, Pakistan Mark Neal School of Business, Eastern Institute of Technology, Napier, New Zealand. 2012. Sustainability in business education in the Asia Pacific region: a snapshot of the situation. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 13:1, 60-71. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
81. John Harraway, Freya Broughton-Ansin, Lynley Deaker, Tim Jowett, Kerry Shephard. 2012. Exploring the Use of the Revised New Ecological Paradigm Scale (NEP) to Monitor the Development of Students' Ecological Worldviews. *The Journal of Environmental Education* 43:3, 177-191. [[CrossRef](#)]
82. Suzanne Benn, Cathy Rusinko. 2011. The technological community as a framework for educating for sustainability in business schools. *Journal of Management & Organization* 658-671. [[CrossRef](#)]
83. Suzanne Benn, Cathy Rusinko. 2011. The technological community as a framework for educating for sustainability in business schools. *Journal of Management & Organization* 17:5, 656-669. [[CrossRef](#)]
84. Suzanne Benn, Cathy Rusinko. 2011. The technological community as a framework for educating for sustainability in business schools. *Journal of Management & Organization* 17:05, 656-669. [[CrossRef](#)]
85. Wendy Stubbs School of Geography and Environmental Science, Monash University, Clayton, Australia Jan Schapper Graduate School of Management, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia. 2011. Two approaches to curriculum development for educating for sustainability and CSR. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 12:3, 259-268. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
86. Arnim Wiek, Lauren Withycombe, Charles L. Redman. 2011. Key competencies in sustainability: a reference framework for academic program development. *Sustainability Science* 6:2, 203-218. [[CrossRef](#)]
87. Kerry Shephard, Nell Smith, Lynley Deaker, John Harraway, Freya Broughton-Ansin, Sam Mann. 2011. Comparing different measures of affective attributes relating to sustainability. *Environmental Education Research* 17:3, 329-340. [[CrossRef](#)]
88. Bethany L. Woodworth, Michelle M. Steen-Adams, Prashant Mittal. 2011. Role of an environmental studies course on the formation of environmental worldviews: a case study of a core curriculum requirement using the NEP Scale. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences* 1:2, 126-137. [[CrossRef](#)]

89. Leamor Kahanov, Lindsey E. Eberman. 2010. Defining Outcomes and Creating Assessment Tools for AT Education, Part 1. *Athletic Therapy Today* 15:6, 41-44. [[CrossRef](#)]
90. Ralf Hansmann. 2010. "Sustainability Learning": An Introduction to the Concept and Its Motivational Aspects. *Sustainability* 2:9, 2873-2897. [[CrossRef](#)]
91. Ray MarksS. Joan Wharf HigginsSchool of Exercise Science, Physical and Health Education, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada Lara L. LauzonSchool of Exercise Science, Physical and Health Education, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada Ann C. YewSchool of Biomedical Physiology and Kinesiology, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada Christopher D. BratsethSchool of Exercise Science, Physical and Health Education, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada Nicole McLeodFaculty of Recreation and Physical Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada. 2010. Wellness 101: health education for the university student. *Health Education* 110:4, 309-327. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
92. David Braun. 2010. Teaching Sustainability Analysis in Electrical Engineering Lab Courses. *IEEE Transactions on Education* 53:2, 243-247. [[CrossRef](#)]
93. Kumba Jallow. 2010. Education for environmentally responsible behaviour in business. *International Journal of Environment and Sustainable Development* 9:1/2/3, 213. [[CrossRef](#)]
94. Peter Jones. 2010. RESPONDING TO THE ECOLOGICAL CRISIS: TRANSFORMATIVE PATHWAYS FOR SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION. *Journal of Social Work Education* 46:1, 67-84. [[CrossRef](#)]
95. Anna C. Hurlimann. 2009. Responding to environmental challenges: an initial assessment of higher education curricula needs by Australian planning professionals. *Environmental Education Research* 15:6, 643-659. [[CrossRef](#)]
96. Kerry Shephard, Samuel Mann, Nell Smith, Lynley Deaker. 2009. Benchmarking the environmental values and attitudes of students in New Zealand's post-compulsory education. *Environmental Education Research* 15:5, 571-587. [[CrossRef](#)]
97. Mageswary KarpudewanSchool of Educational Studies, University Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia Zurida Hj IsmailSchool of Educational Studies, University Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia Norita MohamedSchool of Chemical Sciences, University Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia. 2009. The integration of green chemistry experiments with sustainable development concepts in pre-service teachers' curriculum. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 10:2, 118-135. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)]
98. Kerry Shephard. 2009. e is for exploration: Assessing hard-to-measure learning outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 40:2, 386-398. [[CrossRef](#)]
99. Anthony Middlebrooks, Lauren Miltenberger, James Tweedy, Grant Newman, Joanna Follman. 2009. Developing a sustainability ethic in leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies* 3:2, 31-43. [[CrossRef](#)]
100. Robert L. Nagel, Kyle G. Gipson, Adebayo OgundipeIntegrating Sustainable Design and Systems Thinking throughout an Engineering Curriculum 136-153. [[CrossRef](#)]