

PAY 04225

Title: The household as a site of environmental education: 'Green' families and intergenerational environmental ethics and politics:

AARE, 2004

Dr. Phillip Payne is Deputy Head of School (Research) in Education at La Trobe University, Bendigo. He is a member of the international editorial boards of *Environmental Education Research* and the *Journal of Environmental Education*.

BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH

Findings from one component of a much larger study are reported below. The larger study of families and households combines the work of two grants. The first investigated the intergenerational environmental ethics/politics (or lack of) in 30 'normal' (ie 'non green') families in Bendigo; the second investigated the environmental ethics/politics of 6 inner city Melbourne and 6 Bendigo families who voted for, or are committed to the Greens.

This paper presents preliminary findings from the Melbourne inner city study where at least one parent is a member of the Greens, or votes Green, and at least one child is between 8-16. This qualitative/interpretive research seeks to describe how the family household acts as a site of environmental education.

The research problem relates to numerous unresolved questions about how parents and their children, individually and collectively, 'socially construct' their environmental commitments and 'behaviours'. This 'situated/circumstantial' locus of actions, interactions, relations and associations must be seen in the broader context of the so-called 'ecological crisis,' a popularised notion whose focus 'out there' tends to exonerate the individual, social and political agency required 'in here' if that 'crisis' is to be understood and even remedied. Environmental education typically replicates the Cartesian separation of 'I' and 'world' by focussing on 'out there' knowledge, 'texts', issues and problems not necessarily of learners' own 'doing' and 'making'. It should come as no surprise that children and youth (and adults) express high 'concern' about the environment and its prospects yet consistently feel 'disempowered' and disengaged.

I aim, therefore, to shed some light on how environmental ethics and ecopolitics are enacted 'everyday' in the home, 'passed down' by parents, and negotiated and practiced with their children. Hence, INTERGENERATIONAL ECOPOLITICS.

This study of the embodied and enframed household praxis AND the functioning of the family is different from much research in environmental education and education for sustainable development. It is far less concerned with the customary 'head/mind' stuff of (measurable) environmental beliefs, knowledge, attitudes and values of family members -- although these rational 'concerns' (a very common expression in env ed) do impregnate the habitual, routinized and pre-discursive 'conventions' (rules/resources) of family functioning, (in)action, interaction and relations indicated above.

WHY?

1. Allegations that environmental education hasn't lived up to its expectations and that the field might have 'failed' in promoting environmental 'literacy' and/or 'pro' environmental behaviours (*irrespective* of the chronic dilution of environmental education in schools, in curriculum frameworks, in critical education discourses, in pre-service teacher education).
2. Such allegations rarely consider the powerful (everyday) influence of the family on the 'baggage' those children bring to school. The influence of the family/household cannot be dismissed or underestimated when 'evaluating/judging' the efficacy of the (contrived) school-based State intervention. This 'lack of commonsense' in research and curriculum development also applies to other 'human issues' type curriculum such as health ed, citizenship ed, drug ed. It is counter productive to not examine the relationship between the home and the curriculums/pedagogies we as educators contrive and discipline as 'interventions' in schools.
3. By listening to 'green parents' and their children, about the 'everyday' of the home, we might learn about versions of, arguably, 'best practice'. If so, there might be valuable lessons for what schools and teachers could or should be doing in their environmental education efforts. Green parenting may, in fact, be an ideal 'model' from which curriculum theory and pedagogical practices in environmental ed/ed for sustainability might proceed.
4. There has been very little research into how the home (de or re)constructs dominant 'academic/theoretical' versions of environmental ethics and ecopolitics.
5. Then, there are worrying trends in Aust society. ABS data show declining household concern for the environment (to 62% in 2000 from 75% in 1992) plus the well known/documented view about youth 'feeling powerless' to 'make a difference' despite high levels of concern. But, do those disempowered youth acknowledge or act upon the powerful opportunity they have at home and in their own lives to make a difference? Do parents/families enable or disable (environmental) practices? Hence, a study of inner city and regional families for comparative purposes and inclusion of 8-16 year olds.

THE OVERALL PROJECT

Two grants.

1. 30 'NORMAL' (not Green) families in Bendigo, an anglo saxon, regional centre of 90,000 with a 'suburban' like environment but easy access to the 'bush'. Green Vote 2004 = 6.55% (+0.91%) Held by Labor (marginal). Volunteer samples from two primary schools, year 6 students, at the extremes of the 'Like School' range and two secondary schools, year 10 students, at the extremes of the SE index.
2. 12 GREEN families. 6 in inner city Melbourne; Green vote = 18.5% (+2.73%) and 6 in Bendigo. Member of Green party or vote/committed to Green. Volunteer with children between ages of 8-16.

RESEARCH FRAME

STUDY 1 30 Normal Bendigo Families		STUDY 2 12 Green Families	
15 from upper	15 from lower	6 Inner City	6 Regional

'Like School' 7/8 at year 6 level 7/8 at year 10	'Like School' 7/8 at year 6 level 7/8 at year 10	Melbourne 8-16 yrs old	Bendigo 8-16 yrs old
Parent = 1 -> 1.5 hour 'semi structured/conversational' interview, 25 item household inventory, 134 item survey			
Child = 30 -> 45 minute conversational interview, 92 item survey			
'Grounded Theory' – inductive, interpretive, content analysis → emerging conceptual groupings → returned to 'subjects' for negotiation/elaboration → preliminary findings			

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

1. 'Privacy' legislation and, therefore, problems of 'access' to recruit Greens' members via local electronic and hard mail lists.
2. Anecdotal information that very few inner city Greens' members were i) a conventional/traditional two parent family ii) with children between the ages of 8-16, iii) and were anglo-saxon.
3. The (non)generalizability of qualitative studies with a low sample size.
4. Preferred ethnographic/phenomenological studies of household/family as a 'living culture' of intergenerational 'ecopolitics/environmental ethics' was not really an option due to
 - Intrusive nature of household ethnographies
 - High probability of rejection by families, university ethics committee
5. Reliance, therefore, on conventional multiple methods of in-depth interview (on-site including minimal 'observation'), completion of household inventory and questionnaire.
6. The need for data that 'excavated' individual and collective actions (and inactions), routines and relations as distinct from individual beliefs, attitudes, concerns and values.
7. The usual 'pomo' concerns about the (subject's) presentation of self—limits of 'voice', reason, memory, age (for younger children) and desire for coherent self narratives.
8. The usual 'pomo' angst about the researcher's re-presentation of subjects' experiences and 'biographies' (ie the gross reduction of agency/structure, context, circumstance and positioning to text about it).

6 Inner city Green Families from the N. Fitzroy/Clifton Hill, Northcote area. Strong Green representation in local government. Demographic is highly educated, professional and affluent → replacing poorer, working class over past 2 decades. Five families with mum/dad; 1 with single mum. = 11 interviews with adults; 9 children (only 1 was 16, majority were 10-12) interviewed, some in pairs.

Preliminary findings based on analysis of individual tapes/transcripts, using inductive means to cluster like concepts in emerging categories (ie conceptual indicators as part of a grounded theory, Strauss, 1987) AND returning this first level of individual transcript analysis to respondents (adult only) to check for accuracy of data within conceptual clusters and opportunity to qualify OR elaborate on various ideas (Alvesson, 2002). Either in written form or another discussion.

GENERAL FINDINGS

- Intergenerational continuity across three generations of (pro) environmental practices is present in different versions of family ethics/politics according to changing social conditions, characterized by scarcity/financial need/circumstances (grandparents) -> frugality/anti consumerism/low or counter materialism (parents) -> 'postmaterial' educated constraint (children)
- The current cohort of parents' environmental practices often mark a 'return' to their own parents' conservator 'way of life' and 'memories' of their values but is now a 'retraditionalized' extension and form of social justice/equity commitments.
- The majority of children intentionally rehearse or replicate their parents' environmental practices and reconstitute a family ecopolitic/environmental ethic.
- All participants actively demonstrate conservator and/or pro-environmental practices to a high→moderate level.

PARENTS (current, 45-55 yrs old)

- Parents' environmental ethics and ecopolitic is evolutionary with strong social justice and feminist influences, exposure to other cultures due to travel overseas during late secondary/university studies, often returning to community living arrangements and inner city orientation while incorporating environmental into social activism in domestic, local and national spheres
- Nature and nature experiences/endorsement are not prominent in parents' formative development but home-based vegetable/fruit growing and family holidays (in outdoors) were viewed as important/memorable
- University studies and socio-political climate of late 60s/early 70s were highly influential and 'enabling' or favorable; social and environmental activism prominent in 70s/80s and declining in 90s due to family obligations/priorities and work commitments
- Parents are anglo-saxon, highly educated and now work in a variety of professional human/social service settings with mothers more inclined to work part-time due to child raising commitments
- Parents agree to earn less income than what could be expected but maintain comfortable and conscientiously low consumption inner city lifestyles
- Children/family 'delayed', often to mid/late 30s – 'wiser' and more knowledgeable parenting philosophy and practices attributed to extended and varied life experiences

FAMILIES

- Family functioning/parenting strategies are (strongly) socially 'democratic' – participatory, communicative and responsive; are underpinned by 'governing' principles that are strategically and 'openly' practiced, sometimes 'persuasively' or 'manipulatively' and demonstrably modelled
- Family ecopolitic is increasingly 'domestic', more likely to occur indoor and is often food/diet related and critical of 'consumer culture' practices but also reflected in ongoing/durable commitments to social-justice and community engagement

- Family ecopolitic and its values and practice bases are usually intensified/managed or sustained by mother
- All family members demonstrate high -- moderate levels of 'pro' environmental/conservator actions in five dimensions – water, energy, waste, travel and self. Travel/use of car is 'weakest' ethic.
- Green practices are 'normalized' and habitualized, often through conscientious repetition, in household conventions and routines. Children often 'remind' parents of conservator 'rules' broken in household actions
- Many parents actively limit (younger) children's access to electronic media (tv, computer, mobile, etc), restrict selection of content, and avoid/deflect consumer culture imperatives (fast food, fashion shopping, school tuck shop).
- Most families wish to 'green' their older houses with solar equipment and other resources but are constrained by lack of finances
- Strong community/cooperative focus of families committed to inner city advantages of 'green living' with nature often as 'background' but occasionally sought for 'endorsing' of values and/or 'therapy' purposes → flow to children

CHILDREN

- All children are intelligent, expressive, articulate and 'feeling' / mature 'beyond their years'
- Children less than 10 have vague ideas about environmental problems, concerns, practices and solutions
- Strong uptake, little resistance, by children of parents' pro-environmental actions and 'voluntary' participation in parents' interests/commitments
- Strong evidence of children's 'green' concerns, interests or commitments despite increasing peer/cultural 'pressure'
- Most children are (self) aware and proud of their own 'green' (and family) differences but can confidently negotiate/defend/teach such differences with their peers
- Many children actively reconstitute green household practices
- Most are highly aware of parents social, political and environmental views; 'know' and have basic understandings of national/global environmental problems but have little environmental/ecological knowledge
- Children enjoy limited and irregular contact with 'local' nature (backyard, local parks/creeks and community farms) and 'holiday' nature (beaches, bush)

EDUCATION

- Two children attend Steiner school; the majority attend state primary and secondary schools
- Only one school actively demonstrates environmental education/conservation practices beyond the 'normal' but irregular recycling activities/rubbish pick ups and school camps
- Parents reluctantly accept that (state) schools are limited in their capacity or ability to offer environmental education; most parents view environmental education as their own responsibility

EMERGING CONCEPTUAL GROUPINGS

<p style="text-align: center;">FAMILY BACKGROUNDS OF PARENTS</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Formative/ primary 'shaping'</i></p>	<p>Mainly lower middle/working class nuclear and 'extended' families; lack of wealth with some educated, professional people; some intellectuals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Depression/WW2 influences – Scarcity → economic - Strict/simple, frugal/miserly – make do/live within means/resourceful. - Varied geographical but Aust and UK only, city and rural - Traditional gendered families/parenting roles/expectations - Varied political affiliations – conservative→communist - Some families 'odd' or felt 'different' but accepting - Little concern about environment in overt environmental language but practiced economically – gardens, produce, holiday places - Elements of 'early' feminism (in some mothers) and 'racism' - Education supported, girls not encouraged - Some highly influential parents – rights, gardens/outdoors
<p style="text-align: center;">PARENTS (1 @ low 30s; most 43-53)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Childhood/ youth identity and transitions</i></p>	<p>Normal/conventional but not necessarily traditional upbringing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mostly 'cocooned' /parochial households but some with social exposure from education and cultural exposure from opportunities - Continuity of domestic frugality / domestic lifestyle linked to finances, not environmental concerns, eg vege gardens, clothing, cycling - Mainly state primary / secondary schools – secondary schooling less satisfactory but most achieve highly; no environmental education; relatively low levels of sport - Females react/rebel against parents, school, friends or community / society during later secondary school years → greater awareness of 'independence' – desire for exploration/escape - Little overt/planned contact with 'nature' -- if so, through family holidays – varying in 'significance'
<p style="text-align: center;">UNIVERSITY EDUCATION (late 1960s – mid 70s)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Young adult transition and lifestyle/ identity exploration/ confirmation</i></p>	<p>Extremely high for all (min. of Bachelors, many with PG (PhD /Mast) in various fields – architecture, law, medicine, sociology, ecology, botany, music, education, European Studies, politics, physiotherapy, anthropology)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - University studies – 'unfolding', 'confronting', 'awakening' due primarily to injustices of Vietnam War, Feminism and social change but also intellectual climate, new courses, influential academics, social opportunities/exposure to govt/ political responses. - 'New' sense of empowerment, individual responsibility and social agency, with dose of fun, rebellion and social interaction and heightened sense of freedom from constraint - Lesser but some influence / attraction to Pedder, MAUM, hippies and, later, Franklin. - Inner city often 'community / student' living → exposure to difference, tolerance and action - Changing/deferred relationships - Increasing travel o/s, mainly as 'tourist' but sometimes for 'cultural' education and deliberate exposure to 'difference' - SOCIAL JUSTICE → emerging or confirming 'left wing' orientation with environment as 'background' - Different levels of environmental activism; concerned onlooker → participant or organiser/leader.

<p>EARLY WORK/CAREER (mainly 1980s)</p> <p><i>Identity lifestyle consolidation and work transition</i></p>	<p>Professional, mobile, creative of opportunity, oriented to social justice with blending in of environmental issues / concern / activism and membership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continuities with university qualifications – usually f / t in social and community areas - Shared / collective, often alternative / activist households in older, inner city areas - Activism in work, pg studies and campaigns / movements (Cain Labour Govt.) - Continued strong influence of feminism on males and females— extended / fertilized by environmentalism - Anti consumerism supported by increasing organic living and community interest / solidarity - Strong friendships / networks with like-minded individuals / groups where current partner ‘identified’ - ‘Weak’ pursuit of fixed / planned career ‘aspirations’ - Individual decision to live / earn less than ‘careerist’ potential - Later / delayed commitment to partner
<p>PARTNER</p> <p><i>Identity renegotiation / affirmation</i></p>	<p>‘Late’ marriage, congruent partnership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong compatibility of values / lifestyle / politics with ‘chosen’ future partner - Shared decision to live / earn less than ‘careerist’ potential - remain in inner city due to work / continued study commitments and existing networks / community → lifestyle
<p>FAMILY (1990s)</p> <p><i>Family lifestyle / identity negotiation, transition and confirmation</i></p>	<p>Mainly nuclear (one blended, two single mother); 3 with only child; 4 with two children</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ‘delayed’ children (late 30s / early 40s): limit to larger family - ‘Upheaval’ of personal identity (particularly for female) and lifestyle – ‘discontinuities’ from 80s - Shared decision for f / t parenting – lower \$ / less consumptive, often co-operative (with resources) in pre-existing networks - All mothers, one father, to p / t or no paid employment, some voluntary due to community / environmental commitments. - ‘Waning’ political activism ‘evolves / replaced’ with heightened ‘domestic / household’ feminist / environmentalist activism - ‘De’ politicization frustrating for mothers – hesitant / reluctant ‘acceptance’ re-directed where possible – particularly food
<p>FAMILY FUNCTIONING / DYNAMIC</p> <p><i>Household ecology of (in)actions, interactions, communication, arrangements</i></p>	<p>Planned / strategic: importance of being ‘older’ / far more extensive life experiences, communicative, negotiate differences, consensus, ‘worldview’ committed (equity, social justice, ecopolitical, environmentally and community ethic, low consumption)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Practice of values – ideals / rhetoric as reality → frugality (chosen / reaffirmed) - Household as ‘micro’ community / democracy - Greater / heightened intensity of mother - Importance of friends / cooperative to assist parenting models - Pragmatic when ‘forced’ by work / social demands - ‘Parochial’ when ‘pushed’ - Contradictions recognized – older houses, ‘sustainable’ household aspirations (eg solar) with ‘less income’ decision, declining affordability of options - ‘Subversive’ but ‘naturalized’ non-conformist / alternative - Constructive, supportive, nurturing - ‘Tension’ of ‘imposition / control’ and ‘independence’ for / of children, including ‘intrusion’ of peer pressure and school / consumer ‘cultures’ - Children (sometimes) ‘reminder’ to parents

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conflict/resistance not (yet?) evident - Evidence of strong 'uptake/rehearsal' of parents/values/actions_ but few kids yet at age where they might contest parents - Intergenerational 'continuity/conflict' in face of cultural/consumer 'challenge'
<p>PARENTING Strategies</p> <p><i>Lifestyle/identity translation to children</i></p>	<p>Combination, mix but preference for a 'constrained' 'liberal' (rational, choice, 'self' determining but 'consequentially' alert/aware)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Modelling/doing - Modelling and communicated, explained - Receptive, problem solving - Ongoing 'modelling' from parents (mothers) networks - Expected, trained/instructed, habituated → 'normalization' eg lights/showers/ - Participatory, optional/persuasive, eg demonstrations - Restrictions eg tv, computers, food, clothes - Sporadic use of rewards/punishments
<p>GEOGRAPHIES/NATURE/PLACE RELATIONS</p> <p><i>Inner/embodied</i></p> <p><i>Social/community</i></p> <p><i>Outer/culture-nature</i></p>	<p>Mainly household and school, periodically but declining with age for community/environmental 'farms', local parks and (relatively) natural creek/river/bush inner city areas.</p> <p>Periodic holiday 'escape/attraction' to nature for half of families for re-recreational, perhaps 'spiritual', and family/social reasons, and for some potential/probable 'downshifting'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food, meals, often organic, often resistance to 'refined/produced' and 'fast/packaged/commercial' and school canteen (nb 'ecofeminist' domestic politic) - Vegetable gardening (constant for some, sporadic/constrained for others) and pets – backyard - Clothing, often op-shop (mother) - Household recycling (mother initiated/supervised) - Habituation (lights, doors) (father monitored) - Child 'protection', household 'haven/security' from cultural/consumerist 'penetration' (tv/computers, advertising) (shared) - Sporadic play/exploration of local park and creek/river/bush' - Supported/supervised introduction via bike riding of above (by fathers) - Regular/ongoing local organic shopping and consumer education (mother) - Periodic, declining with age local community/farm, but increasing green/war demonstrations, organizations (shared but probably mother) - Local state schools (one secondary), declining into secondary (shared) - 2 families own/share 'nature/bush' retreats/places - Half families camp, visit national parks - Most holiday - All 'belong' to city dwelling, with adaptation to realize more green advantages than disadvantages in inner city living when compared with 'bush'/nature' living. - All are 'low' or anti-consumer city dwellers

<p style="text-align: center;">CHILDREN</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Intergenerational/ formative</i></p>	<p>All are intelligent, articulate, expressive, confident and achieving well at school. Most strongly involved in parent supported activities outside school – sport and music is very strong for most</p> <p>All are ‘rehearsing’ parents’ commitments/values to a large extent but will reflect/challenge ‘back’.</p> <p>All are aware of their ‘difference’ – all seem to be sufficiently self assured/comfortable to ‘deal/cope’ with peer pressures or influences.</p> <p>All are ‘worldly’ and know about environmental problems/issues but few have environmental/ecological knowledge.</p> <p>All feel they can choose but ‘know’ persuasion is used.</p> <p>All have other, connected ‘communities of support’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only one at 16 years old; majority 9-13.
<p style="text-align: center;">CHILDREN’S EDUCATION</p>	<p>All local, state (except two at Steiner) ‘accepted’ reluctantly due to acknowledged lack of funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ‘Selected’ on basis of best fit for child’s personality. - Reconciled to ‘lower’ levels of social and environmental education. - Little evidence of any environmental education being brought back into home by children but some positive responses to some programs/school actions and some parents already have strong inter-action/involvement with school anyway – so they know and kids know they know - Parents feel major responsibility for environmental education; school can compliment hopefully - Varying degrees of parental involvement (usually mother) in school affairs, sometimes due to menu at tuck shop

THEORETICAL DIRECTIONS?

1. *Curriculum theory.* The findings about Green households provide an ‘ideal’ model of education/training to which a school/state curriculum might aspire if serious about environmental ed/ed for sustainability. For example, strong and participatory democracy, confidence/resilience/assertiveness, normalization and habituation of green practices in the classroom, food growing/care, outdoors as indoor curriculum, community relations/awareness, etc..

Implications -- current approaches to env ed/ed for sustainable development must recognize their limitations and link to a broader array of family and social ‘interventions’

- Validation of the need for a ‘humanly constructive’ embodied/domestic oriented curriculum (Payne, 1997) to precede and then scaffold to the ‘socially critical perspectives, including (Fien (1993)
 - The SLE (Tanner, Palmer, Chawla) ‘body of knowledge’ be qualified – the greening/eco activism of individuals is evolutionary, not revolutionary; difficult to establish a cause/effect relationship between ‘one off’ significant experiences within an unfolding/evolving environmental sense/practice of self.
2. *Youth (dis)engagement.* The chronic sense of disempowerment expressed by or attributed to Australian youth is not something strongly evident in this study. In fact, much can be learned about youth empowerment and youth transitions through the study of parenting practices, family functioning and their influence on child development. **Constraint? These parents are probably exceptional re level of education, political involvement, intellectual engagement, level of action (personal, community & wider political – past and present)**

Child → *Youth* → *Young adult transitions including sustainable consumption and young Australians* (Fien et al, 2003). The nature of 'postmodern' transitions is not well understood in relation to competing demands but its development will be enhanced by incorporating how child and youth identity identities are complicated by family history, functioning/dynamic and processes and how even very committed parenting strategies grapple with and negotiate 'peer/cultural/consumer/entertainment' imperatives.

Findings here are strongly suggestive of positive intergenerational continuity about the environment, conserving and consuming. Findings from the non-green family study are strongly, but in the negative sense, that non or 'anti' environmental and consumer identities are sought, or/and enculturated, often unknowingly.

3. *Political functions of families.* Herring (2003) is critical of family scholarship that has failed to examine the full range of political functions of the family. According to herring, this limited scholarship dwells on one of three factors supporting the 'reproductive' role of the power of the state – the production of competent, good citizens (others include, families relieving the state of having to care for dependent citizens, and families diminishing the power of other intermediate forms of social association that might challenge the state).

Herring's three 'subversive' functions of families are indicated in the findings here – 1) families producing individuals with diverse opinions, passions and interests (most children studied here are acknowledged as different by their parents and already see themselves as different – often in spite of massive peer group pressure). 2) parents involving children in social settings that introduce them to other forms of associational relationship that (potentially) exist outside the state sphere (eg 'voluntary' involvement in demos, CERES, CCF, workshops, green politics). Potentially these social models 'check' state power b/c they provide/encourage intermediate/local forms of associational tolerance.—3) necessary to create the conditions for the stronger functioning of a large pluralistic democracy.

The development of the above possibilities (curric reform, youth empowerment, subversive families) would need to be tempered (theoretically/practically) by other empirical insights gained from this study.

4. *Socio-cultural conditions and formative experiences.* These current parents are legacies of their own parents' 'scarcity' conditions (Depression era and WW2) and were participants/observers when they were young and (felt) 'supported' by readily available/accessible 'social/political change' conditions (Vietnam war, Hippies, feminism, environmentalism, Pedder/Franklin, music).

Parents' frugality and anti-consumerism/materialism (and its own internal disciplines) has now been replaced in their children by a combination of 'entitlement'/children's rights, consumer/entertainment and 'post-material' imperatives that are far less conducive to feelings of (socio-cultural) 'support' and 'alternatives'. Intergenerational environmental/ecopolitical 'continuity' and commitment may, therefore, be (severely) diminished/displaced by the affluence of the post scarcity cultural condition in which today's youth are growing up. There are far fewer youthful opportunities for the 'rebellious rites of passage' enjoyed by their parents.

- Importance of studying these children longitudinally – in 5, 10, 15, 20 years for continuities/discontinuities, their relationships/family parenting etc

5. *Family functioning.* The current cohort of parents are having to work through numerous contradictions themselves about preferred individual and collective eco-identities/lifestyles and that emerging (see above) in their children.
 6. *Nature orientation.* Families living in inner city (the relatively high Green vote in the recent Federal election) do not seem to be overly preoccupied with nature in the 'raw', it is important but 'background' and 'confirming'. These green parents have 'evolved' in their social justice/feminist/'left wing' worldviews by including ecopolitics into their quest for a better world. Their children have less opportunities for 'nature' immersion, engagement, affiliation in the urban setting. Children like being outdoors, in gardens, parks, local creeks and holidays.
- Will be interesting to compare 'inner city' and 'regional' samples where 'nature' is more available.