

INDIVIDUALISED ENVIRONMENTALISM(S):
THE DEADLY SINS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

DAVE HIBBS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN COMMUNICATION & CULTURE
YORK UNIVERSITY
TORONTO, ONTARIO

August, 2015

© Dave Hibbs, 2015

Abstract

This study utilises the theories of Harold Innis to discern how environmental organisations in Toronto, Ontario are impeded by consumer capitalist biases toward mechanisation, individualisation, quantification, and the price system. It develops a preliminary knowledge base of the environmental organisation community in Toronto. Seventy-two environmental organisations were surveyed and the content on their websites was analyzed using a discourse analysis. Organisations appeared to be highly influenced by the biases of consumer capitalism, exhibiting tendencies towards sway by funding sources; individualisation of environmentalism; describing their actions hubristically; incentivisation and recognition of environmental action; and promoting simple and passive environmental actions. Few organisations escaped these problems, but those that did tended to adopt democratic structures, social justice ideals, and strive for inclusion of unheard voices. The conclusions drawn from this analysis point out ways environmental organisations can and must change to be better mediators of environmental change and challenge anti-ecological identities.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables.....	v
 Chapter One: Introduction.....	 1
The Anti-Ecological Identity and its Mediated Basis	1
Setting the Stage for the Present Study	6
 Chapter Two: Literature Review and Hypotheses	 10
Innis’s Medium Theory and the Biases of Consumer Capitalism	10
Environmental Movement and Organisations as Challenging Media	17
The Trials and Tribulations of the Environmental Movement.....	18
Environmentalism’s New Dawn	20
Environmental Organisations as Biased Communication Media	23
Working Hypotheses and Expectations	27
 Chapter Three: Methodology.....	 29
Sample	29
Survey Apparatus.....	29
Procedure	30
 Chapter Four: Survey Results.....	 33
Similar Methods of Action and Individualization of Issue Focuses.....	33
Communication Methods Priorities.....	35
Funder Steering	38
Participant Importance: Paid Staff and Volunteer Reliance.....	39
Summary.....	41
 Chapter Five: The Deadly Sins of Toronto Environmental Organisations.....	 42
The Swaying Effects of Funding.....	44
Self-Indulgent Ideologies and Individualized Environmentalisms	59
Self-Promotion and Overconfidence.....	71
Incentivisation and Recognized Environmental Actions.....	82
Promotion of Easy and Passive Actions	90
The Virtuous Few	96
 Chapter Six: Final Discussion and Conclusion.....	 103
 Bibliography.....	 114
 Appendices	 117
Appendix A: Survey Apparatus	117
Appendix B: Overall Survey Results.....	120
Appendix C: Ideological Self-Indulgence Quotes.....	123

Appendix D: Narrow Community/Group Interests Quotes	126
Appendix E: Heroic Narrative Quotes	129
Appendix F: Hubris and Overconfidence Quotes	132
Appendix G: Incentivisation and Recognition Quotes.....	135
Appendix H: Promotion of Easy/Simple Actions Quotes.....	137

List of Tables

Table 1: Frequencies of Internet/Media Campaigns and/or Community-Based Green Initiatives Methods	33
Table 2: Frequencies Methods of Action by Email Newsletter Reporting Organisations	37
Table 3: Frequencies Methods of Action by Website Reporting Organisations.....	37
Table 4: Frequencies Methods of Action by Face-to-Face Reporting Organisations	37
Table 5: Frequencies of Local Focus and funding priorities.....	39
Table 6: Frequencies of Non-Local Focus and funding priorities.....	39
Table 7: Funding Priorities and Confrontational Methods	39
Table 8: Participant Importance and Spatial Scale Focus.....	40

Introduction

Environmental crises, such as climate change, present a vast obstacle for human civilisation to persist into the future. This thesis aims to discern the ways environmental organisations in Toronto, Ontario communicate about environmental issues and crises, and the solutions and actions they advocate for to solve these issues. Consumer capitalist biases towards individualisation, mechanisation, and the prioritisation of money and quantitative values are expected to influence, or be exemplified in, the contents of environmental organisations' communications and their organisational structures. The apparent failure of the environmental movement to counter-act humanity's anti-ecological identity and activities is likely because of its need to work within the biases of consumer capitalist culture. Environmental organisations, representing the environmental movement in implicit or explicit capacities, are influenced and impeded by the biases of consumer capitalism and the lack of a widespread ecological morality.

The Anti-Ecological Identity and Its Mediated Basis

Evidence of global ecological crises is amounting. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), a scientific organisation affiliated with the United Nations, has reported the extreme likelihood that "more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010 was caused by the anthropogenic increase in GHG [Greenhouse Gas] concentrations and other anthropogenic forcings together" (IPCC, 2014, p. 5). Furthermore, if no actions are taken towards changing economic processes, lifestyles, energy use patterns, climate policy and other elements that contribute to anthropogenic climate change, it is increasingly likely that there will be "severe, pervasive and irreversible impacts for people and ecosystems" (IPCC Report, 2014, p.8). Indeed, this

is a time of ecological crisis and risks that threaten life-sustaining ecosystems around the globe and it would appear that we, as humans, are a significant contributor to engendering this crisis state.

The cultural and political structures of Western civilization enable people to think of nature as something to be used and mastered. In the 1950s, Heidegger had already expressed, in his work *The Question Concerning Technology*, that modern technology enables humanity to reveal nature through the mode he called “enframing” which challenges humanity to “reveal the real in the mode of ordering, as standing-reserve” (Heidegger, 1977, p. 302). Heidegger criticised the essence of modern technology to enable people to see nature only as something that can be counted, ordered, and exploited for human ends; in the end, nature is only important in the way it is utilised by humanity for human ends. Humanity has elevated itself to a level of apparent mastery over nature through the use of modern technologies. However, as evidenced by the IPCC discussions of the climate change crisis, our mastery is a powerful illusion that is being challenged by our inability to control complex ecologies that all life relies on for existence. Indeed, even the IPCC discussions pay close attention not only to mitigation of anthropogenic climate change, but also to the necessity societal adaptation to ecosystem changes in the future.

It appears as though human mastery over nature is illusory. French philosopher Michel Serres, in his book *The Natural Contract*, argues that through “our mastery, we have become so much and so little masters of the Earth that it once again threatens to master us in turn” (Serres, 1995, p.33). He additionally states that humanity’s struggle for life “against other species of flora and fauna” has resulted in a victory that, because of our reliance on the existence of these other species for our continued existence, “will be suddenly

overturned into defeat” (Serres, 1995, p. 19). The illusion of mastery over nature, to which Western civilisation clings, threatens the ecological systems that all life relies on; it implicitly sets Western civilisation against nature and ecosystems.

The absurdity of this illusive mastery becomes apparent when considering humanity’s communicative relationships with ecosystems. Jesper Hoffmeyer, a leader of a field called “biosemiotics”, has theorized the communicative capacities of all life systems (Hoffmeyer, 1996; 2010) and supports Thomas Sebeok’s claim that all signs are manifest within a bio-semiosphere. Hoffmeyer states that life forms in ecological systems exist in reciprocal interpretive relationships where “entities persistently interpret the behaviors of other entities that were themselves interpretations of behaviors of other entities, and so on” (Hoffmeyer, 2010, 383-384). That is, life systems are inherently communication systems that consist of complex, reciprocal relationships between countless entities. Humans, however, have developed a sense of “self-consciousness” that Hoffmeyer laments as enabling humanity to “glorify itself to such an extent that it could eventually imagine that nothing else in this world had any real meaning”; Hoffmeyer goes on to state: “We did not invent meaning. This world has always meant something. It just did not know it” (Hoffmeyer, 1996, p. 146). In other words, regardless of how we see ourselves, we are in no way separate from the communicative, biological systems upon which we rely; nature exists, but our culture and the institutions that make it up help to define it in ways that enable our destructive behaviours and attitudes towards nature.

Taking Heidegger, Serres, and Hoffmeyer together, reveals a view of human identity that distances humanity from nature to such an extent that nature is something to be used, mastered, and something that we are apparently superior to. This identity is biased, self-

interested, and evidently foolish in the way ecological crises such as climate change show that this superiority complex is a path towards ecological annihilation and suicide. The question then becomes, how does the ecologically distant identity of human superiority and mastery become so ingrained in modern cultures?

Humans learn this sense of mastery and distanced identity through the technological, institutional and cultural structures that characterise society. It is here that the medium theory of Canadian scholar Harold Innis is important and serves as a key theoretical lens for this study. Innis sought to answer the following question: “why do we attend to the things to which we attend” (Innis, 2008, p. xliii)? His thorough analysis of social and cultural changes throughout human history found that the communication media, broadly defined as “organizations, institutions and technologies” (Comor, 2001, p.280), bias people to think and act in certain, predictable ways (Innis, 2008).

Other scholars, such as Marshall McLuhan, built on Innis’s ideas theorising media to be extensions of human senses that extend human capacities for action and potentially “reshape any lives that they touch” (McLuhan, 1994, p. 52), pointing to the way that media can change how people think and act in their lives. Edward Hall, in his anthropological critique of the multitude of determining elements of cultures around the world, utilizes this idea of media as extensions in arguing that the frequent utilisation of media can “fragment life and dissociate man from his acts” (Hall, 1976, p. 38). The importance of the medium theory lens particularly that purported by Innis, is its emphasis on communication media, organisations, technologies, and institutions as partially determining elements of human culture and of the ways humans can think and act toward nature. Medium theory enables us to look at how communication media enable and constrain ways of thinking and acting

in the world and, in the case of the present study, towards nature. While McLuhan and Hall are both important when discussing media, this thesis primarily uses Innis's theories because of his emphasis on the political, economic, and social structures and his broad definition of media. This will be better outlined in the following literature review.

Communication media change the ways we communicate with nature. We utilize media to act on the Earth, and the evidence of ecological crises we face suggests that our current media bias us towards actions that are highly destructive towards the ecosystems we rely on. The wasteful and destructive tendencies of industries and commercial culture, enabled by various communication media, are unsustainable and we must challenge them to alter our problematic anti-environmental identity.

Recently, we have witnessed the largest action on climate change that has ever been seen. The so called "Peoples Climate March" in New York City on September 21st, 2014 saw hundreds of thousands of people marching down the street, demanding climate justice and acting out against the industrial culture that both sustains and destroys us. This inspires hope. Hope that we can come together as a global community of all perspectives, ethnicities, classes, and creeds and make environmental changes happen. These are generally the goals of the environmental movement.

This movement, and the various organisations and groups that make it up (including non-governmental organisations, non-profits, and private organisations, amongst many others), seek to deal with environmental crises. There are many discourses and perspectives that arise within the movement, but all have a general goal of finding a way to solve the problems of our environmentally and ecologically destructive actions. The movement also, unfortunately, faces some serious problems. Dieter Rucht, who studies

social movements and discusses the impact of the environmental movement on the Western world, points out a paradox of the movement as simultaneously both a success and failure. He states:

On the one hand, the brief history of the environmental movement can be read as an amazing success story. This success becomes apparent when we consider the movement's growth and consolidation, its role as an agenda setter, its impact on individual attitudes and behavior, and its contribution to the establishment of a new polity and a new industrial sector. On the other hand, however, the movement has been largely unsuccessful in halting environmental deterioration. (Rucht, 1999, p.205)

That is, even though the environmental movement has expanded and diversified to cover many environmental problems (Rucht, 1999, p.206), there seems to be little, if any real change to counter-act the anti-environmental tendencies that characterise the world of global capitalism. Ultimately, Rucht provides evidence that environmental mobilisation is hindered by the “relative strength of forces that oppose the environmental movements, such as the chemical industry and mining and lumber companies” (Rucht, 1999, p.222). Thus, to simply call environmental movements and organisations a failure is not necessarily appropriate since it is not necessarily to blame. Rather, it is more important to analyse environmental movements as situated within consumer capitalist societies. Social and environmental movements are forced to compete with and challenge the mindset of the public today and the overwhelmingly powerful biases of consumer capitalist culture.

Setting the Stage for the Present Study

This study uses this paradoxical situation as its jumping point. Why is it that even with the visibility of environmental issues, made so by such entities as international bodies like the IPCC and environmental organisations, there appears to be little or no perceivable environmental change taking place? How has much of the debate on environmental issues

remained largely within the realm of government and corporate elites? Why has the environmental movement been so successful at establishing awareness and being visible, yet has not been able to counteract persistent march of consumer capitalist growth?

Inspired by these questions, this study focuses specifically on environmental organisations in Toronto; those organisations that operate at local, national and global scales that appear to be working to make positive environmental change happen. The aim is to situate environmental organisations within consumer capitalist society in order to understand their incapability for making change in the fight against environmental crises. In particular, this study aims to understand whether environmental organisations can operate as entities that challenge human culture and human identity to become more ecologically ethical and moral instead of the status quo identity of mastery and environmental exploitation. To do so, this study asks: how do environmental organisations create their meanings and structure themselves in the face of consumer capitalism? What kinds of actions do environmental organisations perform, and how do they frame them? Do any environmental organisations have the power to challenge the dominant social institutions and engender the creation of a democratic, ecological ethic?

The question of solving environmental crises is one of morality. The crises arise out of Western civilisation's actions and biases and suggest a lack of morality amongst people and social institutions. A moral imperative arguably drives much of the environmental movement and the actors pushing it forward. This moral imperative also drives the present study. There is a need to discern why the environmental movement has largely failed to be the mediator of environmental morality in Western civilisation.

Discussion of morality is often relegated to the realm of philosophy and religion, institutions guided by a clergy or group making decisions and setting a path ahead of followers. However, in the case of the environmental movement, morality can, and should, also be achieved through secular institutions. It is essential to understand the characteristic discourses and actions of this *moral* institution to discern whether it is capable of changing society's ecologically destructive course and instigate the development of a moral, ethical, ecological identity. We need to understand the character of these institutions and organisations themselves, seeking whether they are virtuous, fighting against ecologically sinful behaviours in Western civilization, or act as a medium that masks ecological sins, supporting and legitimising the anti-environmental thoughts and actions within Western civilisation. This study thereby sets out to assess the sins and virtues¹ of environmental organisations as institutions that should, ideally, be a strong source of generating ecological identities amongst humanity.

The flow of this study is broken down as follows. First a literature review develops the theoretical background of this study in the medium theory of Harold Innis, introducing his important conception of the individualistic, mechanised, economic, and quantitative biases of consumer capitalism. Contemporary Innisian thinkers, such as Robert Babe, Ian Angus, and Edward Comor, will be utilized to enhance and modernise Innis's theories and relate them to ideas of social change. The literature review will also present some of the theories and discussions surrounding the environmental movement, its history, and the ways consumer capitalist political economies have influenced environmental organisations

¹ The utilisation of sins to describe the problems of environmental organisations is borrowed from the common understanding of the cardinal or deadly sins from Christianity. Virtues are used to describe the few organisations that escape from the problems or sins of environmental organisations in the discourse analysis.

over the years. This literature review ends with some predictions on how environmental organisations in Toronto will reflect the biases of consumer capitalism.

Following the literature review, an overview of the research methods used will be provided, explaining the survey apparatus and discourse analysis. The survey results offer a preliminary set of observations of the Toronto scene of environmental organisations. The discourse analysis provides insight into the ways environmental organisations frame their language about themselves, the environmental issues they focus on, and the actions they take. This section analyzes their discourse in terms of the ways organisations enable or preclude counteraction against the ecologically destructive biases of consumer capitalism. It also evaluates organisations' capacities to escape the influences of the overarching biases of consumer capitalism towards individualisation and mechanisation. Ultimately, the findings are presented to see the ways organisations might be trapped within the consumer capitalist status quo, precluding their ability to contribute to the development of ecologically ethical and moral human identities.

Ultimately, this thesis provides a broad preliminary exploration of the kinds of environmental organisations in Toronto, how they communicate about themselves and the kinds of actions they perform and advocate. We attempt to provide an important critique, with hope that environmental organisations can overcome their biases, become more successful actors in the environmental movement, and contribute to the creation of ecologically moral and ethical societies. It is imperative that organisations make changes to their structures and actions if they ever wish to contribute to substantial change in the environment and challenge humanity to come together to reformulate our collective, environmentally destructive thoughts and actions.

Literature Review and Hypotheses

Innis's Medium Theory and the Biases of Consumer Capitalism

The theoretical backdrop of this thesis is the medium theory of Harold Innis. This includes contemporary theorists who have modernised Innis's ideas, including Robert Babe, Edward Comor, and Ian Angus. Innis's theories posit communication media as the bases of knowledge and identity formation in cultures and societies. In order to best appreciate Innis's theories, one must understand that by "communication medium" or "media" he meant a wide range of institutions, organisations, and technologies. Edward Comor, a contemporary Innisian communication scholar, explains that Innis understood media to be "organizations, institutions and technologies [... that] constitute the core structures through which people interact and history itself unfolds" (Comor, 2001, p. 280).

Understood as such, Innis believed that the physical and structural characteristics of media enable and constrain certain messages and knowledges, thereby biasing users towards the kinds of knowledge they facilitate (Innis, 2008). Media partially determine what knowledge is valued in a given society and the kinds of identities humans adopt within that society, based on that knowledge. In other words, media bias people towards certain kinds of knowledge. Innis utilized the term bias as a heuristic tool to stand for the habits of "individuals which permit prediction and are reinforced in the cumulative bias of institutions" (Innis, 1995, p. 433). Robert Babe clarifies that biases reflect the structurally conditioned behaviours permitted within a social order (Babe, 2010, p. 187). That is, biases pertain to the predictable thoughts and actions people can have and are reinforced by the dominant social order, which is partially determined by the organisations, institutions and technologies (or media) that enable human communication.

Innis's ideas are pertinent for explaining Western civilization's inaction towards environmental crises, such as climate change. Robert Babe explains how cultural biases of present-mindedness, scientific/quantitative knowledge dominance, and the "breakdown of the community" (Babe, 2011, p. 320-323) contribute to difficulties in preventing and solving environmental crises. As fragmented individuals instead of communities, people are unable to think of the environment as a common, public good since they are prevented from thinking of community needs. Elsewhere, Babe explains that the dominance of the price system and money, which "does not carry information concerning the value of" collective goods such as the environment, these common goods are difficult to value and fight for within the consumer capitalist status quo. As such common environmental goods are "not considered in maximizing calculations of individual buyers and sellers" since they cannot be valued through the money medium (Babe, 2010, p. 147). This bias towards monetary value and economic priority in consumer capitalist society precludes serious consideration of the protection of collective interests like the environment. Examining the biases of organisations, institutions, and technologies contributes greatly to understanding how people come to identify with the natural environment. As such, Innis's theories are helpful for understanding how human identities and knowledges about nature are constructed.

Ian Angus builds on Innis's ideas by offering the concept of "media environments", which he defines as pluralities "of media which together constitute the contemporary social order. Media are not isolated from each other but refer to each other continuously" (Angus, 2000, p. 110). In other words, the many different organisations, institutions and technologies in a given society constantly refer to and influence one another, constituting

the ways people can think and act in a culture; media environments serve as a structural basis upon which cultures rest. Culture, according to Pablo del Rio who critiques from a social psychological perspective, is the “third hemisphere” of the brain, which “extends the two hemispheres of the internal brain” and refocuses them “into cultural mechanisms (novels, myths, rites, plans, science) to act in a new ‘medium of media’, replete with interrelated virtual and physical universes” (del Rio, 2002, p. 244). Media environments, enabling and constraining the development of cultural mechanisms, serve as an external cultural brain that processes knowledge and teaches people how to see the world and think about issues. As such, the media that make up media environments enable the development of certain thoughts and actions, and identities, of people in living within them.

Media environments and the biases circulating through them generate what Innis called “monopolies of knowledge”. Monopolies of knowledge, according to Babe, determine “how information is processed” in a given culture, where “what is realistic and unrealistic, imaginable and unimaginable are generated through cultural norms and conventions (‘biases’)” (Babe, 2010, 189). That is, media environments, predisposed to specific knowledge and biases, can become so ingrained that they monopolize designation of the valid forms of knowledge in a society.

Innis was highly critical of the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge and Western civilization’s lack of understanding of the problems of time and duration. He believed that Western civilisation is biased towards the present, which could have “disastrous consequences” in that the balance “between time and space has been seriously disturbed” (Innis, 2008, p. 76). David Harvey, a Marxist political economist, more recently discussed this as a pattern of “time-space compression” which he suggests always “exacts

its toll on our capacity to grapple with the realities unfolding around us. Under stress, for example, it becomes harder and harder to react accurately to events” (Harvey, 1992, p. 306). Present-mindedness makes it very difficult for consumer capitalist societies to deal with problems affecting uncertain futures, such as climate change. Biased towards the present, people are tend not to attend to long-term consequences of current actions and do not have time to think of the nuance and complexities of the issues in the immediate moment.

Western civilization is also biased towards individualism. Angus argues that modern consumer capitalism is characterized by a general “loss of mediation”, such that “the tendency over the last several hundred years has been to break down mediating institutions [...] The consequence has been a loss in reflexivity combined with a greater degree of concentrated organization” (Angus, 2000, p. 86-87). Ulrich Beck, a German sociologist who famously coined the concept of the “risk society”, suggests that as mediating institutions collapse there is a tendency towards “the emergence of individualized forms and conditions of existence, which compel people – for the sake of their own material survival – to make themselves the center of their own planning and conduct of life” (Beck, 1992, p. 88). Both Angus and Beck argue that responsibility is increasingly concentrated and narrowly individualised. Lost is a sense of genuine communality and regard for the interests of the whole; a lack of community-mindedness precludes thought of issues and environmental risks affecting everyone in favour of those affecting one’s self.

Cultural theorist Zygmunt Bauman builds upon this concept of individualisation, suggesting that individuals today are constantly compelled to take responsibility for their

lives, where any suffering, inequality, or injustice is perceived to be the individual's fault. Bauman believes modern consumer capitalism transforms "human 'identity' from a 'given' into a 'task'" such that individual identity is something that individuals earn instead of being born into (Bauman, 2000, p. 31-32). Individualisation thus divides communities and turns individual attentions inward toward satisfying self-interests and identity formations. This also transforms problems in people's lives into failures of individuals. In taking responsibility for themselves, individuals are compelled to resolve their own "illnesses", or susceptibility to risks, instead of the pursuit of "what they all together might achieve for each one of them, once they join forces" (Bauman, 2000, p. 65). As such, individual actions, much like a round key supplied for a square lock, are heralded as the ideal solutions to systemic problems. This enables "[social] crises [to] appear as individual crises, which are no longer (or are only very indirectly) perceived in terms of their rootedness in the social realm" (Beck, 1992, p. 100). The tendency in consumer capitalist civilisation is to place the blame and responsibility for systematic risks, including environmental destruction, on individuals and not on the social, economic, and political context of society; the focus is on the parts instead of a critical perspective on the whole of society.

The consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge is also biased towards what Innis calls the mechanisation of knowledge. Mechanization refers to how improvements and expansions in communication can cause discursive barriers to develop between communicators. He states that "large-scale mechanization of knowledge is characterized by imperfect competition and the active creation of monopolies in language which prevent understanding and hasten appeals to force" between those specialized linguistic monopolies (Innis, 2008, p. 29). Without the ability to communicate rationally because of

difficulty translating between different knowledge groups, mechanised communication emphasises emotion over reason, negating the influence critical thinkers (Innis, 2008, p. 30). Knowledge is sectioned off and divided into different fields that are not easily translatable into each other. Innis saw this at play in the university where knowledge “has been divided to such an extent that it is apparently hopeless to expect a common point of view” (Innis, 2008, p. 190). This is made even more problematic with the overall bias towards the quantitative, economic, and scientific knowledge over the arts and philosophy. Innis argues, the “quantitative pressure of modern knowledge has been responsible for the decay of oral dialectic and conversation” (Innis, 2008, p. 191), which limits societies’ abilities to think creatively outside of, and develop alternatives to, the biases of commercialism.

Other theorists echo the problems of mechanisation and quantitative biases. Heidegger, as discussed in the introduction, believed that modern technology enabled people to think of nature quantitatively, as “standing reserve”, through what he called the “mode of ordering” (Heidegger, 1977, p. 302). This quantitative, scientific emphasis precludes other artistic or philosophical understandings of nature (Heidegger, 1977, p. 309). Similarly, Herbert Marcuse, in his famous work *One Dimensional Man*, was concerned about the rise of technological rationality. He suggests that capitalist society precludes dialectical thought and critical thinking outside of the technical, quantitative sphere. Furthermore, he also suggests that “domination perpetuates and extends itself not only through technology, but as technology, and the latter provides the great legitimation of the expanding political power, which absorbs all spheres of culture” (Marcuse, 1991, p. 158). That is, modern knowledge, largely scientific and quantitative in character, rarely

challenges technological or quantitative reason; alternative worldviews are nearly impossible as the institution of consumer capitalism. Marcuse therefore suggests that thought and behaviour tend mostly to legitimize the dominant social structures that and alternative views that “transcend the established universe of discourse and action are either repelled or reduced to terms of this universe” (Marcuse, 1991, p. 12).

Ultimately, the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge constrains thinking and acting towards the present moment, presents systemic risks and social issues as resolvable by or the fault of individuals, and prioritizes quantitative and economic knowledge above all else. Fortunately, Innis also believed that media introduced at the margins of society, or media with different biases from the dominant media, are capable of checking and challenging dominant monopolies of knowledge:

We can perhaps assume that the use of a medium of communication over a long period will to some extent determine the character of knowledge to be communicated and suggest that *its pervasive influence will eventually create a civilization in which life and flexibility will become exceedingly difficult to maintain and that the advantages of a new medium will become such as to lead to the emergence of a new civilization.* (Innis, 2006, p. 34, emphasis added)

Even as media environments create vast, influential monopolies of knowledge, biasing and penetrating thought and action in daily life towards individualisation, mechanisation, and quantitative valuation, new media can emerge from the margins of society to overturn and challenge these biases. In light of the problems, outlined above, of the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge, especially for resolving environmental crises, we must begin to look for new media at the margins of society. It is possible that the environmental movement and environmental organisations, as marginal, challenging communication media, can fulfill this role.

Environmental Movement and Organisations as Challenging Media

While western civilization is characterised by a lack of mediation and individualisation, social movements can potentially counter those tendencies and be a source of social change. Angus suggests that social movements can introduce new mediations to society:

I want to suggest that the key question facing social change at the present time is rather 'mediation'—that is the mediation between whole and part. The political practice of the new social movements—for example, ecology, anti-nuclear, anti-racist, feminist, peace, regional, and national movements—is precisely to intervene at this 'middle' level of mediation [...] It is at this point that the possibility of systemic change that does not reproduce key features of contemporary domination emerges. (Angus, 2000, p. 163)

Social movements can provide new ways to mediate the private interests of individuals with the public interests of the whole of society. Doing so could counteract the problematic biases of consumer capitalism towards mechanisation and individualisation, enabling people to take control of and solve problems that affect the whole of societies and instigate action on issues that require time and discussion between many voices and perspectives.

Indeed, some theorists believe that the environmental movement, and organisations that make it up, is a major site of contention and public debate that can instigate a robust ecological civil society (Brulle, 2000; Torgerson, 1999). This is especially seen in the work of Robert Brulle, who writes about the importance of the public sphere and the influence of the environmental movement on civil society. He argues that civil society institutions, such as environmental organisations, play a big role as sites “in which democratic social change could originate” (Brulle, 2000, p. 66). Furthermore, he states:

The capacity of a society to learn and respond to changed conditions is [...] dependent on the generation of alternative world views, the open communication of these realities into the general stock of cultural knowledge

and the use of this knowledge in the development of social institutions.
(Brulle, 2000, p. 68)

He believes that widespread environmental change requires: the institutionalisation of ecological rationality; democratisation of decision making processes; ecological ethics to generate ethical concerns for the Earth; and personality characteristics of an “ecological citizen” by developing ecological knowledge and eradicating the dominance of possessive individualism (Brulle, 2000, p. 62-63). This massive social project, challenging the anti-environmental monopoly of knowledge, is partially undertaken by environmental organisations that have the capability of allowing people to participate in environmental actions in various ways.

Environmental organisations can help facilitate an ecologically conscious civil society as potential entry points for participation in the environmental debate. A “robust civil society” working towards environmental change requires

democratic environmental movement organizations. By effectively communicating the imperatives of the lifeworld to the public sphere, the environmental movement’s organizations could foster the development of a democratic and ecologically sustainable society. (Brulle, 2000, p. 72)

Democratic environmental organisations, bringing people’s issues into the public sphere, mediating private lives to collectives are, however, an ideal. As communication media, environmental organisations and the environmental movement are open to influence from the biases discussed above that circulate through the media environment. History has shown that the environmental movement has largely been absorbed into dominant social order and environmental movement organisations tend to be highly influenced by the biases of individualism, mechanisation and the dominance of the price system.

The Trials and Tribulations of the Environmental Movement

There are several problems with the way the environmental movement has developed in North America since the 1960s. Mark Dowie, who has written much on the environmental movement in the 20th century, argues that unlike other social movements of the 1960s, which were more radical, the

ecology movement was saddled from the start with conservative traditions formed by a bipartisan, mostly white, middle-class, male leadership. The culture they created has persisted until very recently and hampered the success of the movement. (Dowie, 1995, p. 28)

The environmental movement was strongly concurrent with the patriarchal capitalist social order, resulting in a lack of confrontational, antagonistic stance against those in power. Without this antagonistic stance, the movement was easily crushed by the conservative public relations rhetoric of the 1980s.

Many of the radical, progressive movements of the 1960s, including the environmental movement, were disarmed by various changes in the public discourse about them. Stuart Ewen presents a comprehensive view of the rise of public relations culture that has developed a “powerful machinery of opinion management” in the news media and political discourse (Ewen, 1996, p. 409). Discourse about the progressive changes caused by the civil rights and ecological movements of the 1960s came to be re-engineered as problems of the “extremism of democracy”. That is, the progressive, social movements of the mid 20th century were reframed as enemies to the American way of life.

Frederick Buell provides a thorough presentation of how this specifically affected the environmental movement. He suggests that amidst economic crisis of the 1970s and institutionalised environmental groups drifting from their grassroots beginnings (Buell, 2003, p. 10), careful public relations campaigns and talking points, conservatives were able

to dismiss environmentalists, labeling them “anti-American” for their claims of environmental threats to humanity. Environmentalists were reframed as the enemy; they were “Marxists, socialists, and even Stalinists” and this rhetoric was repeated by pundits and conservatives ad nauseam, and was very damaging for environmentalists (Buell, 2003, p. 17). The conservative cultural “revolution” was enacted by reframing the narrative to make those social movements “un-American hostage holders” while the “real Americans” were its victims (Buell, 2003, p. 21). The 1980s saw a significant decline in the environmental movement numbers and what seemed like a crushing defeat of the environmentalism of the 60s and 70s.

The history of the environmental movement within the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge suggests its susceptibility to the political economic and cultural biases of the time. Though the movement took a stance against industrialism and against the status quo, it was swayed away from any radical discourses by reframing the environmentalists as enemies. Indeed, while the environmental movement posed a challenge to the environmentally destructive industries and ideologies, powerful voices were able to subdue and disarm that challenge.

Environmentalism’s New Dawn

Environmentalism re-emerged in the 1990s in a relatively de-radicalised, uncritical form. This new form of environmental discourse was above all: market friendly, corporate friendly, and government friendly. Mark Dowie (1995) provides a powerful critique of the environmental movement at the end of the 20th century. He calls this re-emergence the “third wave” of environmentalism. The third wave saw environmentalists and environmental organisations working closely with governments and corporations,

adopting “buzzwords” like “market-based incentive, demand side management, technological optimism, non-adversarial dialogue, and regulatory flexibility” (Dowie, 1995, p. 106).

What is characteristic of this third wave environmentalism is the tendency to focus on human ingenuity, mastery over nature, technological remediation, and corporate responsibility, all while turning a blind eye to the socioeconomic bases of ecological crises. Maarten Hajer (1995), a Dutch political scientist who provides a critique of the discourses of third wave environmentalism, calls this “ecological modernization”. Hajer explains ecological modernisation as follows:

In the most general terms ecological modernization can be defined as the discourse that recognizes the structural character of the environmental problematique but none the less assumes that existing political, economic, and social institutions can internalize the care for the environment... the main obstacles to more effective protection are suggested to be dilemmas of collective action: there would be no fundamental obstructions to an environmentally sound organization of society, if only every individual, firm, or country, would participate. Environmental protection thus becomes a management problem. (Hajer, 1995, p. 25-26)

What is different about ecological modernism compared to the previous forms of the environmental movement is that it focuses on working with business and industry, paying little attention to strategies of regulation and controlling environmental pollution. Indeed, this new environmentalism resonated nicely with the industrial and political elite interests since it did not pose serious challenges to the status quo, but rather sought to work within the biases of consumer capitalism.

Dowie suggests that mainstream environmentalism moved from the “courtroom” to the “board room” (Dowie, 1995, p. 106). Instead of taking action against industries, there is an inherent belief that human ingenuity, technological remediation, and corporate

responsibility will solve the environmental problems. Ecological modernisation is essentially “a strategy of political accommodation of the radical environmentalist critique of the 1970s” (Hajer, 1995, p. 32). While recognising that there are indeed other kinds of environmental discourses, deep ecology, environmental justice, and ecofeminism to name a few, Hajer argues that ecological modernisation has become “the dominant way of conceptualising environmental matters in terms of policy-making” (Hajer, 1995, p. 100), and as such it is a major player in the discursive playing field.

Ecological modernisation exemplifies the influence of the capitalist monopoly of knowledge on the environmental movement. This discourse promotes individualistic, non-controversial actions on the part of market actors; it communicates a highly present-minded, uncritical perspective on the social order; it utilizes business language and emphasis on economic reasons for environmentally friendly behaviour; and its win-win rhetoric sees business and environmentalists working together and benefiting makes environmentalism seem like something that people should only undertake as long they benefit, usually monetarily. This rhetoric also has some disastrous consequences for the environmental movement as a whole.

Buell argues that ecological modernisation “frequently excludes radical and populist environmentalists and disallows radical and populist positions, something that has helped disunify the environmental movement” (Buell, 2003, p. 56). As such, this rhetoric, easily adopted and friendly towards some of the most powerful actors in Western society (Hajer, 1995, p. 31-33), also divides and fragments the environmental movement into individual pieces working separately towards similar goals. The current environmental movement is

riven by a painful set of internal divisions, the most profound of which, perhaps is a division between radical grassroots activists and the

mainstream, national, Washington-based, large environmental organizations
(Buell, 2003, p. 56)

Indeed, the environmental movement has succumbed to the mechanisation of knowledge that Innis discusses; individualised groups with different perspectives of the same issues pursue their own ideologies without communication or translation between all perspectives. Certain voices in the environmental movement are silenced in favour of the discourse that appeals to the powerful interests in Western civilization. The problem is, as Buell points out, that these silenced voices could be those that tend to focus on the social justice issues surrounding environmentalism and the confrontational, antagonistic perspectives of activists.

The discourse of mainstream environmentalism fits well within the status quo of consumer capitalism. It lacks a criticality towards the systematic destruction of the environment enabled by the media of consumer capitalism, and instead seeks to work within that system to produce environmental changes. This pattern is also reflected in literature on social movement organisations.

Environmental Organisations as Biased Communication Media

Organisations, such as non-profits and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), confront several limitations when trying to pursue social changes along the lines of movements they represent. Jael Silliman discusses some of these limitations, but first argues that NGOs can perform several vital roles, acting as “lightning rods” to change social policies and public opinions:

They incubate new ideas and do legal, scientific, and technical analysis to effect policy changes. They galvanize support and shape, implement, and monitor national and international commitments. They often act as alternative conduits through which external and transnational agencies deliver funds and expertise to local communities, bypassing governments in

this process. Many NGOs have become, in effect, guardians of the welfare of hundreds of thousands of poor people, and are watchdogs against government malfeasance and the evasion of accountability. (Silliman, 1999, p. 26)

NGOs in general can play important roles in solving issues and mobilizing public opinion. However, the types of support organisations receive, including funding sources, staff and volunteer participants, and the like tend to correlate with the kinds of politics and actions they perform (Silliman, 1999, p. 28). Indeed, these structural imperatives can greatly influence the discourses organisations communicate.

Dowie has outlined the many ways that funding sources influence environmental organisations. For instance, organisations relying on direct mail fundraising and marketing require “well-paid staff to determine what will and will not work”, which places further pressure on the organisation to gain more funding to pay for the staff (Dowie, 1995, p. 44). Additionally, they will steer their discourse to their memberships through direct mail polling in order to make sure the organization continues to resonate with membership interests (Dowie, 1995, p. 43). Funding from foundations tends to be “project specific” and gives the funders greater influence over organisational politics and actions over and above membership and participant influence (Dowie, 1995, p. 49). Also, increasingly, corporate philanthropy plays a big role in some large environmental organisations and while the influence of corporate sponsorship is obvious, it also tends to serve as a means for corporations to revel in good publicity and greenwashing (Dowie, 1995, p. 57-58).

Many NGOs and non-profits also tend to take on uncontroversial roles of service providers. They fill gaps left by the collapse of state support and in some cases are contracted by governments to fulfill these roles (Silliman, 1999, p. 32). Indeed, as neoliberalism has risen to prominence, there are many cases where governments tend to

offload responsibilities to local community groups and NGOs (Purcell, 2006, p. 1927). This is evidence of a kind of a widespread mechanisation of environmental action, where many different spatially and ideologically fragmented groups perform different services without any communication between them.

Many organisations, reliant on funding, membership, and audiences will “appeal to moderate reformers” rather than “pursue more radical causes or strategies for fear that this might affect” participation and funding contributions (Brulle, 2000, p. 254). Drieling and Wolf (2001) suggest that the political ideologies adopted by environmental movement organisations “reflect the interests and ideologies of those funding the EMO” (Drieling and Wolf, 2001, p. 42). For instance, in a study conducted by Markham and Bonjean (1995), they found that organisations reliant on support and participation of higher status citizens will focus on issues that do not confront or threaten established powers and are significantly more conservative than liberal in their discourse (Markham and Bonjean, 1995, p. 1554). They found that organisations often swayed their messages to suit the interests of those who they rely on for volunteer labour and funding. The need to function within the current monopoly of knowledge and appeal to as many people as possible entices “social actors [to] generally undertake projects only if they are feasible [...] Thus moralities which cannot be realized through feasible means are socially meaningless” (Gough, 2010, p. 132). Social movement organisations are thereby, to some extents, compelled “to select narrow, ‘realistic’ projects, whose outcomes are accessible to measurement” (Silliman, 1999, p. 11).

Given the fact that there are many environmental organisations working towards similar goals, organisations often need to adopt somewhat spectacular language to stand

out amongst the crowd. In a study by Greenberg et al. (2011), they suggest that public relations strategies are often employed to attract audiences and public attention. In this sense, environmental organisations tend to “brand their identities and overhype their interests and perspectives” often to ensure media access and to take control of their public image (Greenberg et al., 2011, p. 69). According to a study conducted by Cooper and Fritz (1992), the expansion of the number of environmental organisations has also engendered greater divisions between them, creating a severe mechanisation of the environmental organisation community (Cooper and Fritz, 1992, p. 801). Additionally, they point out that organisations are also differentiated by those that focus specifically on environmental issues and those that consider them as part of other social projects (Cooper and Fritz, 1992, p. 802). Indeed, the sheer number and spread of environmental organisations engenders greater division between them and clamouring for public attention.

More recently, grassroots environmental organisations have become more prevalent. Cable and Benson (1993), in an article discussing grassroots organisations, point out that local communities are not as inclined to think about global or national environmental issues. Rather, residents will focus more so on local environmental conditions and issues that “impinge on their everyday lives” (Cable and Benson, 1993, p. 466). Grassroots organisations form out of the will of locals and focus on alleviating the issues in their locality. Sociologist Michel Callon, who is a proponent of the relatively recent Actor Network Theory, argues that this kind of organization, whether it becomes a legitimate institution or just an informal outburst, tend to be the result of “controversies” in the socio-technical world (Callon et al., 2001). That is, the experiences of locals in response to controversies, such as excessive pollution, food contamination, and the like, generate

new “unexpected themes for discussion, and redefining the possible consequences” of various projects that cause controversies (Callon et al., 2001, p. 15). People mobilizing around socio-technical controversies that affect their lives in immediate locales can ideally generate new and important discussions about the issues, such that these grassroots, laypersons force themselves into the debate. While these grassroots groups are, indeed, beneficial for specific locales, their successes tend to “have limited effects on national and even regional environmental quality” (Cable and Benson, 1993, p. 475). In this sense, grassroots organisations are not necessarily motivated by inclusivity of all perspectives, but only focus on issues that impinge on their own individualistic self-interests.

Working Hypotheses and Expectations

Ultimately, problems arise due to the fact that environmental organisation “campaigns focus on treating environmental problems rather than addressing their roots [...] in ways that fail to build an alternative vision for a species not in a permanent state of conflict with the planet” (Assadourian, 2013, p. 293). Environmental organisations have been historically disarmed by political and economic biases in collaboration with the various ways that environmental organisations appear to individualise environmental issues based on the interests of funders, participants, and locales. Environmental organisations are thereby significantly influenced by the biases of the institution of consumer capitalism. In order to understand why organisations tend not to foster critical, radical perspectives or actions, we can point to their need to operate within the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge; in order to resonate with the widely held perspectives of people, organisations must apparently adopt familiar frames of reference and avoid challenging the powerful. The historical developments outlined above suggest that

environmental organisations, promoting the ideologies of the environmental movement, have evolved to be less holistically focused on the entire global community and ecosystem, and more individualised and focused on the interests of few. Rather than inspiring public debate and raising the volume of new worldviews and perspectives, mainstream environmental organisations appear to simply focus on communicating within narrowly focused ideologies.

There is very little literature on the Canadian context of the environmental movement, and seemingly none on organisations within the city of Toronto. The following research seeks to remedy this by focusing on whether or not environmental organisations in Toronto are particularly influenced by the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge they operate within.

A few working hypotheses and expectations guide the following analysis. Firstly, it is expected that the environmental organisation community in Toronto will be fragmented and mechanised, focusing on specific, narrow interests. Additionally, funding is expected to play a partially determining or swaying role in the discourses environmental organisations employ in their communication materials. Environmental organisations are also expected to strive to stand out amongst the many organisations in the Toronto scene by promoting themselves and overhyping their actions and ideologies in a self-serving way. Overall, the environmental organisation community is expected to focus largely on uncontroversial issues and adopt non-confrontational methods, in line with much of the literature presented above.

Methodology

This study utilises a mixed-methods approach to discern the structural characteristics and discourses of environmental organisations in Toronto. This includes a survey measure to understand how organisations self-report their respective organisational structures and issue focuses. The methodology also utilises a discourse analysis, influenced by the theories of Dell Hymes and Edward T. Hall, of the respective organisations' meaning creation on their websites.

Sample

The study utilises a non-random sample selected from an online directory provided by the Ontario Environment Network. This directory lists around 700 Ontario-based environmental groups that range from local, neighbourhood based initiatives to large, national or international organisations. The directory accounts for 248 Environmental organisations based in Toronto. The survey apparatus, described below, was emailed to all of the organisations on this list, to email addresses retrieved from their respective websites. Additionally, the biases of self-selection were mitigated with a snowball sample attained by creating two questions at the end of the survey for participants to list other environmental organisations in Toronto, which were also sent participation requests. A total of 72 organisations replied to the survey, providing the sample for this study. This same sample of organisations was utilised for the discourse analysis as well.

Survey Apparatus

The survey was constructed to allow organisations to report their structural characteristics, such as issue focus, methods of action, communication media utilized, numbers of paid staff and volunteers, primary funding sources, spatial focus, and

“visibility” of email newsletters and websites. Two surveys were created, the first contained the main questions and the second was a set of revised questions to fix some ambiguities in the initial survey questions about the number of staff and volunteers. The finalized survey apparatus contained a total of 14 questions (Appendix 1.)

The survey was designed such that the answers could be analyzed and interpreted for a general, preliminary understanding of the structures and priorities of Toronto-based organisations. The apparatus was constructed to deliver qualitative data from many different participants that could be interpreted as individual speech acts in lieu of conducting qualitative interviews, which would have yielded relatively fewer participating organisations.

Procedure

The survey was first deployed in late December 2014 to the 248 emails collected from the Ontario Environment Network directory using the online platform called “Survey Monkey”. Reminder emails were sent on a weekly basis to the email list. At the end of January 2015, survey results were collected into a spreadsheet for analysis. Initial review of the results revealed some problems with the initial survey’s questions, which resulted in ambiguous answers. The problematic questions were revised and sent to organisations that already participated in the form of a follow up survey. These revised questions also replaced those in the initial survey to create a second survey that was sent to the non-respondents of the original 248 organisations and the snowball sample collected from survey responses.

The survey was officially closed on March 5th, 2015. Data from the survey was collected and put into a digital spreadsheet. Analysis of the data was performed by

calculating the frequencies of responses to each survey question and displayed in tables for a visual analysis of percentages. Each organisation's responses were filtered and controlled based on survey various survey responses to create different groupings. For instance, one grouping controlled for organisations that answered "paid staff" in question #4 (highlighted in Appendix 1) to see how the participants responding in this way answered the other questions. This enabled an understanding of some of the structural characteristics and contexts of environmental organisations in Toronto.

The discourse analysis was devised as a sort of amalgamation of the Ferree et al.'s (2000) concept of the "discursive opportunity structure" and ideas from Dell Hymes (1964) and Edward Hall (1976). Discursive opportunity structure provides a way of looking at the ways speech events are framed within a discursive playing field. Ferree et al. explain the discursive opportunity structure as a "tool for understanding why certain actors and frames are more prominent in public discourse than others" (Ferree et al., 2000, p. 62). The discursive opportunity structure takes the context of the culture as "the field in which framing contests occur" and suggests that the field "provides advantages and disadvantages to the various contestants in framing contests" (Ferree et al., 2000, p. 62). Utilizing this concept, this study's discourse analysis situated environmental organisations within the discursive opportunity structure of consumer the capitalist monopoly of knowledge. Additionally, Dell Hymes' "ethnography of communication" emphasizes the contexts of speaking communities. Hymes points to the necessity of investigating the communicative habits of speaking communities as a whole, "so that any given use of channel and code takes its place as but part of the resources upon which the members of the community draw" (Hymes, 1964, p. 3). That is, the goal of analysis of language and meaning has to be

situated within the patterns of the entire community of speakers. As such, the environmental organisations in Toronto were analyzed against one another and against the culture of consumer capitalism in order to best situate them.

Edward T. Hall's ideas of context in language analysis also inform the following discourse analysis. Similarly to Hymes (1964) and Ferree et al. (2000), Hall emphasizes that culture plays a massive role in understanding the meanings communicated by different actors. He argues that the problem of understanding

lies not in the linguistic code but in the context, which carries varying proportions of the meaning. Without context, the code is incomplete since it encompasses only part of the message (Hall, 1976, p. 86).

Taken together these three focuses on understanding the patterns of speech in speaking communities, with reference to the cultural and structural contexts of speakers, all inform the following discourse analysis. Following these ideas, the language on environmental organisations' websites were analysed with reference to the context of the cultural biases of consumer capitalism (i.e. the discursive opportunity structure) and the context of the environmental organisation speech community as a whole.

The general procedure of the discourse analysis was performed in three steps. First, all websites were examined and the text from each was copied into a master document amounting to 185 single-spaced pages of data from each organisation in the sample. Second, this data was read through several times, making notes of the themes and patterns that arose within the language utilized. Attention was paid to relationships with survey data and how discourses fit within or escaped the biases of the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge. Lastly, the organisations were coded based on the patterns that arose from this analysis in order to write the analysis chapters below.

Survey Results

The following is a preliminary analysis of survey results, bringing to light some patterns that arose in the sample of seventy-two participants. A summary of the results can be found in Appendix 2. Overall, the trends that arise in the survey results paint a picture of organisations that are varied in their issue focus, report different communication media depending on their reported methods of action, steer their methods of action towards the interests of funders, and prioritize a local focus when volunteer labour is most important.

Similar Methods of Action and Individualisation of Issue Focuses

Organisations employ a variety of methods to achieve their organisational goals and solve the issues they portend to focus on. The second highest reported methods of action organisations utilise are Internet/Media Campaigns (48.61%) and Community Based Green Initiatives (48.61%). Participants that chose one or both of these methods account for 75% of the entire sample, which indicates a homogenization of methods of action in the Toronto scene. This is broken down in Table 1.

Table 1: Frequencies of Internet/Media Campaigns and/or Community-Based Green Initiatives Methods

Method	Frequency	% Of Total Sample
Internet/Media Campaigns	20	27.78
Community Based Green Initiatives	19	26.39
Both	15	20.83
Totals	54	75

Thus, two major methods are utilised by organisations to achieve their goals: working within communities and disseminating information about issues through media campaigns. While there are, indeed, many different methods employed by organisations, as indicated by the fact that Other (54.17%) had the highest response frequency, the majority, (75% of the sample) focus on either information dissemination or community-based initiatives.

This might indicate homogeneity of the methods of action performed by environmental organisations in Toronto.

On the other hand, organisations vary quite a lot in the environmental issues they focus on. Evidence for this is that the highest frequency response was “Other” (65.28%), indicating highly differentiated environmental issue focuses amongst organisations in the Toronto scene. Issues that organisations listed under Other included: “Water” (five organisations with responses such as “Water Sustainability”, “Water”, “Water Protection”); “Land Use” (six organisations with responses such as “Habitat Protection,” “Public/Green Space,” “Land Use,” “Land Conservation”); “Environmental Justice” (two organisations with responses such as “Environmental Justice”); “Environmental Education” (two organisations with responses such as “Outdoor and Environmental education”); “Food” (two organisations with responses such as “Food,” “Feeding people experiencing hunger”).

The variety of issue focuses suggests that organisations strive to define themselves uniquely through the issues they focus on, possibly to stand out amongst others in the Toronto scene. Climate change is the second highest frequency issue (45.83%). Given that climate change is a well-recognised environmental issue, this could mean that many organisations also fall in line with mainstream environmental discourse; that is, while differentiating themselves from other organisations by focusing on many issues, organisations ensure that they engage in recognized environmental issues that resonate with the public. The environmental issues focused on by organisations in the sample points to a wide differentiation in issues, potentially motivated by a need to differentiate themselves from other organisations.

Environmental organisations seem to employ similar methods of action, but attempt to define themselves by distinct, individualised issues. This indicates the potential that organisations differentiate themselves from others by the content of their messaging (i.e. what issues they focus on), while performing similar kinds of methods as other organisations (i.e. media campaigns and/or community-based green initiatives). In this sense, the environmental organisations in the Toronto community are very similar in their methods of action, but distinct in their issue focuses. While many organisations function the same way, performing the same kinds of actions, they strive to appear unique by the issues on which they focus.

Communication Methods Priorities

The results show tendencies towards Internet-based media as organisations' prioritised communication methods. Website (25%) and Email Newsletters (25%) are most frequently ranked highest and including Social Media (12.50%), Internet-based media account for 62.50% of the entire sample. Organisations thus generally appear to prioritise widespread communication over the Internet. Face-to-Face communication has the 3rd highest response frequency with 20.83%, indicating a smaller portion of the sample interested in communicating with people in person.

The general prioritisation of mass, internet-based communication indicates that organisations are more interested in broadcasting their message to wide audiences rather than participating in direct discussion. This is further evidenced by the fact that Social Media, arguably more conversational than Websites and Email Newsletters, has the lowest response frequency of the internet-based media. Websites and Email Newsletters are more suitable for broadcasting messages than engaging in conversation with an audience, thus

providing greater control over messages. Face-to-Face and Social Media are more likely to compel conversations with audiences or the publics, which are unpredictable and uncontrollable. Given the emphasis on the broadcast, internet-based media, it is possible that environmental organisations in the sample place great importance on controlling their public image and messaging while relatively few focus on conversation with people.

A relationship appears between the communication media organisations report and the methods of action they employ to achieve their organisational goals. Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4 reveal trends in Email Newsletters, Website, and Face-to-Face prioritising organisations. Face-to-face communication is most related to community-based green initiatives. This, coupled with the relatively lower reporting of “Political Advocacy” methods indicates that face-to-face communication does not necessarily pertain to sparking political discussions, but is more likely limited to the confines of community initiatives run by the organisations.

In this sense, face-to-face communication is frequently employed in organising community initiatives, but not necessarily for establishing oral discourse about environmental issues. Indeed, it is possible that organisations rarely reach out to people in person, unless at a sanctioned organisation event or initiative. Ultimately, this finding requires further exploration to discern better how organisations engage with people in person, but it also allows us to make some assumptions as to how organisations communicate with their audiences.

Table 2: Frequencies Methods of Action by Email Newsletter Reporting Organisations

Method	Frequency	% Of Respondents
Activism	7	36.84
Canvassing	3	15.79
Political Advocacy	9	47.37
Internet/Media Campaigns	9	47.37
Stewardship	4	21.05
Community-Based Green Initiatives	6	31.58
Selling Eco-Friendly Products	0	0.00
Providing Eco-Friendly Services	2	10.53
Other	8	42.11
# Of Respondents	19	

Table 3: Frequencies Methods of Action by Website Reporting Organisations

Method	Frequency	% Of Respondents
Activism	6	30.00
Canvassing	1	5.00
Political Advocacy	7	35.00
Internet/Media Campaigns	9	45.00
Stewardship	5	25.00
Community-Based Green Initiatives	7	35.00
Selling Eco-Friendly Products	2	10.00
Providing Eco-Friendly Services	4	20.00
Other	14	70.00
# Of Respondents	18	

Table 4: Frequencies Methods of Action by Face-to-Face Reporting Organisations

Method	Frequency	% Of Respondents
Activism	5	33.33
Canvassing	1	6.67
Political Advocacy	3	20.00
Internet/Media Campaigns	7	46.67
Stewardship	7	46.67
Community-Based Green Initiatives	12	80.00
Selling Eco-Friendly Products	3	20.00
Providing Eco-Friendly Services	6	40.00
Other	6	40.00
# Of Respondents	15	

Funder Steering

Results point to a relatively strong emphasis on the Local (36.11%), Provincial (33.33%), and National (20.83%) spatial focuses. Interestingly, there is a relationship between local and non-local spatial focus and the organisations' funding priorities, as outlined in Table 5 and Table 6. From these results, we can see a relationship between local focus and government grant funding. Locally focused organisations are more likely to prioritise government grant funding, while non-locally focused organisations place a stronger emphasis on donations and membership/subscription fees. This could be the result of a bias of government granting agencies for supporting local initiatives rather than those that focus on larger scales.

Funding priorities of organisations also appear to relate to the organisations' likelihoods of performing confrontational methods such as Activism and Political Advocacy. Controlling the major funding priorities, Table 7 shows the relationship with confrontational methods. The numbers here suggest that confrontational methods of action are least likely to be adopted by organisations that prioritise government funding and corporate sponsorships. Meanwhile, there are higher frequencies for the other funding priorities. These relationships suggest that funding may have an influence on the types of methods organisations can employ to achieve their goals. It is particularly prevalent in the frequencies of political advocacy methods, where government grants and corporate sponsorships seem to preclude any advocacy for political policy changes or confrontation with government in general. This potential swaying influence of funding will be explored further in the discourse analysis chapters below.

Table 5: Frequencies of Local Focus and funding priorities.

Funding Priority	Frequency	% Of Respondents
Government Grants	11	42.31
Corporate Sponsorship	2	7.69
Fundraising	4	15.38
Membership/Subscription Fees	2	7.69
Out-of-Pocket	0	0.00
Product/Services Sales	2	7.69
Donations	1	3.85
Other	4	15.38
# Of Respondents	26	100.00

Table 6: Frequencies of Non-Local Focus and funding priorities.

Funding Priority	Frequency	% Of Respondents
Government Grants	10	21.28
Corporate Sponsorship	3	6.38
Fundraising	3	6.38
Membership/Subscription Fees	9	19.15
Out-of-Pocket	1	2.13
Product/Services Sales	0	0.00
Donations	13	27.66
Other	8	17.02
# Of Respondents	47	100.00

Table 7: Funding Priorities and Confrontational Methods

Funding Source	Respondents	Activism Frequency	% of Respondents	Pol. Adv. Frequency	% of Respondents
Government Grants	21	6	28.57	4	19.05
Corporate Sponsorship	5	1	20.00	0	0.00
Membership/Subscriptions	10	2	30.00	6	60.00
Fundraising	7	4	57.14	3	42.86
Donations	14	5	35.71	6	42.86
Other	12	4	33.33	5	41.67

Participant Importance: Paid Staff and Volunteer Labour Reliance

The sample shows a strong tendency toward rating Paid Staff (40.28%) and Volunteers (34.72%) as the most important participants in organisations' respective actions. Options that also received responses were Subscribers/Members (8.33%), Students (2.78%) and Other (13.89%), which are significantly lower response frequencies than Paid Staff and Volunteers. No organisations responded with Government Officials as their most important participants. Obviously, volunteers are the backbone of

environmental organisations and the survey data supports this. While Volunteer importance had a lower response frequency than Paid Staff, there were only three organisations (4.17%) in the total sample that claimed to have no volunteers at all. On the other hand, seventeen organisations (23.61%) claimed to have no Paid Staff, adding evidence to the high importance of volunteers to environmental organisations.

There is a relationship between the spatial focus and the most important participant types for organisations. Table 8 outlines the frequencies of reporting a local scale and non-local scale focus compared to participant importance. Patterns emerge in the paid staff and volunteer reporting organisations. Organisations that reported paid staff most important were more likely to have a non-local focus than a local focus. Meanwhile, organisations that placed greater importance on volunteers are more likely to adopt a local spatial focus. This suggests that organisations that require greater volunteer labour power are more likely to focus on local issues that affect people who they are targeting to volunteer. As such, it is possible that organisations focused on local scales and reliant on volunteer labour will manipulate their discursive to suit the self-interests of the potential volunteers in the locale. The other participant types (Subscribers/Members, Students, and Other) were also more likely to be related to the non-local scale, but given that relatively few participants responded with these survey options, it is difficult to draw substantial conclusions from this.

Table 8: Participant Importance and Spatial Scale Focus

Participant Importance	Respondents	Local Frequency	% of Respondents	Non-Local Frequency	% of Respondents
Paid Staff	30	10	33.33	20	66.67
Volunteers	26	14	53.85	12	46.15
Subscribers/Members	6	1	16.67	5	83.33
Students	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Other	10	1	10.00	9	90.00

Summary

The above trends suggest some potential lines of questioning for analyses of environmental organisations in Toronto. First, the survey results suggest that organisations tend to adopt very similar methods of action on their goals, with 75% performing internet/media campaigns, community-based green initiatives, or both, but they individualise themselves through the issues they focus on. Second, face-to-face communication is related to performing community-based green initiatives, suggesting that face-to-face communications are not necessarily geared towards oral discussion of issues, but instead primarily about engagement with people during community initiatives run by the organization. Third, there seems to be a relationship between funding priorities, spatial focus, and confrontational methods, suggesting that funding may influence organisations' structure and discourse. And lastly, volunteer prioritising organisations tend to focus more on the local scale, suggesting that their discourse will be directed at the potential volunteers in the focused on locale; organisations may manipulate their discursive appeals and spatial focus to suit the interests of their most important participants and/or audiences.

These conclusions are largely preliminary; no causal relationships can be made, nor have these results been analysed for statistical significance. However, the results here are ideal to inform the analysis of organisations' communication materials on their websites. Given that these results indicate that organisations are individualised in their issue, spatial and participant focuses, and are potentially steered by funding sources, there is justification for looking further at how organisations focus their discourse in various ways to appeal to different interests.

The Deadly Sins of Environmental Organisations

This chapter presents an analysis of the discourse of environmental organisations in Toronto. The contents of each organisations' websites provides a large amount of information on the actions organisations perform, their ideological stances on issues, and how they construct their appeals to specific audiences.

Reviewing the website communication materials in conjunction with some of the survey results revealed several patterns in organisations' communicated discourses. These patterns present organisations in the Toronto scene as individualised and mechanised. Organisations tend to be self-interested, focused on promoting themselves above others, and focused on retaining funding. Several criticisms arise from the following analysis that situate organisations within the biases of the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge towards individualism, mechanisation, the priority of economics and the price system, and quantitative value.

The following analysis is broken down into six sections. The first five each correspond to patterns of self-interestedness, individualisation, and mechanisation of environmental organisations. These five sections cover the following themes: the swaying effect of funding on organisations' discourses; the narrow, self-interested focus of organisations; the theme of self-promotion and overconfidence in organisational actions; the incentivisation and recognition of environmental actions; and the simplification or easiness of promoted actions for the public to take. The last section focuses on several organisations that perform more positive actions and can serve as models for future organisations to effect environmental change. Overall, this analysis examines the problematic discourses of environmental organisations and why they need to be overcome.

This analysis outlines the problems environmental organisations face and must overcome in order to be better promoters of ecological identities in Western civilization. The following criticisms are not intended to attack the environmental organisation community, but instead to expose their biases that prevent them from inspiring widespread social changes that are more in line with an ecological morality or ethic. Such biases are limiting for environmental organisations and enable the continuation of ecologically destructive actions throughout society. The overall goal is that this critique will bring to light the problems facing many environmental organisations today in hopes that future environmental organisations will strive to overcome them to bring about ecological and social change.

The Swaying Effects of Funding

The discursive appeals of organisations in the sample exhibited tendencies to be swayed by the types of funding they received. The survey data provides insight into the types of funding seventy-two organisations in Toronto report is most important for their functioning. These funding priorities include: Government Grants (29.17%); Corporate Sponsorship (6.94%); Fundraising (9.72%); Donations (19.44%); Membership/Subscription Fees (13.89%); Product/Services Sales (2.78%); and Out-of-Pocket (1.39%). Additionally, several responses indicated Other (16.67%) forms of funding priorities, which included: Foundation Grants; all of the funding sources; Stock Market Returns; Profits; Student Levy Fees; Ministry of Attorney General funding; Private Grants; and Fundraising Campaigns.

Reviewing the respective websites of organisations revealed some patterns and relationships between different funding priorities and the actions and appeals organisations emphasize. The remainder of this section will outline these patterns in organisations' construction of meaning in relation to the above funding prioritizations. This is broken down into two sections, first organisations that I have deemed Government Friendlies, Greenwashers, and Profiteers, and second the organisations that prioritize Donations, Fundraising, and Membership/Subscription fees.

Government Friendlies, Greenwashers, and Profiteers

This first category contains organisations that prioritize funding from relatively powerful entities. These funding sources include government grants and funds, corporate sponsors, and foundation grants. Additionally, for-profit organisations are captured under

this category. Overall, they are similar in their framing of environmental issues and their actions.

Governments offer many different funding programs for environmental initiatives. Three such funding programs include “EcoAction Community Funding Program,” the “Environmental Damages Fund,” and the “Great Lakes Sustainability Fund.” As a government agency, the Trillium Foundation also provides funding to many different projects including environmental ones under their funding stream called “Green People”. Each of these funding opportunities requires that organisations fit several requirements and stipulations. They tend to require projects to create positive and measurable changes in the environment and affected communities. EcoAction’s applicant guidelines state that applicants “are required to demonstrate how their project will lead to positive, measurable environmental results so that we may track the overall impact and success of the program” (*Potential Applicants – EcoAction, 2015*). The Trillium foundation similarly stipulates that funding is only for “efforts that result in a tangible change – projects that move beyond education/awareness to result in concrete action that reduces our impact on, and increases benefits to, the environment” (Ontario Trillium Foundation, 2015, p. 6). EcoAction also requires that organisations be accountable and available to “respond to ad-hoc requests by Environment Canada for information on project progress” at any point during the projects’ schedules (*Potential Applicants – EcoAction, 2015*).

Fundable projects and initiatives are also limited. EcoAction requires projects to fit into one of four categories (“Clean Air,” “Clean Water,” “Climate Change,” and “Nature.”) The Environmental Damages Fund gives priority to “projects that will help to restore the natural environment and conserve wildlife in the geographic region (local area, region or

province) most affected by the original incident” (*Potential Applicants – Environmental Damages Fund*, 2013.). Indeed, restoration and conservation projects are more privileged when it comes to receiving government funding. Additionally, government-funding programs also refuse support for any political advocacy projects. The Trillium Foundation and Environmental Damages Fund very distinctly state they will not fund advocacy, political, or lobbying activities and initiatives. The ideal organisations funded by governments are thereby accountable, politically neutral, and work towards tangible, measurable goals. Such a discourse excludes any political advocacy, radical groups or groups working towards confrontational mobilisation.

The discourses of organisations that prioritise government grants tend to conform to these stipulations. Firstly, six organisations perform actions that could be performed by, or could benefit government. For instance, Participant 22, funded by the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Energy, evaluates and certifies schools for environmental practices in waste, energy efficiency, and curriculum. Similarly, Participant 46, working with local governments to enhance climate adaptation capacities, frames the consequences of climate change within governments’ interests by focusing on the impacts on infrastructure and local economies. Participant 59, funded by a government appointed entity called the Independent Electricity System Operator, provides energy audits and advice for residents to increase their energy efficiency. Participant 58 specifically states that they enable interested volunteers “to collect, record and share accurate and reliable stream data which will contribute to the Ministry of Natural Resources’ (MNR) database.” In this case a government agency, the MNR, benefits directly from the actions of Participant 58.

Four organisations present their actions in terms of protecting, restoring and conserving nature, falling into the government funding bias towards restoration and conservation programs. Participant 5 proclaims a tagline of “Giving Nature a voice and a helping hand” while Participant 15 also states a conservation and restoration mission: “Our goal is to restore the ecological health and functioning of the Black Creek Watershed”.

Government grant prioritising organisations also tend to focus on specific, local communities such as neighbourhoods, non-specific “communities”, as well as some shared interest and hobby communities. For instance, Participants 8, 13, 18, 50, 62, and 64 claim to be focused on providing services and/or information to neighbourhood communities within Toronto or across Ontario. Participants 26, 28, 43, and 58 address communities that share a particular interest or activity, including Beekeeping, documentary filmmaking, the environmental non-profit organisation community, and those interested in scientific monitoring of nature. Two other organisations focus on communities in a slightly different sense. Participant 35 focuses on enabling international, developing communities in Africa to be healthy and sustainable, while Participant 36 is focused on enabling ethnic communities in Toronto to better understand environmental issues and behaviours.

These organisations also mostly fall in line with stipulations for measurable, tangible results and accountability in their actions. Participant 22 describes their successes in terms of quantitatively stating that their program “reaches over 730,000 students every year, from kindergarten through grade twelve”; “The program has been adopted by 1,745 schools in 53 school boards across Ontario.” Additionally, Participant 11, a built and natural heritage conservation organisation, frames their actions quantitatively as holding “approximately 9,100 acres (nearly 3,700 hectares) for the people of Ontario. This number

includes 3,650 acres (1,460 hectares) along the Bruce Trail. We have also assisted other organizations to secure a further 36,000 acres (14,499 hectares)”.

None of the twenty-one government grant organisations communicate confrontational or political messages. Falling in line with the stipulations of several government funding programs that refuse funding to “advocacy” groups, these organisations tend not to make any political statements or controversial statements about environmental issues or the social and economic conditions that enable these issues to arise in the first place. Participant 58 exemplifies this in their emphasis on just enabling people to learn the skills necessary to monitor watersheds. This is also seen in Participant 33’s mission to provide information and resources to companies and governments to make their vehicle fleets more efficient. These are only two examples but they represent the way that government grant organisations tend to provide and advocate for solutions that are practical and non-controversial towards governments or social conditions.

Corporate sponsorship priority only accounts for five participants in the sample. Much like the government grant funded organisations, none of these organisations adopt a critical, confrontational stance on environmental issues or advocate for political changes. Instead, they tend to frame their discourse with a veneer of positivity and optimism. Participant 72, for instance, communicates the goals of one campaign in uplifting and simplistic terms: “We believe that a conserver lifestyle, done right, is more fun, saves money, and can save the planet. It just doesn't get any better than that!” Nowhere does their messaging criticize economic or social structures that legitimize unsustainable, consumer lifestyles. Participant 29 “safely recycles and refurbishes donated computer equipment keeping it out of landfills” in order “to bridge the digital divide” by providing

that equipment to help “individuals get and stay connected.” This is a very specific and uncontroversial action that similarly does not make substantial challenges to the rampant over-consumption in consumer society that causes the crisis of electronic waste.

Organisations that prioritize corporate sponsorships also potentially operate as corporate “greenwashing” mechanisms. Four of the organisations (Participants 14, 29, 57, and 72) all give prominent space on their websites to corporate sponsors. Sponsors are celebrated with phrases like “our donors are leaders,” “2014 City Champions,” “2014 City Builders,” and “We couldn't have got this far without you -- those of you who share our vision of crafting a united conservation movement.” Participant 57 runs an online campaign that invites people to perform certain environmental actions, such as cycling to work, each of which is sponsored by individual corporations and companies. The campaign website counts the number of times users report performing an environmental action with a sponsor logo next to each action. The prominence of these sponsor logos and the celebratory language used to acknowledge their sponsors associates their corporate sponsors with environmental and social responsibility, thereby potentially greenwashing their corporate images.

Five organisations specified a priority for foundation grants. Once again, none of these organisations take a critical or political stance on these issues and tend to frame their actions in terms of positive social and environmental changes. Participant 3, for instance, advocates on behalf of a national partnership of health and medical professionals and produce information for individuals, such as parents and caregivers, to take preventative measures. Participant 7 presents their actions of harvesting fruit from homeowners’ trees in the urban region as having a positive impact on the environment and fighting climate

change. Similarly, Participant 67 works “with communities and schools, providing them with the knowledge and tools to monitor their environment and take action for positive environmental change.” Indeed, much like the other funding priorities above, there is a distinct veneer of positivity, uncritical discourse, and actions that tend not to deal with social and economic contradictions that are the root of many environmental issues.

There are also some outliers from the main funding options in the survey, including Participant 38 who responded with “Stock Market Returns”. They focus on funding innovations and companies with an environmental bent, with a focus on what they call “impact investing”, which “generate[s] a measurable, beneficial environmental impact – reduced greenhouse gas emissions – in addition to a risk-adjusted rate of return. *We target a market rate of return*”. Their need for a return on investments may be predispose them towards funding uncontroversial projects, such as those that are more mechanised and able to achieve measurable, quantifiable, and easily marketable results. Additionally, their discourse is implicitly celebratory of the power of the capitalist marketplace to invigorate environmental change.

Lastly, there are three for-profit organisations in the sample. Participant 40 is a marketing firm that specializes in connecting “conscientious consumers to leading providers of green goods and services.” Participant 2 sells software to employers that want to engage their “passionate” employees. Additionally, Participant 2 presents environmentalism almost as a passing fad or something that is currently “in” or “hip” with people these days: “Listen, we get it. Social responsibility is hot. The climate is sizzling. And ‘wellness’ is a buzzword.” Participant 27 is a for-profit company that provides advice to members to make socially and environmentally responsible financial investments. All of

these organisations, in slightly different ways, are entirely focused on greening the image of their clients; whether by creating marketing campaigns to reach “affluent”, green consumers, by persuading employees that their employers are environmentally conscious, or teaching social/environmental investment they sell a green image to their customers.

Uniting these Government Friendlies, Greenwashers, and Profiteers is a discourse that is entirely uncontroversial, seemingly apolitical, and supports actions that do not challenge the status quo. Government grants are related to services performed apparently on behalf of, and accountable to, governments; Corporate Sponsorship prioritizing organisations largely act as mediators that greenwash the images and actions of corporate sponsors; foundation funded organisations exhibit a similar veneer of positivity and optimism surrounding their actions; and for-profits tend to focus on uncontroversial innovations or act as greenwashing mechanisms for hire.

Donor and Member Friendlies, and the Independents

How do organisations that prioritise other forms of funding differ from those above? This section examines those that prioritised donations, fundraising, and membership/subscription fees. For the sake of clarity, “fundraising” pertains to funding from many sources, including all of the survey options. Upon analysing the donations prioritising organisations’ websites, seven of them (Participants 4, 23, 37, 44, 48, 56, and 60) had comprehensive fundraising programs in addition to donations. Meanwhile, the other seven donations prioritising organisations (Participants 9, 30, 41, 45, 52, 54, 55) appear to only receive donations as their main source of funding. These organisations communicate their total reliance on donations, up front:

“[Important] animal protection work is entirely dependent on donations from people like you. We receive no government funding.” (Participant 41)

“[Completely] funded by public donations. We rely on the generous support of individuals just like you to help finance our campaigns.” (Participant 52)

“We have no paid staff. Our executives draw no salary. Our budget is made possible only by support from members of the public just like you.”
(Participant 45)

There are, therefore, seven organisations that prioritise donations in addition to a comprehensive fundraising program, and seven organisations that appear to prioritise donations and are independent of other funding sources. The latter seven organisations will hereafter be referred to as independent(s).

From the analysis of their websites, both fundraising and donations prioritising organisations are more likely than those discussed in the previous section to adopt political or adversarial stances on issues; that is, they define themselves against policies or industries. While still relatively few adopt these types of stances, they tend to only be within fundraising and donations prioritization. For example, Participants 47 and 71, both of which prioritise fundraising, work to influence political policies towards different environmental ends. Participant 63, that also prioritises fundraising, similarly takes a stance against the fast food industry and industrial agriculture. On the other hand, the remaining fundraising prioritising organisations (Participants 12, 16, 25, 68) and the organisations that prioritise donations in addition to other forms of fundraising (Participants 4, 23, 37, 44, 48, 56, 60), present messaging similar to the government and foundation grants funded organisations in the previous section, and thus will not be discussed in detail here.

The seven independents in the sample tend to oppose industries², government policies³, and other powerful entities⁴. There are five independents that adopt a discourse that is distinctly critical of the social and economic domination of certain powerful interests in industries and the inaction of governments to solve these issues. Participant 45 takes a confrontational stance against the fossil fuel industry with calls for divestment and attempts to “hold our leaders accountable to the realities of science and the principles of justice.” Similarly, Participant 52 condemns “privatization” of public environmental goods and anti-environmental government policies. Participant 54, arguably the most controversial organization in the sample, rails against the mining industry and capitalism under several antagonistic slogans: “Agitate... against corporate impunity and in support of substantive regulatory change;” “We reject the current economic system, which accumulates wealth without redistributing the benefits.”

Four of these independents also utilise confrontational methods (i.e. methods that publicly act against entities responsible for environmental issues) to achieve their goals. They focus on organising public demonstrations, non-violent protests, and vocalising their beliefs to governments through lobbying and direct contact. The one outlying independent organization, Participant 9, does not act through confrontational means, instead acting within the realm of environmental law, defending citizens against powerful industrial interests, and advocating for new laws. Their lack of activism or confrontational methods might also be associated with the fact that Participant 9 lists donors that donate very large

² Participant 54 stands against mining companies

³ Participant 9 tries to change anti-environmental government laws and policies through winning legal battles

⁴ Participant 41 takes opposes animal exploiting entities, especially zoos.

sums of money, including some big foundations, suggesting a possible influence of powerful funders on their actions.

Organisations that solicit only donations to fund their actions thus tend to have a greater chance of operating under a critical, controversial or confrontational frame. They define political, social and economic issues pertaining to their environmental focus and are more likely to adopt methods that publicly confront those responsible for the issues. This relationship between donations funding and confrontational stance of the organisations suggests that greater financial independence partially enables antagonism towards social and political-economic structures.

Lastly, ten organisations prioritised memberships/subscription in the survey with themes arising in their discourses both similar to and different from the donations and fundraising organisations. First, there is a tendency to celebrate and uphold the values specific to the members. For instance, Participant 39 makes a direct appeal to people interested in environmental issues and makes this audience seem qualitatively better than those who do not care for environmental issues: "YOU just read that article about renewable energy in a major newspaper, and got frustrated by how much they got wrong. Help us correct them." Using the second person and strong imperatives, as well as referring to existing and potential members, the organisation sets up an implied in-group or elitist discourse and acts as a cheerleader for the environmental ideology of the membership. Participant 66 celebrates their vegetarian membership with a mission to "inspire people to choose a healthier, greener, more compassionate lifestyle through plant-based eating." Here, by implying that vegetarian lifestyles are "healthier, greener" and "more compassionate" Participant 66 practically and morally elevates their members and

audience above non-vegetarians. Membership is presented as beneficial to their specified audience: “get discounts on meatless meals and groceries with the [membership] Card. You'll also get access to Toronto vegetarian news and events in our Lifelines newsletter. Support Toronto's go-to resource for all things veg.” Similarly, Participant 61 works on behalf of Ontario outdoor educators, promoting “safe and high quality outdoor education experiences for people of all ages.” Participant 21 promotes events and educational opportunities for membership and others in the community, while also advocating for waterfront development interests behalf of the membership community. Indeed, these membership dependent organisations direct their actions towards benefiting the interests of their members.

There are four member/subscriber dependent organisations (Participants 21, 24, 39, and 51) that communicate using confrontational and antagonistic discourses about the environmental issues that are of interest to members. For instance, Participant 24 takes a stance against military spending and nuclear power, including weapons and energy, addressing linkages between war and “environment and health issues”. They oppose war and nuclear energy: “Internationally, we call for the cessation of the exploration and mining of uranium.” Participant 51 also adopts aggressive stances on issues related to the interests of their biologist membership. On behalf of the membership, Participant 51 develops and advocates for “policies that seek to achieve a balance among resource management and utilization, protection of the environment and the quality of life” and believes that “Governments should not be exempt from environmental assessments with regards to programs, policies, or activities.” Participant 51 therefore provides its critique of governmental policies but limits this to the sphere of environmental assessment and

resource management, which is partially the expertise of their members (i.e. environmental biologists).

Membership/subscription fee prioritising organisations generally tend to celebrate members and gear their discourse towards their interests. While there are some instances where organisations take an oppositional stance against economic and political actors, the environmental issues focused on tend to be narrowly defined within the interests of members. The problems involved with narrowly focused organisations will be discussed further in the next analysis section on self-indulgent ideologies.

Discussion

The influence of funding on the stance, appeals, and actions of respective organisations is exemplified in the above analysis. Organisations that prioritise Government Grants, Corporate Sponsorships, Foundation Grants, and Comprehensive Fundraising programs tend to adopt non-confrontational and uncontroversial stances on the various issues. Government grant stipulations appear to influence on the ways organisations that prioritise this funding communicate and act on environmental issues. Additionally, corporate sponsorship prioritizing organisations seem to celebrate their funders in ways that could be perceived as beneficial for these corporations. Meanwhile, more controversial stances on political and economic structures arise within the more independently funded donations organisations. While only one organisation in the sample adopts a distinctly anti-capitalist perspective, there are several that were highly critical of industry actions and government inaction on environmental issues. It is thus possible that critical discourses are more likely to appear in organisations that prioritise donations funding without comprehensive fundraising initiatives.

Ultimately, there is evidence indicating that funding influences organisations, which can negatively impact their abilities to deal with root causes of environmental issues or simply treat surface symptoms. This should be taken into account by new organisations considering developing a critical stance or utilising confrontational means to strive for independence from more powerful funders. Given the instability of independent sources of funding, such as donations, this can present some hurdles that organisations need to overcome. In particular, they may need to decrease overhead spending and employ fewer staff members to avoid resorting to receiving funding from powerful government or corporate interests. Additionally, to escape the greenwashing effect seen in corporate sponsorship, organisations should strive to achieve funding anonymously to counteract the potential influence of powerful funders.

A relatively new concept known as “crowdfunding” may offer an avenue for organisations to procure relatively anonymous and independent funding sources. Crowdfunding pertains to a new development in funding acquisition that sees people and projects asking for funding from many individual sources, primarily over the Internet. Rodrigo Davies (2015) discusses the potentials and limitations of what he calls “civic crowdfunding” for funding services and projects that benefit communities (Davies, 2015, p. 343). He suggests that this is only a small part of the crowdfunding industry that focuses primarily on funding cultural and commercial projects. Civic crowdfunding also poses possibilities for increased participation and focus on public interest projects (Davies, 2015, p. 353). Given that the independents in this study were more likely to adopt critical perspectives towards social and environmental issues, the possibility of relatively anonymous funding from crowdsourcing technologies, like KickStarter and IndieGoGo

websites, may present means for some organisations to acquire the independent funding they need. Indeed, this opens new lines of research and practice to discern whether crowdfunding is an avenue for critical organizational development.

The economic biases of consumer capitalism that require capital investment for success lay at the root of why organisations will sway their discourses and actions to suit the needs of funders. The need for funding will likely influence organisations to match their discourses to those of potential funders. This provides reason to argue that the consumer capitalist biases towards prioritising the economy and the price system influence the ways environmental organisations can structure themselves and their discourses of ecological issues. As discussed in the literature review, monetary, quantitative values are prioritised in consumer capitalist society. Robert Babe outlines problems of the money medium penetrating all aspects of peoples' lives in capitalist society, where "those aspects necessarily become understood through the logic of the price system" (Babe, 2010, p. 143).

Environmental organisations' actions and appeals are partially determined by the need for money and the price system. As they require funding for their projects, they must choose projects that are attractive to their primary source of funding. Environmental organisations are influenced by the consumer capitalist biases towards prioritising economics and the price system by virtue of their operation within that system. Future and existing organisations need to discover new ways to continue organisational operations that enable them to limit their needs to procure funding from influential, powerful sources.

Self-Indulgent Ideologies and Individualised Environmentalism(s)

Analysis of the sample revealed a tendency of some organisations towards self-interested discourses and narrow, self-indulgent ideologies that appeal to the interests of specific communities. These self-interested, indulgent organisations fall into two categories: *Ideological Self-Indulgence and Perpetuation*, and *Individualised Environmentalism(s)*. The first category pertains to organisations that communicate their ideologies as their primary objective; their messaging tends to be lofty and idealistic, while their actions either do not match that ideology or are mainly focused information sharing and dissemination. The second category pertains to organisations that adopt a language that is highly specific to different, narrowly defined communities or interested groups. These organisations thereby generate individualised environmentalisms for their respective audiences to indulge, contributing to the fragmentation and mechanisation of the environmental organisation community and environmentalism in general.

Ideological Self-Indulgence and Perpetuation

There are twenty organisations in the sample that focus on communicating their ideologies but adopt a set of incongruous or information dissemination focused actions. These organisations tend to talk a big game but do not present the actions to match. In some cases they tend to simply communicate their ideologies as their *raison d'être*.

Survey results of these twenty organisations point to patterns in the types of communication media they prioritise and their spatial focus. Firstly, there is an emphasis on Internet-based communication media, with Website (35%); Email Newsletters (30%); and Social Media (20%) accounting for the most organisations' preferred communication medium. Additionally, only four organisations (20%) claimed a local focus, while provincial

focus (45%) and national focus (30%) accounted for the majority of responses. This could be regarded as evidence that these organisations are more focused on spreading information and their ideologies across wider distances and to larger audiences instead of communicating and acting locally. Appendix C provides a list of the organisations and some quotes that fall into this category; several examples are outlined and explained below.

An organization that engages in this ideological self-indulgence is Participant 8. Their discourse strongly emphasises communities: “Our mission is to create innovative solutions to meet community challenges and build strong, equitable and sustainable communities through education, engagement and collaboration.” Their website suggests that they build and enable “healthy communities” understood in a holistic sense where “the whole is more than the sum of its parts”. Acting on this community ideology, Participant 8 focuses on networking and enabling information sharing between certain organisations and groups in communities:

We bring together a broad-based group of community and provincial associations, spanning the social, environmental, economic, and political spectrums. [Participant 8] members share a common goal of creating healthier communities and they actively support the development of Healthy Communities by sharing their knowledge, skills and experiences with others through our monthly Bulletin and community stories. (Appendix C)

Their actions are removed from the communities themselves, instead reaching out to and creating networks of leaders and members of groups and already existing organisations in communities. Participant 8 simply facilitates information and knowledge sharing between groups, which makes their actions more symbolic than practical in building and enabling communities. Their information dissemination bias is further evidenced by the survey data that shows they ranked Internet based communication media (Website, Social Media, and Email Newsletters) in the top three most important media for their actions. Participant 8

thereby communicates a lofty ideology of vibrant and empowered communities, but performs actions that are primarily directed at spreading information and “healthy community” ideologies.

Similarly, Participant 31’s mission is to “transform” cities while their actions are presented as communicating, extending and perpetuating their own discourse to those that will listen. They state their mission is as follows:

[Mission] is to transform cities into sustainable, vibrant, resilient communities, where the air is clean to breathe and greenhouse gas emissions are minimized.

We believe we can make cities greener, healthier places. To do that, we work with Canadians, decision-makers and businesses to make the environment a top priority. We focus on strategies that will get results, which for [Participant 31] means influencing decision-making in the interests of liveable cities.

To act on this ideology, they tend to present symbolic, information sharing actions as seen in their “successes” listed on their website. These include: School presentations (“In partnership with GTA school boards, we delivered 20/20 The Way to Clean Air to over 400 classrooms and 10,000 families”), panel discussions (“Participated in the Expert Panel on Climate Change Adaptation”), creating an informative guidebook (“Peer reviewed a new national guidebook for local governments on integrating Climate Change Adaptation, Mitigation and Sustainability.”), and other primarily information producing and sharing activities. In this sense, their communicated intention is to transform cities, but their actions rarely leave the sphere of language. Participant 31’s survey results are also insightful as they provide more evidence for their information and ideology perpetuating bias. Much like Participant 8, they ranked Internet-based communication media in their preferred top three, with face-to-face communication ranked sixth. Despite their apparent lack of interest in communicating face-to-face, they still report a local spatial focus,

suggesting they are focused on perpetuating their ideas about making cities greener and healthier only within Toronto. Nonetheless, their bias towards spreading information instead of direct actions is supported by their survey results.

Individualised Environmentalism(s)

The next category of organisational self-indulgence pertains to those with discourses narrowly focused on and directed at specific interested groups. These groups are specific spatial communities, shared interest/hobby communities, and elites (e.g. governments, industry/business leaders, organisation leaders). These narrowly focused discourses contribute to the fragmentation of the environmental organisation community and dissociate individual organisations from perspectives and interests different than their own.

There are twenty-three organisations that fall into this *Individualised Environmentalism* category, with seven focused on shared interests/hobby communities, ten focused on spatial and/or neighbourhood communities, and six focused on elite, organisation, or industry interests. From the survey results, we see that these twenty-three organisations tend to focus on the local scale (60.87%), while focusing less on provincial (21.74%) and national (17.39%) scales. This is almost a complete reversal from the Ideological Self-Indulgence organisations described above, which might be explained by the fact that these twenty-three organisations are more narrowly focused on communities and specific interests, likely within a specific locality. Given that face-to-face communication (30.43%) is relatively higher than the organisations presented in the section above, it is possible to suggest that these organisations are likely more interested in communicating directly with people in the locality and less about simply communicating their ideologies to

many people across wide distances. The majority of these organisations receive funding from government grants (39.13%) and membership/subscription fees (21.74%), with relatively fewer receiving donations funding (13.04%). These survey results paint a picture of these twenty-three organisations being more locally focused and possibly less interested in simply perpetuating their ideologies as information to wider scales. Refer to Appendix D for a list of quotes evidencing this category.

Firstly, seven organisations narrowly focus on specific shared interest groups. Cycling organisations, such as Participant 12 and Participant 30, gear their discourse specifically towards cycling communities. A video on Participant 30's website states:

This is a place where you can fix your bicycle using our tools and recycled or new parts. If you don't know how to fix it, our volunteers will be there to help you. It is also a social space where you can come and meet with your neighbours and figure out how to improve our city. (Participant 30)

Similarly, Participant 12 promotes their "rich history of serving Toronto's cycling community through award-winning programs that enable affordable, clean transportation and of improving communities through waste-diversion." The language appeals to the specialised interests of the cycling community, narrowing their scope of action to primarily benefiting that community thereby creating individualised cyclist environmentalism. This enables cycling communities to engage in environmental behaviours within the scope of their own interests.

Another special interest organisation is Participant 43, focused on beekeeping and helping "inexperienced individuals interested in working with bees to learn about hive ecology and maintenance, as well as honey production". Participant 51 also has a narrow focus, primarily endorsing the interests and perspectives of "professionally-trained biologists and biology students, from the wide range of environmental biology disciplines."

Similarly, Participant 61 focuses on promoting outdoor education for children and adults, while also acting “as a professional body for outdoor educators in the province of Ontario.” All 3 of these organisations appeal to the interests of specific and narrowly defined groups, each with different, individualised environmentalisms in which the people the organisations focus on can partake.

The narrow discursive focus on these shared interest organisations is unproblematic at first glance. However, by focusing on the interests of one narrow group, there is little to no guarantee that their environmental message will escape the bounds of that special interest group. Cycling enthusiasts are likely to be attracted to cycling organisations; biologists will participate in Participant 51’s discussions and debates, and beekeepers will be drawn to Participant 43. Indeed, this type of individualisation creates several different special interest environmentalisms that appeal to different groups with completely different environmental discourses. This could prevent cohesion, translation, and recognition of and between all different environmental interests; fragmenting the movement into special interest organisations primarily enables people to pursue their own interests without confrontation with the interests of others.

Additionally, there are ten organisations that narrowly focus on communities in spatial locales; they enable and applaud efforts of specific communities working towards environmental changes within their own spatial boundaries. Participant 23 provides a good example of this pattern, focusing on the interests of people who appreciate and reside on the Georgian Bay waterfront:

[Participant 23 is a] charity supported by people who love and want to protect the wilderness of Georgian Bay for current and future generations. We are residents, cottagers, boaters, sailors, kayakers, canoeists, native communities, fishers, campers, hikers and nature enthusiasts. We are a

community who share a passion for preserving this incredible area for future generations of Canadian

Appealing to residents, communities, and hobbyists that enjoy this spatial area, this organisation focuses only on preserving the natural space that is of interest to the locale. The benefits of this organisation's actions are framed in the interests of those affected by or associated with that specific locale. This creates a spatially individualised environmentalism, where the participants are focused only on preserving their own interests in the cottage and residential communities near Georgian Bay. The organization is, to some extent, a self-interest preservation mechanism for a very specific community that shares a spatial area.

Participant 47 operates on a similarly narrow spatial focus in their battle against expanding the Toronto Island airport. Their focus is summed up by the following three quotes:

[We are] concerned citizens dedicated to preserving Toronto's mixed-use waterfront and a regional Island Airport (Participant 47)

While we do not oppose the status quo of the Island Airport, we are opposed to turning it into a Pearson-by-the-Lake (Participant 47)

If Porter wants to play in the big leagues, they should go to the big leagues airport – Pearson. Pearson has plenty of capacity to grow. (Participant 47)

This refusal to oppose the status quo of air travel precludes the organisation's ability to deal with larger-scale issues of air pollution caused by air travel. But more problematically, by pointing to increased air pollution and congestion they argue against the Island airport expansion. However, they do not reckon with the negative impacts that a Pearson airport expansion would have for communities surrounding it. Participant 47 thereby implicitly neglects the well-being and interests of other impacted communities. This can be

interpreted as an unfortunately exclusionary and alienating spatial environmentalism in that the discourse only appeals to a specific community, while implicitly being against another.

Individually, the goals and actions communicated by these organisations are quite noble. Focusing on expanding and supporting a community that shares an interest in cycling or thinking about environmental issues, or focusing attention on preserving the environment of a specific space shared by a community or interested parties are both noble goals on the surface. However, on a deeper level, these organisations tend to define a strong in-group and out-group; the in-group is the community that shares an interest in the space focused on, and the out-group becomes those that are neglected and un-served by the organisation's discourse. Focusing their attention on environmental issues within a specific space can potentially make these organisations incredibly self-interested and self-indulgent only in issues that affect them. Once again, this creates individualised environmentalisms for specific interested parties to partake in, but does not necessarily enable the development of collective action on widespread environmental issues or ecological consciousness.

Lastly, six organisations focus on the narrow "elite" interests such as government officials, business leaders, industries, and organisation leaders; we can name these "Elite/Professional Environmentalisms". Rather than focusing on empowering citizens and publics to enact change or to enact environmental change, these organisations embolden the elites and professionals in Toronto and across the province. This narrow focus keeps the debate of environmental issues and environmental change the job of the powerful.

An example of this type of organisation is Participant 14. This organisation operates on a discourse of emboldening efforts of business leaders and corporations in Toronto to make a difference on environmental and social issues: “[Participant 14] has brought together senior executives and rising leaders from all sectors to tackle some of our region’s toughest social, economic and environmental challenges.” Focusing attention on the actions of executives and leaders frames action within the realm of the powerful, but only in ways that appeal to these elites’ self-interests. The environmental actions promoted by Participant 14 thereby tend to be simple and uncritical, such as enticing them to make their offices more energy efficient. With the elite business class as its primary focus, Participant 14 does not question the actions of the business elites outside of strict, narrowly defined environmental and social parameters. This effectively limits the actions of these elites to simple changes in their office habits, while ignoring the possible environmental issues caused by their business practices. This elite environmentalism enables companies to perform environmental actions and appear environmentally conscious, while not challenging the environmental destruction that their other business actions may cause.

Participant 26 narrowly focuses on emboldening environmental organisations (such as non-profits, NGOs, and charities) in Ontario, providing them with opportunities to “receive advanced organizational training, learn from peers and explore broader issues facing the sector.” This is made even narrower when considering the ways Participant 26 helps organisations:

Our mission is to enrich Canadian environmental leaders and nonprofit organizations through programs, services and support that help them increase their capacity to lead, manage and strategize. [Participant 26] works with environmental non-profits to make them more effective and efficient.

Participant 26 thereby focuses on a narrow group of already existing organisations and teaches them how to be more successful, administratively. The focus is not on emboldening organisations in their fight for environmental issues as it is on making them more administratively efficient and increasing their fundraising capabilities. This fits directly, and only, within the interests of relatively professionalised environmental organisations that strive for organisational efficiency. Utilizing traditionally business-oriented language of efficiency and administration, this organisation communicates a discourse of professionalised environmentalism. Such a narrow focus does little to advance environmental ideals, as it does just embolden the administrative capacities of environmental organisations.

Key factors in the “elite” focused organisations are the implications that already powerful entities in Canadian society inherently leaders of environmental changes and debates. The discourse remains focused on the already existing decision makers and leaves the responsibility in their hands. They create a sphere of action that enables the elite actors in society to environmentally act in their own interests.

Discussion

This chapter points to how environmental organisations generate individualised environmentalisms. These themes and patterns correspond to the cardinal sin of gluttony. Gluttony, in this study, is manifest in the self-interest and individualisation of environmental organisations in terms of their focus, perspectives, and messaging. This includes self-interested, self-indulgent organisations and organisations that appeal to the interests of specific shared interest and spatial communities.

Some organisations primarily act in their own self-interests to perpetuate their ideologies to audiences and memberships. They set ideological parameters for environmental discussions, but do not present ways of acting that are congruous with those ideologies. Instead, they simply create a space for people to mainly talk about their perspectives on environmental issues, informing individuals and groups, but do not seem to have the capacity for leaving the sphere of language and engendering widespread changes. Special interest and Spatial community environmentalisms set parameters of environmental discussion and action within the interests of the communities appealed to. They enable people to practice their own individual environmentalisms, pursue their own self-interests, and thereby potentially cut themselves off from environmental issues of other spatial or special interest communities. Lastly, elite/professional environmentalisms characterize organisations that work primarily to embolden elites (governments, corporate leaders) and professionals (organisations) in environmental endeavours. Environmental actions are framed within the interests of elites and professionals, thereby narrowing the environmental impact to those that are in the interests of the already powerful.

This tendency to individualise environmentalism to the interests of specific groups, spaces, and the organisations' own ideologies, reflects the tendency of Western civilization towards mechanisation and individualisation. Corresponding to Innis's critique of the division of knowledge, and Beck (1995) and Bauman's (2000) critiques of individualism, environmental organisations in this study's sample tend to divide environmentalism into many different, and in some cases irreconcilable or alienating, discourses focused on the biased perspectives of individuals and interested groups. Thus, there appears to be a lack of cohesion and community within the divided ideologies and actions of environmental

organisations in Toronto. A follow up email conversation with one participant in this study revealed an interesting insight:

[Sometimes] passion and desire to make change overrides personal wellbeing in the Eco space I find. Hence I am seeing a lot of burnout in this space. That is an issue needing solved is bringing groups together and collaborating.

This participant's statement suggests a potential problematic result of this division of environmental organisations. With each organisation working toward their own ends and on their own ideologies, attempting to individually solve large-scale issues, they might experience burnout. This opens a line of questioning that cannot be adequately dealt with in the confines of this thesis, but the evidence of individualisation indeed points to the need to be critical of individualised environmentalisms enabled by environmental organisations.

Self-Promotion and Overconfidence

Environmental organisations in the sample tended to overconfidently promote themselves and their actions. This is reflected in two ways. First, there are organisations that create a narrative for themselves that makes them the heroes or leaders of the environmental battle. This form of self-promotion and self-exaltation adds imperative to their existence and reinforces their respective *brand* images. Second, some organisations are often overconfident in the environmental actions they perform such that it borders on *hubris*; overhyping their actions and uncritically communicating their actions as perfect solutions for invigorating environmental change are some manifestations of this. Organisations that exhibit this excessive ambition present their actions as solutions to large-scale environmental problems relatively uncritically and without reflexivity. This chapter will examine the self-promotion and overconfidence/hubris of organisations in two sections focusing on the *Heroes and Leaders* frame and *Hubris and Overconfidence* in their actions.

Heroes and Leaders

Within the sample, there are twenty-four organisations that present themselves as heroic figures or leaders in the field they operate. While plenty of the organisations in the sample engage in some self-promotion of their leadership and heroism, these twenty-four organisations were more explicit in creating this heroic narrative. Interestingly, from their survey results, there are some patterns that arise within this group. Firstly, fourteen participants responded that paid staff members (58.33%) were their most important participants, while only three participants responded with volunteers (12.50%).

Additionally, only four organisations responded that they had no paid staff members

(16.67%). This suggests that within these organisations there is a stronger emphasis on paid staff and a relatively low emphasis on volunteer importance. Their self-presentation as heroic might be motivated by the need to keep paid staff members by instilling a sense of pride in the staff. In regards to the way these organisations actually present themselves as heroes and leaders, some interesting patterns arise within their discourses.

Participant 4, a migratory bird rescue and stewardship organisation, is cast in a heroic role by presenting itself as “the first organization in the world to address the issue of birds in collisions with buildings.” Further, they label actions as “Leading-edge Bird Protection Programs and Policies” and their efforts are described as inspiring “bird lovers to action within our community and also in other cities across North America and around the world.” In this sense, Participant 4 presents itself as a foundational hero; it is the first, the leader, the beginning of a potentially global movement that focuses on the safety of migratory birds. This discourse frames organisation as a heroic figure in its actions and in the way it inspires others to do the same. As a hero and leader in bird rescue and stewardship, they are actively promoting themselves to publics, likely as a means to enhance the legitimacy of their public image.

Participants 9 and 32 present themselves as heroic figures in the field of environmental law and justice. Their missions are to represent people in court in environmental cases. Both cast themselves as heroes in their narrative:

In partnership with our clients, we launch ground-breaking lawsuits that level the playing field so industry interests can't trump those of people and the planet. We achieve legal precedents that keep harmful substances out of the environment, protect wilderness and wildlife and take aim at climate change.

When our lawyers have done everything they can do with the legal tools they have, we go further, leveraging our expertise to push for stronger laws.

Together, we are leading the fight for a brighter environmental future.
(Participant 9)

[A] specialty community legal clinic providing services to low income individuals and disadvantaged communities across Ontario in environmental law matters (Participant 32)

To advocate for comprehensive laws, standards and policies that will protect and enhance public health and environmental quality in Ontario and throughout Canada (Participant 32)

Both present themselves as working on behalf of underprivileged, underrepresented citizens, fighting for their environmental rights, situating themselves as heroes in environmental battles. Participant 9 is especially persuasive in this regard, with their emphasis on big industry being against the powerless “people and the planet” in a classic David vs. Goliath narrative. By doing this, Participant 9 is implied to be on the side of the underdog, thereby becoming a hero of the powerless.

Participant 49 cast themselves a heroic role by claiming that they are “the only watershed-wide organization dedicated solely to the needs of community-based groups and actions working to protect and restore the Great Lakes and water resources”. This language adds impetus to their actions and potentially persuades audiences to regard them as one of the only entities fixing past and preventing future environmental destruction. Similarly, Participant 55 claims they drive “transformative change in the absence of true leadership by governments”. The narrative presented on both of these organisations’ websites sets them up as unique heroes, providing action in a space that is devoid of action without their presence. This type of narrative implies that their existence in the Toronto scene is imperative if any sort of environmental action is to take place; without these organisations, it is implied that nothing will change.

Some organisations will additionally imply their leadership in the Toronto scene on their specific actions. For instance, Participant 37 frames themselves as the “main provider of fresh food to people in Toronto... [Participant 37] is the largest food rescue program in Canada”? Participant 57 similarly emphasize the size and scope of their organization: “the largest environmental event in the world. More than six million Canadians—including nearly every school-aged child—participate”. These organisations are self-described leaders and heroes in their respective activities and exhibit great pride in their actions.

Overall, this heroic/leadership framing emphasizes organisations’ importance and necessity in their respective fights for environmental issues. While performing actions, these organisations are inclined to communicate the great importance of these actions to the public. This is evident in many organisations and Appendix E presents several more quotes exhibiting this heroic, leadership framing.

This kind of discursive framing allows organisations to present themselves as heroes of the environmental movement in their specific activities. They make themselves out to be the primary actors in creating environmental change through this self-promotion, which establishes them as legitimate environmental actors working on behalf of the public. Such framing puts the power for environmental change within the hands of these organisations, without critical reflection on the need for more actors than themselves.

Hubris and Overconfidence

Some organisations hubristically present their actions as perfect solutions to various environmental issues. They tend to lack a sense of humility or criticality towards those actions, which allows them to communicate them as almost infallible. This section presents organisations in the sample that exhibit overconfidence of their abilities to enact

large-scale changes in the environmental sphere. This is classified as hubris, which also encompasses the way organisations fetishize and overhype their actions or services by uncritically suggesting that they solve large environmental problems.

There are nineteen organisations in the sample that exhibit this false confidence and overhype of actions. Their survey responses are relatively similar to those of the hero/leader pride organisations above. These organisations placed a great emphasis on the importance of paid staff (57.89%) compared to volunteers (10.53%). Additionally, all nineteen of these organisations reported at least one paid staff member as there were no organisations reporting no paid staff. Once again, this suggests that these nineteen organisations have reason to convince the public of the importance of their actions given their need for funding and vested interest to keep their paid staff employed.

The discourses of these organisations reveal several themes. Participant 2, for instance, sells software that is presented as being able to “accurately measure and manage social and environmental impact” in their efforts to “make change happen.” Their hubris is exemplified by their explanation that the “evidence-based, motivating, and community-oriented rewards system spreads Good habits exponentially.” While their software primarily encourages small environmental actions, they give all of the power to the software to create these environmental changes; the software is imbued with a power to generate social change, while being relatively inconsequential in practice. In this sense, Participant 2 overhypes the impact of their software product and by extension, their actions in creating environmental change.

Participant 38, an organisation that finances “entrepreneurs whose product or service can significantly cut emissions in Toronto”, is overconfident in the products and

activities they finance, and in their ability to effect environmental change through capital investment. Claiming that “impact investments generate a measurable, beneficial environmental impact”, their hubris is the overconfidence in market and economic processes to generate environmentally friendly products. Both Participant 2 and Participant 38 promote the incredible power of their actions to create social and environmental change. In reality, their actions are only small parts of the whole picture of social change, but the discourse paints them as the most important element, which reflects their overconfidence, self-promotion, overhyping of their actions, and hubris.

Additionally, hubris is seen in the way some organisations express that their actions, no matter how large or small, will create vast environmental changes. For instance, Participant 31 communicates about their work with other actors in Toronto:

We tackle the most critical environmental and health issues of the day: clean air and climate change.
We get commitments. We get commitments that achieve measureable progress.

They uncritically place great confidence in their ability to get people to commit to contributing to reducing emissions and confidence in those commitments following through. Participant 31 assumes that “measurable” progress is the best way to understand environmental action. Focusing only on those actions that can be measured or understood quantitatively misses the underlying features of consumer capitalist society that cause environmental problems in the first place. Measurable progress actions Participant 31 promote include “step-by-step actions to reduce home energy use and vehicle use by 20%” and “raise awareness of the economic and social impacts of unnecessary vehicle idling”. However, placing all of their efforts into various measurable progress areas precludes qualitative, socio-cultural elements of changing the way society thinks and acts towards

nature in general. Hence, their overconfidence or hubris lies in the way they give great power to both the commitments and measurable progress areas they promote, while lacking any criticality towards whether commitments will last or whether there are other, qualitative elements to changing society's attitude towards nature. Participant 44 also seems excessively confident or hubristic in their presentation of their actions and their effects:

By allowing households to benchmark and compare their carbon footprint to other households at the neighbourhood and city-level, and to municipal reduction targets, Project Neutral (PN) is creating a culture of awareness around greenhouse gas emissions and connecting individuals to actions.

Their confidence in the benchmark program and enabling comparison between neighbours becomes hubristic when they point to the supposed "culture of awareness" they are creating through this relatively small action.

In the case of both of these organisations, they frame their actions overconfidently and uncritically. By explaining their actions this way, these organisations appear to define themselves as having genius or truly innovating in the environmental movement. Their actions are presented as best solutions to environmental issues, while the actions may not be quite so comprehensive or infallible. Unfortunately, this reflects a false confidence and hubris since their actions are only a small part of the overall social changes that are required for creating ecologically sound societies. While having confidence in one's actions is not necessarily bad, doing so without a sense of criticality or reference to the need for other, large-scale actions precludes thought about action outside those performed by the organisations themselves.

Discussion

The organisations presented above tend to represent themselves as heroes and leaders in the fight for environmental issues and present their issues with great overconfidence such that it borders on hubris. This corresponds to the sin of pride, which is mobilized in organisations' discourses most likely in order to add to their perceived importance and legitimacy as environmental actors. By communicating this pride, ascribing infallibility to their actions, organisations make themselves appear as heroic figures and innovators in the environmental sphere, thereby legitimising their existence and garnering public respect.

Pride and self-promotion is likely a product of the biases of consumer capitalist promotional culture. With so many environmental organisations crowding the Toronto scene, organisations are likely compelled to ensure that they stand out. Adopting a discourse that situates them in the heroic leadership position, or describing their actions as impactful despite their relatively small effect, emboldens organisations' public images. By emphasising their leadership capability and the powerful change capacities of their actions they essentially promote themselves as a brand. There appears to be a general focus on enhancing public image, likely because of the need for fundability and participation of members, volunteers, and attracting good staff members.

Some existing research regarding mission statements, organisation performance and employee retention is potentially insightful in explaining these results. McDonald, who writes on the importance of mission statements in non-profit organisations, suggests that "a clear, motivating mission can help guide a nonprofit organization in its efforts to be innovative" thereby being generally more "efficient and/or effective" (McDonald, 2007, p.

278). It has also been shown that employees in non-profits are more motivated by the missions and a chance to do “good” than by salary or benefits (Mann, 2006, p. 40). With these in mind, it is possible that the manifestation of pride in the discourse of these organisations’ websites is self-serving. Their pride could be mobilised as a source of motivation and persuasion for volunteers and staff members; the more important one’s actions feel within an organisation, the more likely one will be continually satisfied by performing those actions.

While pride may indeed be important for public relations or organisations’ recruitment of participants, it also presents some potential problems for the environmental movement and the Toronto community of organisations. Firstly, an organisation presenting its actions uncritically as being an ideal solution to environmental crises (such as investment in entrepreneurs, or behaviour monitoring software) can divert public opinion away from the larger scale of environmental problems. For instance, Participant 38’s emphasis on investing in environmentally friendly products fetishizes the process of investment as a tool for social change. Their focus on investing leaves little room for being critical of the overall bias of consumer culture towards over-consumption and environmentally unfriendly products and industries. It also upholds the *free market* ideals of competition and makes it seem as though economic means of change, such as investing in *green* entrepreneurs, are the only and most important avenues. This is a kind of hubris that is worrisome because it is unlikely that simply investing in a single product or idea will cause widespread environmental change, but Participant 38 presents their activities with great pride and infallibility.

Another reason that pride becomes a deadly sin of the environmental organisations is how it might establish competitive barriers between environmental organisations. With so many organisations claiming to be heroes in the environmental fight, each must communicate that they are the best at what they do. As each claims to be the most important organisation in the Toronto environmental scene, the organisations are in an implied competition for supremacy in gathering participants, funding, and public acceptance. Competition amongst organisations is counterproductive to the environmental movement. Self-exaltation and pride are beneficial for individual organisations achieving their own goals, but might preclude cooperation between organisations working towards similar ends.

Blame for this problem cannot simply be laid on the environmental organisations, as they must operate in a society biased towards competition. Indeed, some non-profit sector theorists even advocate today for “sector bending” or the adoption of a “market discipline” amongst non-profits (Dees and Anderson, 2003, p. 16). The belief is that this could increase accountability, benefit resource allocation, and inspire innovation. However, the competition bias of market logic could potentially turn the non-profit sphere into an even more competitive space, inspiring larger, more comprehensive public relations campaigns and exhibition of pride. If we want to see a more cooperative environmental organisation community, such a path should be avoided and pride should instead take the form of pride of the earth and of communities instead of heroic organisations and entities. If environmental organisations wish to inspire real change, they should begin by inspiring public pride and valuation towards the ecological systems that sustain all life on the planet rather than exhibiting self-pride and self-promotion.

Organisations thus appear to be influenced by the individualisation and mechanisation biases of consumer capitalism as Innis discussed. Those presented in this chapter exhibit a public image that attempts to implicitly set themselves above other organisations working towards similar goals and/or present their actions as infallible or perfect. Organisations, competing for funding, participation, and public acceptance, attempt to stand out amongst the rest, much like companies creating brands and public images for consumers to recognise. Individualised and divided, organisations compete amongst each other, preventing cooperation and ensuring that only the loudest, proudest, and most successful voices are heard on a wide scale. This presents an obstacle for environmental organisations that do not have the resources or means of amplification, while empowering those who already have the resources and voices to drown out alternative, marginal voices.

Organisations exhibiting pride in themselves and their actions are not necessarily doing so for nefarious ends. However when this pride is mobilised in such a self-interested, self-sustaining way, it becomes problematic for cohesion between organisations working towards similar goals. They enshrine themselves as heroes and leaders, and portray their actions with such hubris that they neglect the need for cohesion and widespread action. Such pride is a sin in the environmental organisation community because of its basis in the competitive bias of consumer capitalism and its contribution to the mechanisation and division of the environmental organisation community.

Incentivisation and Recognised Environmental Actions

Several Toronto-based environmental organisations perform actions that are geared towards incentivising and recognising certain actors for performance of environmental actions. This is reflected in environmental organisations that incite competition, publicly recognise and reward individuals for their environmentally friendly actions, and exploit incentivisation of environmental behaviours. Operating on a behaviourist, utilitarian logic of reinforcement, the Toronto-based organisations that succumb to this contribute to the mechanisation and individualisation of environmental action. As seen below, these organisations tend to facilitate competitions, comparison to neighbours and peers, and rewards for performing environmental behaviours.

Ten participants communicated actions of incentivisation and recognition of environmental behaviours. From their survey results, there is a tendency towards having paid staff with only one participant reporting no paid staff and five participants reporting paid staff as the most important members of their organisations (50%). Additionally, only one participant had a local focus (10%), while five participants reported provincial focus (50%), three reporting national focus (30%) and one reporting international focus (10%). Additionally, the majority of these participants report “community-based green initiatives” (70%) as a method they utilise to achieve their goals. Thus, while these ten organisations are very likely to perform community-based initiatives, they are not necessarily focused on the local scale, suggesting that they are relatively distanced from the initiatives they facilitate. Refer to Appendix G for quotes and examples of how this discourse is employed.

Within these organisations’ discourses, incentivisation and recognition are employed in several different ways. Participant 14 runs a campaign that enables companies

to compete to be the most energy efficient in what they call a “race to reduce”. The campaign is presented as:

a friendly corporate challenge that represents unprecedented collaboration between office building landlords and tenants to encourage smart energy use. It encourages behavioral and positive team-building amongst landlords, tenants and their employees.

To incentivise this behaviour Participant 14 “recognizes participants with annual awards celebrating successes of landlords and tenants.” The campaign thereby enables corporate actors in Toronto to compete for public recognition of their “green” behaviours. This redefines environmental actions as important only insofar as they result in recognition of the successes of the winner. As a figurative badge of honour, this recognition inherently labels and celebrates winners as being environmentally conscious, though in a very narrow and relatively inconsequential way; simply being a more energy efficient tenant or landlord does not necessarily mean a company’s actions are entirely ecologically friendly. The recognised actions are relatively simple and inconsequential compared to the vast social changes needed to counteract environmental crises. The annual awards also work to engender envy amongst other groups to work harder and compete to be the winner in following years.

Participant 22 similarly utilises recognition with schools with its certification program. The program is framed as allowing schools “to be recognized and celebrated by your school community, board, parents, and peers for achievement in environmental education and action.” Schools are thereby incentivised with the recognition of others in the community and those that are uncertified are implicitly shamed for not performing the environmental actions of certified schools. Meanwhile, the certifiable actions are relatively inconsequential, such as a few minor changes to the efficiency practices and curricula, and

schools are encouraged to “start small and work at their own pace.” As such, certification is not only something the organisation holds over the heads of schools, but the actual actions involved in the certification process are not incredibly difficult for school, making it seem a little less prestigious than Participant 22 makes it out to be.

Recognition is also utilised to award and celebrate organisations’ memberships and individuals. For instance, Participant 61 presents awards because they “provide an important opportunity to recognize individual and group efforts, as well as to celebrate the many and varied expressions of outdoor education within our organization and the province of Ontario”. Awarding recognition essentially works as celebration of Participant 61’s membership. Awards are used to entice members to remain part of the organisation and to celebrate the ideals of the organisation itself. In this case, the awards can be seen as a tool for retaining membership and keeping members engaged in the organisational discourse aimed at them. This is further evidenced by the fact that Participant 61 is mostly reliant upon Membership/Subscription Fees according to the survey data.

Participant 44 employs recognition by enabling individual households to decrease their environmental impact and strive for “carbon neutrality” by monitoring and comparing themselves to their neighbours:

Compare Yourself to Your Neighbours. A dynamic interface shows residents which of their behaviours and actions are producing the most greenhouse gas emissions. As part of our feedback strategy, PN uses a community based social marketing approach to create “norms” (neighbourhood averages). Households can compare themselves to similar households in their neighbourhood, as well as longer-term municipal reduction targets

Individual households are able to make decisions on how best to achieve carbon neutrality by comparing themselves to their neighbours through an impersonal presentation of average numbers. Neighbours are enticed to envy the environmental actions of

unidentified others in their community and implicitly shame or look down on those who bring down the average numbers. It also serves as a way for those who do better than the averages to feel certain of their environmental impact and also act as a beacon for others in the neighbourhood to envy. Once a household's impact is better than average, they may feel a sense of self-satisfaction and self-recognition for their individual environmental action, but this is limited to those environmental impacts measured by Participant 44's conception of household energy efficiency.

Incentivisation is manifest in environmental organisations that entice action through temptation or self-promotion and reward for individuals in the public. Participant 2, a for-profit organisation, builds software and apps to reward environmental behaviours and lifestyles with a social currency that people can exchange for products and things:

[Participant 2 supplies] software solution that measures and analyzes people's actions across multiple engagements simultaneously for the purpose of incentivizing GOOD behaviour. It also powers GOODcoins, a social currency.

Behaviours are monitored and measured, earning users credits to buy products and services in the real world. Environmental behaviour, in this regard, is framed as something to be rewarded with material goods. This theme is further seen in Participant 25's activities. As a "children's conservation" group, Participant 25 allows kids to sign up online, complete "missions" and receive awards online:

Missions are cool activities and challenges that you and your family can do together to help protect animals, their homes and the environment. When you accept your mission, you'll receive a special Brief to help get you started. Once your mission is complete, you'll earn an online badge on your Achievement Wall.

The web platform enables kids to show off their environmental conservation actions in an online environment to their friends and others using the website. It entices kids to perform

environmental behaviours, but utilises reinforcement of badges and achievements to get their attention. Additionally, children are encouraged and recognised for running individual campaigns to raise funds for an animal of their choice on behalf of Participant 25.

Participant 57 similarly incentivises environmental behaviours with online recognition: “Commit to green acts, share your profile and achievements, and be recognized for making good green choices”. Users are recognised for the number of times they perform activities like walking, cycling, and taking the train, each of which are sponsored by companies. Similar to Participant 2 and 25, Participant 57 also instils the idea that environmental behaviours must be recognized and rewarded. Participation is incentivised such that people can appear more environmentally conscious as individuals.

Discussion

While the organisations discussed in this chapter do not represent a huge portion of the sample, the themes of incentivisation and recognition are interesting nonetheless. Incentivisation is employed in ways to reward people for environmental behaviours or award various actors with recognition for green behaviours. This kind of discourse, however useful it might be to get people to perform actions, tends to make environmental action seem like something that should only be performed if it is incentivised. Ultimately, this reflects the cardinal sins of envy and lust; these organisations entice people to envy their neighbours for their actions and lust after fame and reward for their environmental behaviours. This goes against any belief that environmental actions should be performed for the sake of ecosystems and for the sake of nature and human collective survival. Environmental actions should ideally be performed not because one is looking for reward

or recognition, but because of the inherent ecological benefits and moral obligation to protect ecosystems and lives.

Another problem arises in the fact that most of these organisations incentivise and recognise actions that tend to be highly quantitative, measurable, and individualised. As such, these organisations are caught up within the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge bias towards quantitative value and mechanisation. Participant 14 provides a spreadsheet for individual participants to measure their energy efficiency and achieve reductions by making small changes to what lights are on in the office or how many appliances are plugged in. Participant 44 utilises quantitative averages of neighbourhood energy consumption and individual assessments for people to figure out how to make energy reductions. Participant 22 certifies schools based on whether they earn enough points in various environmental categories. Participant 2 collects quantitative data on users' smartphones and from their energy consumption to distribute points for their accomplishments. Additionally, Participant 57 counts individual environmental actions reported by users. Indeed, these organisations focus on promoting actions that are measurable and individualised. The issue with this trend is the way these measurable actions amount to relatively simple actions that can easily be tracked and counted in order to give one a score. Given that these incentivised and recognised actions are frequently measured through quantitative means through various interfaces, this might point to a future of the gamification of environmentalism.

Gamification is a term that has recently been utilized in the realm of education and marketing. Following a definition provided by Simões et al. (2013), gamification is the application of "elements associated with video games (game mechanics and game

dynamics) in non-game applications. It aims to increase people's engagement and to promote certain behaviors" (Simões et al., 2013, p. 346). It pertains to harnessing the stimulating elements of video games (i.e. utilitarian behaviourist mechanisms of reward) to create motivation for behaviour in non-game settings. By turning environmental action into behaviours or challenges with the promise recognition, these organisations employ various game mechanics to inspire behaviours. It promotes the idea that environmental behaviours are good for the selfish individual not inherently good and communally responsible.

Incentivising and recognising achievements are reflections of biases of consumer capitalism. The perspective that people will only perform actions towards a compensatory goal (e.g. wage, reward, food, etc.) fits within the capitalist bias towards self-interest. Additionally, striving for recognition of environmental actions reflects the consumer's drive to construct their identity through individual actions and responsibilities, as Bauman (2000) posits. Ultimately, this theme was not overstated in the Toronto sphere, but given the proliferation of social media technologies and monitoring applications on smart devices, this type of gamified environmentalism could become more commonplace in the future.

Recognition also serves as public relations and marketing tools for those recognised. Indeed, it is unsurprising that Participant 40, a green marketing for-profit company, falls into this category, presenting awards to "honour the top corporate Canadians dedicated to creating sustainable and ethical practice in business." In a sense, recognition can become a label that individuals and companies add to their public image, allowing them to identify as environmentally responsible. This is problematic when combined with the fact that most actions that individuals and companies are recognised for are relatively inconsequential to

the overall effort to solve environmental crises. Recognition is highly symbolic and self-serving for the recognised party.

Of course, being recognised or rewarded for one's environmental actions is not inherently bad. It becomes a sin for environmental organisations when considered within the context of consumer capitalist society. How can rewarded and recognised environmental behaviour develop into an ecological ethic or morality? What happens when the incentive disappears? Do environmental behaviours disappear as well? They are inherently immediate, present-minded, shortsighted solutions that focus on immediate gratification of individual actors instead of finding ways to escape the bias towards the present and promote ecological consciousness. As such, incentivisation and recognition cannot be the only actions environmental organisations perform and promote.

Promotion of Easy and Passive Actions

While much of the discussion thus far has focused organisations' actions, this section relates to the types of environmental actions organisations advocate for people to take. This unearths a final problematic theme arising in the way organisations promote actions for people to take that are framed as easy and simple, or tend to be relatively passive in character.

Interestingly, there are not a lot of organisations in the sample that advocate for actions that people or publics can take. Most encouraged actions are framed as either donating money to the organisation or volunteering one's time to help run events, perform tasks, assist with fundraising, and other organisational needs. These actions are primarily beneficial to the organisations and indirectly so to the environment. However, the following focuses on those that advocate for other actions people can take that are not directly beneficial to the organisations themselves; that is, those organisations that present actions for people in their daily lives, outside the purview of the organisations themselves. These actions tend to be framed as being easy to do, or, in some cases, "fun." Others advocate for menial, individualistic lifestyle changes that are relatively passive. Within the sample, there are seventeen participants that fall into this category (refer to Appendix H for a list of quotes exemplifying this).

First, several organisations frame individual environmental actions as something that is, or should be, very easy for anyone to perform. For instance, Participant 2 presents their software rewards program as follows:

HOW DOES IT WORK?

Easy. [Our program] rewards people like you for making measurable change in your everyday life.

In turn, you inspire others around you. They jump on the bandwagon. Before you know it, we're all in it together, making good changes and changing the world. It's not idealistic; it's happening. Right now.

Not only is it easy for anyone to participate, this action will supposedly inspire others to do the same. Contrary to their statement above, such a belief is highly idealistic; to believe that participating in a behavioural rewards program can change the world makes a lot of egregious assumptions that neglect social inequalities, access to technologies, and technological literacy. This smacks of marketing and advertising rhetoric and a kind of blind faith placed in the power of their innovation to change the world. Of course, it must be mentioned that Participant 2 is a for-profit company, so this marketing and advertising speak makes some sense. However, as outlined below, they are hardly alone in employing this discourse.

Other organisations adopt a similar language of easiness of actions. Participant 14 describes one of their programs as “easy to join and simple to manage”. Participant 22 entices schools to participate in their certification program by encouraging “schools to start small and work at their own pace”, thereby making it easier for more schools to act. Similarly, Participant 72, encouraging a conserver lifestyle suggests, “It's not as hard as you think. You don't have to be perfect, just better. You get to choose conserver solutions that make sense for you.” Participant 62 frames actions people can take as easy and effective: “Idling vehicles is the #1 most common forms of ‘unnecessary air pollution’ that affects your community and our family. It is also one of the easiest to stop.”

Language framing environmental actions as easy could be a strategy to attract more people to perform the actions they promote. The emphasis is on getting more people to participate in these actions, which is arguably much easier to sell if the audience believes

that the environmental actions required are not difficult. Advocating for difficult actions is counterproductive for organisations as this could dissuade many individuals from participating and therefore less visibility for the organisation. As such, easy actions could be seen as a way for organisations to get more people to perform actions, menial though they may be.

Other actions are framed as simple behaviour and lifestyle changes. For instance, Participant 4 advocates for people to take individual action by turning out their lights, which they say “saves birds, energy and money, and reduces light pollution and CO2 emissions. These direct benefits result in a healthier environment for both humans and wildlife.” Easy actions are thereby made out to be hugely and directly beneficial for the humans and wildlife. Simple actions are thus rebranded and reified, giving a sense that they are actually more powerful, meaningful, and effecting greater environmental benefits than one would expect. This disguises the fact that these individual actions are relatively innocuous to the root problems of urban hyper-development causing migratory bird deaths. Similarly, Participant 66 frames environmental actions as choosing “a healthier, greener, more compassionate lifestyle through plant-based eating.” The implication is that the simple act of individually adopting a vegetarian lifestyle will be beneficial for the environment and protecting animals. Meanwhile, this action is also relatively menial and meaningless in the face of widespread industrial farming, animal cruelty, and increasing global meat consumption.

There are also several organisations that advocate for simple actions of sharing individual opinions by contacting government representatives, distributing pamphlets and emails to acquaintances, and passively consuming informational media, such as

documentary films. For instance, Participant 19 asks people to take action by “contacting Bill Mauro, the Ontario Minister of Natural Resources, to urge him to phase out logging in Algonquin.” Clicking on a link brings site visitors to a page with a pre-typed email message asking them to simply type their email address into a bar and press send. This is about as easy and passive as political actions can get. Participant 60 advocates for similar actions, but gives greater choice to the individual actors:

Help [Participant 60] to knock out coal, reduce Ontario's climate impact and clear our air. Whether it is writing a letter to the premier, distributing pamphlets to your friends or neighbours, finding out what you can do to reduce electricity use or volunteering with the [Participant 60], your efforts can have a big impact.

These actions are framed as lifestyle changes (e.g. reducing electricity), sharing information supplied by Participant 60 with friends and neighbours, and writing letters to government officials. Aside from these relatively small actions, the more meaningful actions remain within the purview of the organization itself. Additionally, Participant 28 and Participant 68 ask people to act by viewing films related to environmental issues, and Participant 39 advocates primarily for people to watch, listen, and distribute the media content they produce. The passive act of consuming information does not necessarily inspire active discussion between parties, but instead one-way communication between the organisations and individual audience members. However, these organisations seem to conflate the act of consuming information as akin to taking action on issues.

Discussion

The actions presented in this section tend to be simple and quite individualised. Asking individuals to spread information, change their behaviours and lifestyles, or simply becoming aware and listening to what the organization has to say are some of the actions

organisations advocate for publics to perform. Additionally, when the actions are framed as “easy” or “simple” the organisations appear to be selling their solution as if it is a product or commodity. These organisations shy away from telling people to take on large-scale, difficult actions and instead enable people to take actions that are easy to do. These organisations do not engender a sense of the difficult actions that individuals, together as a society, will need to undertake to prevent future ecological catastrophe.

As mentioned at the outset of this section, the majority of environmental actions advocated by almost all organisations for people to take are framed as donating funds, volunteering for the organisation, or participating in events and demonstrations facilitated by the organisation. What are people supposed to do in the absence of environmental organisations? Are publics supposed to just sit idly by and wait for direction from environmental organisations? Environmental organisations appear less interested in mobilizing public actions towards environmental changes as they are promoting their own actions and enabling people to act towards individual ends. Environmental organisations have a monopoly on the meaningful actions for environmental change, while actions people can take in their daily lives are either simple or primarily beneficial to the organisations. Ultimately, in their emphasis on passivity and ease, the organisations outlined in this chapter might unintentionally dissuade people from participating in larger actions for environmental ends.

Promoting difficult changes to the status quo as solutions to environmental crises could be scary or unfathomable to many people. Thus, it is also possible that organisations frame the issues as “easy” in order to get more people to be more environmentally friendly, including such menial tasks as turning out a light or recycling. As discussed in prior

chapters, organisations are biased towards retaining their audiences, influencing them to adapt their messaging to suit their audiences' interests. As such, it is possible that they are simply advocating for individualistic, simple solutions to reach the busy 21st century consumer who already has very little time outside of work and consumption. This means that environmental organisations are likely influenced by the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge. This is also supported by the fact that the simplicity of actions outlined in this chapter presents no challenge to the dominant biases of consumer culture.

This leaves a large void that environmental organisations mostly cannot fill. Of course, there are some organisations that inspire hope in the environmental organisation community for providing avenues for public action. However, the main finding of this chapter is that organisations tend not to advocate for large-scale action on environmental issues unless it is within the confines of the organisation itself. What this means for the citizens of Toronto is that environmental action is only open to those able to change their lifestyles by the methods promoted by organisations, or those that have time to participate in the environmental organisations' actions. Additionally, action against the larger social issues that need to be addressed for environmental changes to occur, tend to be ignored.

The Virtuous Few

This last short analysis section focuses on some of the ways that organisations in Toronto have escaped committing one or more of the above sins of environmental organisations. These organisations provide more meaningful opportunities for people to participate. They tend avoid exclusivity based on spatial, ideological, or special interests. Additionally, they tend to advocate for the involvement of people and publics in activities and discussions to determine the organisations' directions and projects. They also tend to be humble and aware of the relatively small impact of their actions; some recognize that they are individual actors in a movement that is bigger than their individual interests.

First, the virtuous organisations attempt to engage with different communities to incorporate new and different voices into the environmental movement. Participant 36 presents themselves as follows:

Our purpose is to engage individuals from diverse communities who are economically and socially disenfranchised, particularly youth, children, seniors and women. The objective is to support their engagement process and to foster a positive leadership role in implementing their own solutions.

Participant 36 organises outdoor activities and training sessions to allow those who are “deprived of engaging in low impact outdoor recreational activities” to partake and learn about their environment and how to develop sustainable lifestyles. While Participant 36 does not necessarily challenge the status quo and tend promote “practical, realistic and measurable options”, their encouragement and enabling of underprivileged and under-represented communities to participate is important for the democratisation of the environmental movement and debate.

Participant 64 adopts a similar perspective, focusing specifically on a “diverse and high needs area” in downtown Toronto. They thus promote accessibility of environmental

actions and genuinely engage the members of the community in various ways. They run community programming in “Urban Agriculture,” “Education” (“Provide people with skills on how to improve, protect and preserve the environment”), and “Community Engagement”. While some of the organisations discussed throughout the above critique have emphasised enabling and building the capacities of communities, Participant 64 matches this discourse with its actions. For instance, they organise community potluck dinners, involve community members in urban garden management, and teach underprivileged people how best to take action on environmental issues. This narrow, community focus potentially qualifies them for the sin of self-indulgence, however their intentions are not entirely individualistic, but instead driven by a sense of justice and inclusivity. They appear to operate on a more genuine sense of community and democratic justice by reaching out to under-represented communities, thereby expanding environmental participation.

There are also virtuous organisations in the sample that enable participants to decide the direction of the actions taken by the organisation. Participant 42 frames themselves in this distinctly democratic frame:

[Participant 42 is] a grassroots organization, one where everyone in the organization had a say as to the direction and initiatives of the organization. We decided on a structure that allowed anyone to pursue the creation of initiatives or programs, with a focus on their long-term sustainability. Since our creation, thousands of volunteer hours have been dedicated to dozens of community initiatives created by our chapters.

The organisation does not dictate or control the initiatives that are performed, but instead allow any individual to “propose a program or initiative related to environmental sustainability or social justice.” Interestingly, this democratic structure and inclusivity of different perspectives is correlated to their critical and controversial perspective on the

roots of environmental issues: “Change that is needed is an uproot of the current system” (Participant 42). Participant 42 communicates their disdain with the current system and “promote the use of alternative economics in achieving our mission, including the gift and sharing economies, reusing, repairing and upcycling.” Operating on a discourse of social justice, inclusivity, and democratic, grassroots action, Participant 42 provides a space for empowerment and engagement.

Similarly, Participant 10 works “to promote anti-oppression politics, confront injustice, raise awareness about important issues and promote positive change”. It is also presented as “a bastion of creativity, passion and idealism.” With these focuses, they work to enable the development of activist mentalities and capacities:

Our main approach to activism is through a constantly evolving set of working groups and funded projects. These working groups consist of driven volunteers who are interested in one or many issues who then approach [Participant 10] for support.

Participant 10 thereby creates a supportive, democratic space that allows participants to choose the initiatives and actions they believe are most important. This has enabled the organisation to tackle a wide range of critical issues and make “links between issues including anti-racism, economic justice, the environment, Native rights, sexuality and women.” The organization provides the tools, resources, and support participants need to make their own campaigns and discussion groups to try to make changes in their communities and, ideally, wider scales. They communicate some of the initiatives participants have undertaken such as “community gardens”, rallies and events on York University campus. Participant 10 believes that their main route to change is not by winning campaigns but by ensuring that “each and every student involved would walk away having learned skills needed to be effective for social change.” In this sense, they are

humble about their actions and activities performed by participants. The goal is, instead, to indirectly extend social and environmental justice by training people to be agents of change in their communities.

Participant 42 and Participant 10 both focus primarily on the student community. However, both are conscious of this and communicate their intention to reach out to and engage larger communities. Participant 42 suggests that they work “on campuses and in local communities, in collaboration with others [to] design, plan, facilitate and operate initiatives and programs.” Similarly, Participant 10 extends invitations to “new students and community members to stop by the office any time and share ideas and energy.” While both are potentially narrowly focused on student communities, their inclusive discourse extends beyond the student community and into communities at large.

As already alluded to, many of the more virtuous organisations operate on a discourse of social justice and attempt to either act and/or advocate against the dominant social, cultural, and economic biases of consumer capitalist society. For instance, Participant 45 “seeks to engage with political, economic, social and technological factors in order to ensure that humanity leaves the world's remaining coal, oil, and natural gas reserves in the ground where they belong.” While narrowly acting on climate change issues, this organisation recognises and focuses on the roots of the issues within the structures of our unsustainable society. Participant 52 employs a distinctly political tone in setting anti-environmental government policies up as the adversary. In fact, the organisation was founded “in response to a number of problematic environmental initiatives that were being proposed by the provincial government under the leadership of Premier Mike Harris.” Both of these organisations also engage in public awareness raising

on these contentious issues through the use of demonstrations, rallies and other “creative means” to raise awareness. While these actions are, arguably, not the most effective at anything but promoting their ideologies about the environmental issues, they buck the tendency of organisations in Toronto to neglect the roots of environmental issues in their messaging. Participant 52 also exhibits humility in responding to an open-ended question on the survey: “Goals are rarely achieved, but the most successes have been through public outreach, media outreach and public pressure”. They understand that their goals are difficult to achieve but continue to strive for action and public mobilisation.

Discussion

The virtuous organisations discussed above are by no means perfect; they still tend to focus on narrow issues, symbolic actions, and emphasise action within the parameters set by the organisation. However, their democratic structures, incorporation of alternative views, enabling unrepresented and underprivileged people to act, and genuinely engaging with and interacting with communities directly, sets them apart from the other organisations within the sample.

The reason they can be considered virtuous is not necessarily because they entirely escape the sins and biases of environmental organisations, but because they present alternative organisational forms to which others can strive. In particular, the democratic structures of some virtuous organisations enables people to influence the decision-making processes that go on in organisations. While many of the organisations discussed in this study emphasise their role on behalf of communities, some of the virtuous organisations legitimise themselves by allowing the self-determination of participants and people who wish to get involved in the organisation.

Additionally, while many organisations focus their attention on empowering specific subsections of the population thereby excluding others, the virtuous organisations take including those excluded from the environmental debate as their starting points. They attempt to expand the scope environmentalism and environmental action to incorporate the voices and perspectives that are disregarded by other organisations. This tendency towards providing access increases the possibilities of alternative voices to enter into the environmental debate at various levels.

The humility communicated by some of these virtuous organisations suggests a criticality that is lost in the discourse of others. Being able to publicly critique the effectiveness of their actions, they appear open to changing their tactics instead of continually performing the same actions despite little social and environmental change. The virtuous organisations thereby exhibit preparedness for changing their emphases based on environmental issues that arise in the public debate. They are more attuned to the communicated needs of a constantly evolving group of participants. This is where democratic organisational structures become even more important. As participants can decide the directions and issues of the organisations, there is potential for these organisations to serve as a voice for the voiceless, giving underrepresented perspectives the microphone to be heard in public debates.

The prevalence of discourses that work towards social and environmental justice implicitly places these organisations against the dominant social order. While not necessarily perfect communication media, their incorporation of alternative views from ethnic communities, underprivileged communities, student communities, and the like enables alternative and critical viewpoints to arise. These organisations are ideally better

equipped for nurturing and empowering those voices and people, thereby potentially acting to strengthen the criticality of environmentalism in the future.

Final Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to discern the ways environmental organisations construct their meaning in the face of cultural and structural limitations and constraints, or biases. The above analyses were undertaken with the assumption that environmental organisations are communication media that influence and are influenced by the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge. The goal was to understand the extent to which organisations exhibit the biases of individualisation, mechanisation of knowledge, and the influential power of money, and how this is reflected in their structures and discourses.

The survey portion of this study yielded results showing that environmental organisations in the sample are individualised in terms of their issue focuses, with many attempting to define themselves uniquely beyond the confines of the survey. In conjunction with the fact that organisations largely reported adopting internet/media campaigns, community-based green initiatives, or both, it is possible that organisations make use of similar methods but are differentiated and fragmented by the issues they focus on. Additionally, organisations' prioritisation of specific communication media tended to relate to their emphasis on community-based initiatives, or working with communities. Those who emphasised face-to-face were more likely than those that prioritised website and email newsletter media to report community initiatives as a method of action. Face-to-face communication is thus likely utilised for the coordination of community-based initiatives and events rather than engaging people in oral discussion and debate on environmental issues. The results also indicated a swaying effect of funding priorities on the spatial focus and utilisation of confrontational methods. And lastly, organisations that place great importance on volunteer participants are also likely to adopt a local spatial focus,

indicating that organisations appeal to the local scale in order to attract volunteer participants, narrowing their focus towards the interests of the locale.

The discourse analysis of the sample environmental organisations' respective websites also yielded evidence of the individualisation of environmental organisations, self-promotion, and a general lack of comprehensive, socially critical, or controversial discourses within this community. The environmental organisations in the sample were largely guilty of committing sins of self-indulgence, funding sway, hubris, incentivisation/recognition, and promoting passive environmental actions, corresponding to the cardinal sins: Gluttony; Greed; Pride; Envy/Lust; and Sloth.

The analysis chapter revealed several themes specific to the environmental organisations in the Toronto scene. First, funding priorities are potentially related to the discursive appeals and actions organisations employ. Second, the majority of organisations communicate a highly narrow, individualised focus on either disseminating their ideologies or appealing to specific spatial and/or special interest groups' interests. Third, organisations strive to overhype themselves as heroes of the movement and the effectiveness of their actions. Fourth, some organisations communicate a discourse focused on incentivising and recognising environmental actions. And lastly, when organisations do promote actions and activities that people can perform individually to thwart environmental degradation, these tend to be framed as "easy", possibly in order to avoid scaring off their audiences.

A few organisations escaped the above sins, earning them the label of *virtuous*. These virtuous organisations tend to be more inclusive of underprivileged perspectives and groups, making up for a void left by the majority of environmental organisations. They

are also more democratically structured, enabling people to participate in determining the direction of the organisations. Their actions are thus partially the result of democratic decisions made by participants, unlike other organisations that claim to work on behalf of communities and tend not to include them in organisational decision-making processes. Additionally, the virtuous organisations were more critical, implicitly and explicitly, of the dominant social norms and structures, while also retaining some criticality towards their own actions. Indeed, these organisations, though few, are important for analysis in order to see how environmental organisations can improve to be better media of the environmental movement. However, even these virtuous organisations are unable to completely solve the environmental issues they work against, meaning that there is still plenty of room for improvement and self-reflection in order to find ways to actively work against the biases of consumer capitalism.

There were, however, some limitations confronted in this study. The survey portion had several design elements for future studies to avoid and was limited by time constraints. Firstly, because of a short research timeframe, a pilot survey was not conducted. As such, there were some ambiguous questions that required the deployment of a second follow up survey. Not all original participants responded to the follow up survey, thereby slightly decreasing participation numbers and the sample size. Additionally, some questions contained answer options that were regrettable. For instance, the inclusion of “Out-of-Pocket” funding in the question about organisations’ funding priorities served to confuse more than enlighten since the only organisation that chose this option was discerned to be a for-profit company that gains most of its funding from product sales. The participant did not respond to attempts to follow up and clarify this. It is highly recommended that future

studies conduct a pilot survey study to better understand the reliability and validity of the survey device.

Additionally, while the survey results were informative they might have been improved with more open-ended input from the respondents. Given more time to conduct research, an interview method would have been ideal for more detailed understanding of the structural characteristics of the organisations. As such, future studies could perform such interview methods to add to the results of this study and gather data on how participants of environmental organisations perceive the issues, methods of action, and influences of funding in more detail. This could provide greater insight into the attitudes and perspectives of the staff and/or volunteers of organisations.

The discourse analysis could also be improved in future studies. The initial goal was to utilise the survey results more thoroughly to structurally contextualise the organisations. While the question on funding was highly informative for the section on funding sway, the survey results were not as informative for other chapters. Basing the study design on this plan to combine content analysis with the survey results limited the sample size for the discourse analysis to only those who responded to the survey. Future studies could expand the sample size to incorporate all environmental organisations in Toronto by only performing a discourse analysis without a survey portion. Indeed, this could incorporate a larger sample including the organisations in Toronto that declined to participate in the study.

Additionally, future discourse analyses could benefit from a smaller sample size to allow for deeper understandings of individual organisations. While a larger sample size suited the needs of this preliminary exploration into the Toronto scene of environmental

organisations, the large number of organisations analysed, coupled with the significant amount of data on each website, made it particularly difficult to fully discern the discourses of each individual organisation. As such, future studies could perform a more in depth discourse analysis of a smaller subsection of organisations in the city to allow for greater depth and nuance, or even different results than those outlined above.

Limitations aside, some important conclusions about the environmental organisation community in Toronto come out of the research presented above. Overall, environmental organisations tend not to adopt critical discourses and are caught up within the biases of the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge. The organisation community exhibits the mechanisation of knowledge, focusing on individualised, narrow issues and interests of few communities. Indeed, it appears that a radical or critical environmental movement, advanced by environmental organisations, suffers or does not even exist in the face of the powerful biases of consumer capitalist society.

Innis's theories of the biases towards individualism, mechanisation, quantification, and economic knowledge are indeed reflected in the environmental organisations analysed in this study. Prior research has shown the influence of capitalist political economic structures on the environmental movement, but this study focuses specifically on the structures and understanding the discourses of environmental organisations. This study also sheds light on environmental organisations that partially counteract the biases of the consumer capitalist monopoly of knowledge. It is thus important to conclude this study by looking at the ways organisations can construct themselves to be media that challenge the roots of environmental crises.

Environmental organisations, if they are to be media of an environmental movement that tackles the root issues, need to develop biases of community thinking/orientation, opposing the overarching bias towards individualism, and adopt and aggressively promote the processes of democracy. Douglas Torgerson, who provides an insightful look at what he calls the “Green Public Sphere”, argues that the environmental debate currently favours those who are literate in political language and excludes marginal voices without political clout (Torgerson, 1997, p. 352). Additionally, the Canadian government has utilized anti-terrorism strategies to label radical environmentalists working to prevent oil pipelines as eco-terrorists or eco-extremists. McCarthy presents this in an article in *The Globe and Mail* showing how this can be seen as a governmental “effort to demonize the environmental movement and aboriginal groups” (McCarthy, 2012). Indeed, official democratic processes today do not include all voices and appear to actively exclude or silence opposing voices. The status quo, political social order tends to oppose the democratic process relating to environmental issues.

Ian Angus defines democracy in its purest sense as “self-government”; it is the ideal that decisions are made through a process of participation and public interchange amongst all who are affected by those decisions (Angus, 2001, p. 34). Democracy “develops a sense of shared identity among the citizens that entails a conception of universality that overrides, or coexists with, the differences between them” (Angus, 2001, p. 51). For societies to overcome crises and to adequately respond to changing social conditions, they must facilitate “the generation of alternative worldviews” and open, public communication of these alternative worldviews into the knowledge circulating throughout Western civilization (Brulle, 2000, p. 68). Social movements can and should enable increased public

participation and to kick-start the democratic process. They must adopt this role because of their special role to develop “alternative forms of identity formation that conflict with the dominant institutions and identities” which enables them to disrupt the reproduction of social crises and inequalities (Angus, 2001, p. 62).

Ideally a new, radical environmental movement will need to focus on developing democratic capacities and the performance of political action in a Green Public Sphere.

Torgerson defines the green public sphere (GPS) as follows:

The significance of the green public sphere resides not merely in reaching conclusions and resolving issues, but in sustaining a process of ecologically informed discourse that through its agenda, presuppositions, and cultural images challenges the monological administrative mind and the prevailing discourse of industrialism. (Torgerson, 1999, p. 20)

Instigating the development of a green public sphere that incorporates the views of all people in open, public debate, breaking down barriers of policy professionalism and inequality, is the path the environmental movement must hold as a goal. So many people, publics, and organisations focus on achieving results in the environment, towards reducing carbon emissions, divesting in fossil fuels, and picking up garbage; but the idealism of environmentalism needs aggressive reinvigoration to achieve the goal of democratic decision-making and participation in the performance of politics. This aggressive, antagonistic environmental movement will need to challenge “existing hegemonic field frame[s]” through acts of dissent, negation and contribute to defining a new “desired state in material reality” (Brulle, 2010, p. 87). The problem, today, is that for the most part, environmentalism is mostly “polite” towards the current system (Dowie, 1995, p. 8). But it is also punctuated by brief moments of public aggression and antagonism.

Social movement culture is currently characterised by momentary outbursts of what Bauman calls “explosive communities” or “*events* breaking the monotony of daily solitude [...to] let off the pent-up steam and allow revelers to better endure the routine” (Bauman, 2000, p. 201). That is, public life in consumer capitalist society, rife with individualistic tendencies, is occasionally punctuated by brief events that reveal contradictions in the system. These moments include: environmental catastrophes mobilising millions against industries and exposing the fragility of ecosystems and human lives; protests against civil rights abuses and police brutality; massive global marches in cities across the world for climate justice; and more recently, massive natural disasters linked to a rapidly changing climate that displace and agitate publics. All of these moments can break the routine, spark debate, and inspire brief public mobilisation.

In many ways, these are socio-technical controversies that pose health, environmental, and humanitarian risks. Michel Callon argues that these controversies expose the “overflows” of political, social, and/or technical actions, such that negative consequences of actions initially go unheard in the professional decision making sphere (Callon et al, 2001, p. 29). The exposure of these overflows in the form of controversies introduces the voices of those negatively affected by the overflows; for instance, when the Deepwater Horizon drilling rig set the public imagination aflame, a moment of outrage and critical debate was similarly ignited, into which new voices of the global public and the people living on the shore of the Gulf of Mexico entered and aired their grievances.

The entrance of these alternative voices creates what Callon et al. calls “Hybrid Forums”, or a dialogical space of laypersons and specialists that are necessarily forced to listen to one another and exchange knowledge (Callon et al., 2001, p. 36). It is in these

hybrid forums, which only develop amidst vast controversies, that citizens and specialists (scientists, politicians, academics) enter into debate originally dominated by the latter. Those affected in the controversies are finally listened to and have their interests incorporated into the decision-making processes. However, as we have seen with many disasters, controversies, and the resulting public mobilisations and debates remain mostly momentary, immediate and lacking the power to persist into the future.

One cannot deny the powerful, emotional feelings of outrage or empowerment that arise in these moments, but how can we make these moments linger and draw them out into long public discussions, engendering a green public sphere where the democratic process is practiced on ecological issues? The environmental movement is the primary medium that should engender such lingering. But the environmental organisations, the media of the environmental movement, are an entry point for citizens and activists to create material conditions for the communication of the green public sphere.

Environmental organisations must become more attuned to democratic process, inclusion, criticality, and confrontational antagonism. Unfortunately, as this study and others have shown, the movement and organisations have been influenced by consumer capitalist biases, which means new organisations must strive to overthrow this influence and unleash a new, powerful, and radical environmental movement.

This study has pointed to some ways that virtuous environmental organisations in the Toronto scene have tended towards democratic structures, inclusivity, and even face-to-face discussion and community engagement in many cases. These organisations offer models for new environmental organisations to learn from. Not only should democratic structures enable people to practice decision making processes within the organisations,

these organisations need to develop capacities for reaching out to other organisations, other individuals, and to the specialists to re-join the dispersed, individualised organisations and environmentalisms into debate and discussion. Environmental organisations should promote and help facilitate the democratic process; virtuous organisations have already begun to incorporate silenced voices, they now need to elevate those voices and mediate the meeting of alternative voices with the dominant monopoly of knowledge.

However, such elevation of alternative voices is nearly pointless when the majority of environmental organisations remain mechanised, fragmented, and narrowly focused on individualistic interests. Indeed, what is needed is a dual process of amplifying alternative voices and mediating them into the public debate. Essentially, environmentalism today must strive for intersectionality; organisations that develop to democratically represent alternative of their participants can serve this purpose.

In order to do this, new environmental organisations need to develop the capacities to latch onto the socio-technical controversies and explosive moments of public aggression, and find ways to make those feelings linger and grow. It is here that the environmental organization community in Toronto is lacking. There needs to be organisations that are specifically structured to foster public discussion and debates. These organisations need to operate within an ideology of democracy, justice, and intersectionality, striving to reach out to many different communities, facilitate the development of new organisations, and be able to constantly evolve to suit the needs of newly included voices.

The environmental organisations of tomorrow must become mediators of the specific interests of people to the overall interests of society. The lack of public debate,

discussion, and community needs to be remedied by media of the environmental movement. While no perfect model of this kind of organisation could be postulated within the context of this study, the virtuous organisations that operate on the ideologies of inclusivity and partial democracy provide evidence that this is potentially possible, though a highly difficult task.

References

- Angus, I. (2000). *Primal scenes of communication: Communication, consumerism, and social movements*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- . (2001). *Emergent publics: An essay on social movements and democracy*. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.
- Assadourian, E. (2013). Building an Environmental Movement. In The Worldwatch Institute (Eds.), *State of the World 2013: Is Sustainability Still Possible?* (pp. 292-303). Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Babe, R. (2010). *Cultural studies and political economy: Toward a new integration*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- . (2011). Innis, environment and new media. In E. Comor (Ed.), *Media, Structures and Power: The Robert E. Babe Collection* (pp. 314-335). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (1992). *The risk society: Toward a new modernity*. (M. Ritter, Trans.). London: Sage Publications.
- Brand, P. C., & Thomas, M.J. (2005). *Urban Environmentalism: Global Change and the Mediation of Local Conflict*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brulle, R. J. (2000) *Agency, democracy, and nature: The U.S. environmental movement from a critical theory perspective*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- . (2010). From environmental campaigns to advancing the public dialog: Environmental communication for civic engagement. *Environmental Communication*, 4(1), 82-98.
- Buell, F. (2003) *From apocalypse to way of life: Environmental crisis in the American century*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cable, S., & Benson, M. (1993). Acting Locally: Environmental Injustice and the Emergence of Grass-Roots Environmental Organizations. *Social Problems*, 40(4), 464-477.
- Callon, M., Lascoumes, P., & Barthe, Y. (2001). *Acting in an uncertain world: An essay on technical democracy*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Comor, E. (2001). Harold Innis and 'the bias of communication'. *Information, Communication & Society*, 4(2), 274-294.
- Cooper, A. F., & Fritz, J. (1992). Bringing the NGOs in: UNCED and Canada's international environmental policy. *International Journal*, 47(4), 796-817.
- Davies, R. (2015). Three provocations for civic crowdfunding. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18(3), 342-355.
- Dees, J. G., & Anderson, B. B. (2003). Sector-bending: Blurring lines between nonprofit and for-profit. *Society*, 40, 16-27.
- Del Rio, P. (2002). The external brain: Eco-cultural roots of distancing and mediation. *Culture and Psychology*, 8(2), 233-265.
- Di Norcia, V. (1990). Communication, time and power: An Innisian view. *Canadian Journal of Political Sciences*, 23(2), 335-357.
- Dowie, M. (1995). *Losing ground: American environmentalism at the close of the twentieth century*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Drieling, M., & Wolf, B. (2001). Environmental movement organizations and political strategy: Tactical conflicts over NAFTA. *Organization & Environment*, 14(1), 34-54.
- Ewen, S. (1996). *PR! A social history of spin*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

- Ferree, M. M., & Hess, B. B. (2000). *Controversy and coalition: The new feminist movement across three decades of change* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gough, J. (2010). Workers' strategies to secure jobs, their uses of scale, and competing economic moralities: Rethinking the 'geography of justice.' *Political Geography*, 29, 130-139.
- Greenberg, J., Knight, G., & Westersund, E. (2011). Spinning climate change: Corporate and NGO public relations strategies in Canada and the United States. *International Communications Gazette*, 73, 65-82.
- Hajer, M. A. (1995). *The politics of environmental discourse: Ecological modernization and the policy process*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Harvey, D. (1992). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Heidegger, M. (1977). The question concerning technology. In D. F. Krell (Ed.), *Martin Heidegger: Basic writings* (pp. 287-317). New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Hoffmeyer, J. (1996). *Signs of meaning in the universe*. (B. J. Haveland, Trans.). Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- . (2010). A biosemiotic approach to the question of meaning. *Zygon* 45(2), 367-390.
- Hymes, D. H. (1964). Introduction: Toward ethnographies of communication. In J. J. Gumpers, & D. H. Hymes (Eds.), *The ethnography of communication* (pp. 1-34). Menasha: American Anthropological Association.
- Innis, H. A. (2008). *The bias of communication* (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- . (1995). The role of the social scientist. In D. Drache (Ed.), *Staples, markets, and cultural change*. Montreal, QC: McGill Queens University Press.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2014). *Climate change 2014 synthesis report: Summary for policymakers*. Retrieved from <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
- Mann, G. A. (2006). A motive to serve: Public service motivation in human resource management and the role of PSM in the nonprofit sector. *Public Personnel Management* 35(1), 33-48.
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Markham, W. T., & Bonjean, C. M. (1995). Community orientations of higher-status women volunteers. *Social Forces*, 73(4), 1553-1571.
- McCarthy, Shawn. (2012, February 10). Ottawa's new anti-terrorism strategy lists eco-extremists as threats. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/ottawas-new-anti-terrorism-strategy-lists-eco-extremists-as-threats/article533522/>
- McDonald, R. E. (2007). An investigation of innovation in nonprofit organizations: The role of organizational mission. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(2), 256-281.
- McLuhan, M. (1994). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. (1st MIT Press ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ontario Trillium Foundation. (2015). Green People. Retrieved from <http://www.otf.ca/what-we-fund/action-areas/green-people>
- Potential Applicants – Environmental Damages Fund. (2013, July 8). Retrieved from <http://www.ec.gc.ca/edf-fde/default.asp?lang=En&n=C7C99D1F-1>

- Potential Applicants – EcoAction Community Funding Program. (2015, April 7). Retrieved from <http://www.ec.gc.ca/ecoaction/default.asp?lang=En&n=141750CF-1>
- Purcell, M. (2006). Urban democracy and the local trap. *Urban Studies*, 43(11), 1921-1941.
- Rucht, D. (1999). The impact of environmental movements in western societies. In M. Giugni, D. McAdam, & C. Tilly (Eds.), *How social movements matter* (pp. 204-224). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Serres, M. (1995). *The Natural Contract*. (E. MacArthur & W. Paulson, Trans.). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Silliman, J. (1999). Expanding civil society: Shrinking political spaces—The case of women's nongovernmental organizations. *Social Politics*, 6(1), 23-53.
- Simões, J., Redondo, R. D., & Vilas, A. F. (2013). A social gamification framework for a K-6 learning platform. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29, 345-353.
- Torgerson, D. (1999). *The promise of green politics: Environmentalism and the public sphere*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- . (1997). Policy professionalism and voices of dissent: The case of environmentalism. *Polity*, 29(3), 345-374.

Appendices

Appendix A: Survey Apparatus

The results of this survey will be kept confidential.

1. What is the name of your organization? _____

2. Which environmental issues does your organization mainly focus on? (select all that apply)

Climate Change | Animals/Wildlife | Pollution | Waste | Alternative Transportation

Deforestation | Ecosystem Degradation | Energy Production/Use (e.g. oil, coal)

Other (please specify): _____

3. What methods does your organization utilize to achieve environmental goals? (Select all that apply)

Activism | Canvassing | Political Advocacy | Internet/Media Campaigns

Stewardship | Community-based Green Initiatives | Selling Eco-Friendly Products

Providing Eco-friendly Services

Other: _____

4. Which participants are most important for the functioning of your organization? (Select only one)

Paid Staff | Volunteers | Government Officials | Subscribers/Members | Students

Other (please specify): _____

5. How many people does your organization have on paid staff?

0 1-10 10-20 20-50 50-100 100+

6. How many people volunteer with your organization?

0 1-10 10-20 20-50 50-100 100+

7a. Please rank these methods for communicating with the public from MOST to LEAST important for your organization?

Website Social media Email Newsletters/Mass Emails Telephone Mail

Face-to-Face Advertising Campaigns Email (

Other (please specify): _____

7b. How much less important is your 2nd choice from the 1st choice? (Example: If “Email Newsletters” were ranked as #1 and “Website” ranked #2, Websites were “b. 20%” less important than Email newsletters for my organization)

10% 20% 30% 40% 50% >50% Equal Importance

8. If you use email newsletters, how many people are the emails sent to?

0-50 50-100 100-500 500-1000 1000+ N/A

9. How many weekly hits does your organization’s website get on average?

0-50 50-100 100-500 500-1000 1000+ N/A

10. Which of these funding sources is most important for your organization? (select only one)

Government Grants Corporate Sponsorship Fundraising

Membership/Subscription fees Out-of-Pocket Product/Services Sales

Donations Other (please specify): _____

11. How would you describe your organization’s primary focus? (select only one)

Local Provincial National International Global

12. Are there other environmental organizations in the Toronto area that you believe are making an impact on environmental issues?

a. I would prefer not to answer this question (skip directly to question 13) .

b. Yes, these Toronto based organizations (list up to 5):

i. _____

ii. _____

iii. _____

iv. _____

v. _____

13. Does your organization actively work with other environmentally focused organizations in the Toronto area?

a: I would prefer not to answer this question

b: We do not actively work with any other organizations.

c, Yes, we work with these organizations (list up to 5):

i. _____

ii. _____

iii. _____

iv. _____

v. _____

14. Please describe, in 50 words or less, what environmental issues your organization focuses on and how environmental goals are achieved.

Appendix B: Overall Survey Results

Issue Focus: Question 2

Response Options	Responses	Percentage of all respondents
Climate Change	33	45.83%
Animals/Wildlife	23	31.94%
Pollution	23	31.94%
Waste	13	18.06%
Alternative Transportation	13	18.06%
Deforestation	12	16.67%
Ecosystem Degradation	19	26.39%
Energy Production/Use (e.g. oil, coal)	14	19.44%
Other	47	65.28%
Totals	197	

Methods: Question 3

Response Options	Responses	Percentage of all respondents
Activism	24	33.33%
Canvassing	6	8.33%
Political Advocacy	26	36.11%
Internet/Media Campaigns	35	48.61%
Stewardship	22	30.56%
Community-based Green Initiatives	35	48.61%
Selling Eco-Friendly Products	8	11.11%
Providing Eco-friendly Services	18	25.00%
Other	39	54.17%
Totals	213	

Communication Methods: Question 7a

Response Options	Responses	Percentage
Website	18	25.00%
Social media	9	12.50%
Email Newsletters	18	25.00%
Telephone	1	1.39%
Mail	1	1.39%
Face-to-Face	15	20.83%
Advertising Campaigns	1	1.39%
Other	9	12.50%
Totals	72	100.00%

Participant Importance: Question 4

Response Options	Responses	Percentage
Paid Staff	29	40.28%
Volunteers	25	34.72%
Government Officials	0	0.00%
Subscribers/Members	6	8.33%
Students	2	2.78%
Other	10	13.89%
Totals	72	100.00%

Paid Staff: Question 5

Response Options	Responses	Percentage
0	17	23.61%
1-10	39	54.17%
10-20	7	9.72%
20-50	6	8.33%
50-100	2	2.78%
100+	1	1.39%
Total Responses	72	100.00%

Volunteers: Question 6

Response Options	Responses	Percentage
0	3	4.17%
1-10	19	26.39%
10-20	13	18.06%
20-50	15	20.83%
50-100	5	6.94%
100+	17	23.61%
Total Responses	72	100.00%

Spatial Focus: Question 11

Response Options	Responses	Percentage
Local	26	36.11%
Provincial	24	33.33%
National	15	20.83%
International	3	4.17%
Global	4	5.56%
Totals	72	100.00%

Funding Sources: Question 10

Response Options	Number	Percentage
Government Grants	21	29.17%
Corporate Sponsorship	5	6.94%
Fundraising	7	9.72%
Membership/Subscription fees	10	13.89%
Out-of-Pocket	1	1.39%
Product/Services Sales	2	2.78%
Donations	14	19.44%
Other	12	16.67%
Totals	72	100.00%

Email Recipients: Question 8

Response Options	Responses	Percentage
0-50	2	2.78%
50-100	5	6.94%
100-500	12	16.67%
500-1000	10	13.89%
1000+	36	50.00%
N/A	6	8.33%
Skip	1	1.39%
Totals	72	100.00%

Website Hits: Question 9

Response Options	Responses	Percentage
0-50	5	6.94%
50-100	11	15.28%
100-500	19	26.39%
500-1000	11	15.28%
1000+	12	16.67%
N/A	13	18.06%
Skip	1	1.39%
Totals	72	100.00%

Appendix C: Ideological Self-Indulgence Quotes

Participant 1 “[Participant 1] provides a platform to develop consistent climate information, climate risk assessment and adaptation across the province for various sectors vital to the economic development, social well-being, and health of Ontario residents and eco-systems.”

Participant 8 “mission is "to create innovative solutions to meet community challenges and build strong, equitable and sustainable communities through education, engagement and collaboration”.

“We bring together a broad-based group of community and provincial associations, spanning the social, environmental, economic, and political spectrums. [Participant 8] members share a common goal of creating healthier communities and they actively support the development of Healthy Communities by sharing their knowledge, skills and experiences with others through our monthly Bulletin and community stories.”

Participant 17 “Vision: Every Ontarian conserves energy and generates sustainable energy either as a household or as part of a local community-owned business, contributing to the rapid transition to 100% sustainable energy.

Mission: To be Ontario's most respected sustainable energy advocate and facilitator by providing credible, accurate and timely information and an unparalleled network of community and commercial sector supporters and participants.”

Participant 25 “We all get busy and forget how our daily actions affect the world around us. We forget that, while important, we’re just one part of a huge ecosystem. Children don’t – they’re passionate about protecting life on earth. When they learn how their behaviours can help, they don’t ignore them, they act. [Participant 25] provides children with the opportunity to protect animals, to improve the environment and to make a difference. We are the Kids’ Conservation Organization.”

Participant 28 “Our goal is to enlighten, engage, and entertain audiences of all backgrounds – through film.”

Participant 31 “mission is to transform cities into sustainable, vibrant, resilient communities, where the air is clean to breathe and greenhouse gas emissions are minimized.” “We believe we can make cities greener, healthier places.”

Participant 39 “YOU just read that article about renewable energy in a major newspaper, and got frustrated by how much they got wrong. Help us correct them.”

“[Participant 39 is a] multi-platform news project that seeks to reintroduce our inherent and inescapable connection with the natural world into our daily discourse so that we might live more sustainable and happy lives.”

Participant 40 “Canada’s leading cause-marketing agency focused on social and environmental program development. Our team is led by award winning industry experts

in the fields of brand and program development; custom content; advertising, marketing and PR; and event management.”

Participant 41 Zoocheck works to improve wildlife protection and to end the abuse, neglect and exploitation of individual wild animals through: investigation and research; public education and awareness campaigns; capacity building initiatives; legislative actions; litigation

Participant 45 “We work to promote leadership in climate action. We are building a global, grassroots movement to solve the climate crisis.” “We engage in creative direct action, educational events, online campaigns and direct contact with decision-makers.”

Participant 51 “to undertake environmental research and education programs of benefit to the community” “non-profit registered society, whose primary focus is to further the conservation and prudent management of Canada's natural resources based on sound ecological principles.”

Participant 52 “Coalition engages in a variety of initiatives based around the betterment of Ontario's parks and protected areas” “recognized that within the environmental community there needed to be a stronger voice to provide the type of opposition that was needed.”

Participant 54 “Toronto-based activist group that organizes to draw attention to and resist the negligent practices of Canadian mining companies, who comprise over 75% of mining businesses worldwide”

“Educate... the Canadian public on mining injustices in Canada and around the world. Advocate... for stronger community control of mining practices, and in support of self-determination in mining-affected areas.

Agitate... against corporate impunity and in support of substantive regulatory change.”

Participant 55 “The foundation of our work is the education and empowerment of people to fight for the values and policies we believe in.”

Participant 56 “[Participant 56] believes that informing the public about conservation issues is critical to the continued recovery of the peregrine falcon and other endangered species.”

Participant 62 We are a grassroots charity, made up of caring citizens who, in organized numbers, can affect positive change in our communities” “campaign raises awareness that unnecessary vehicle idling, mainly when parked, is totally preventable and is one of the greatest forms of wasteful and harmful pollutants individuals face”

Participant 67 “[Participant 67] works with communities and schools, providing them with the knowledge and tools to monitor their environment and take action for positive environmental change.”

Participant 68 “We believe the answer lies deeper in the fundamental connection everyone has with nature.” “Documentary storytelling touches people deeply – often down where attitudes take shape and the momentum to act gets started.”

Participant 69 “[Participant 69] works to advance the principles of sustainable urban forest management in Ontario.” “Provide information about the benefits of trees and advise about their conservation.

Provide volunteer speakers for public education events.

Host an educational display at various community events.”

Participant 72 “As a Council, we promote networking, collaboration, and innovative ways to make conservation easy, affordable, and desirable. Through our programs, we seek to be a catalyst for the positive social and economic change we see happening around us.”

Appendix D: Narrow Community/Group Interests Quotes

Participant 3 “an affiliation of groups with overlapping missions to improve children's environmental health in Canada. Working across traditional boundaries, [Participant 3] provides common ground for organizations working to protect children's health from environmental contaminants.”

Participant 6 “will deliver financial support to the community-based education, recreation and preservation programs that animate and enhance High Park and the Western Beaches”

Participant 10 “a student funded, student-run, nonpartisan organization on campus that conducts research, advocacy, organizing, lobbying, as well as educational and media campaigns. Over the years [Participant 10] has stood at the forefront of social justice mobilization at York University, operating a dynamic space that acts as one of the main activist hubs on campus. [Participant 10] is a bastion of creativity, passion and idealism.”

Participant 12 “We have a rich history of serving Toronto’s cycling community through award-winning programs that enable affordable, clean transportation and of improving communities through waste-diversion”

Participant 13 “We believe that by introducing users of the park to each other, and by organizing communally, we build a circle of Friends not just for the park, but for ourselves.”

Participant 14 “[Participant 14] has brought together senior executives and rising leaders from all sectors to tackle some of our region’s toughest social, economic and environmental challenges.”

Participant 15 “an association of individuals interested in the preservation and rehabilitation of the Black Creek through community involvement.”

Participant 18 “a community group of residents from Toronto’s east end neighbourhoods”

Participant 20 “If you aren’t on the side of Mother Nature and her need to recycle organic resources back into benefits for productive soil, it would be best to stay low on acclaiming diversion successes. You must and can do better”

Participant 21 “We continue to monitor and comment on these proposals to ensure that they reflect good planning for our community and the environment.”

Participant 23 “charity supported by people who love and want to protect the wilderness of Georgian Bay for current and future generations. We are residents, cottagers, boaters, sailors, kayakers, canoeists, native communities, fishers, campers, hikers and nature enthusiasts. We are a community who share a passion for preserving this incredible area for future generations of Canadians.”

Participant 26. “Regional, provincial or subsector ENGO leaders meet in a series of multi-day retreats over a year or two. Participants receive advanced organizational training, learn from peers and explore broader issues facing the sector.” “These interventions facilitate progress on core capacity issues by fostering an in depth understanding of the major issues facing environmental organizations.”

Participant 30 “This is a place where you can fix your bicycle using our tools and recycled or new parts. If you dont know how to fix it, our volunteers will be there to help you. It is also a social space where you can come and meet with your neighbours and figure out how to improve our city.”

Participant 31 “To do that, we work with Canadians, decision-makers and businesses to make the environment a top priority. We focus on strategies that will get results, which for CAP means influencing decision-making in the interests of liveable cities.”

Participant 34 “has assisted communities around the shores of the Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River revitalize their waterfronts and connect them with a trail now enjoyed by bikers, hikers, and joggers of all ages.” “Trail that is ‘complete and connected,’ an integral part of each ecosystem it passes through, enhancing the environment, economy, society and history of every community that participates in the development and use of the Trail.”

Participant 38 “We can realize a livable, prosperous city that embraces the green economy – a city where people spend less time commuting, spend less money on energy costs and the fallout of extreme weather events, and breathe cleaner air.”

Participant 43 “To create opportunities for inexperienced individuals interested in working with bees to learn about hive ecology and maintenance, as well as honey production”

Participant 44 “We are friends, neighbours, residents, and colleagues. We came together through a common passion for thriving, healthy neighbourhoods, a desire to act (in response to climate change) and a belief that grassroots, neighbourhood-based efforts have tremendous potential.”

Participant 46 “As a movement we accelerate action by running programs and campaigns that help local governments advance their sustainability activities and achieve meaningful results.”

Participant 47 “concerned citizens dedicated to preserving Toronto’s mixed-use waterfront and a regional Island Airport” “While we do not oppose the status quo of the Island Airport, we are opposed to turning it into a Pearson-by-the-Lake.” “If Porter wants to play in the big leagues, they should go to the big leagues airport – Pearson. Pearson has plenty of capacity to grow.”

Participant 51 “Members are professionally-trained biologists and biology students, from the wide range of environmental biology disciplines. Individuals with other backgrounds are welcome to join as associate members.”

Participant 58 “We reach out to local community members, college and university students, experts in the environment field and other interested volunteers in order to build awareness and understanding of local aquatic ecosystems and their related issues (e.g. endangered species, stormwater management and aquatic invasive species) with the hopes of shaping a more sustainable future.”

Participant 61 “non-profit, volunteer-based organization that promotes safe and high quality outdoor education experiences for people of all ages. It also acts as a professional body for outdoor educators in the province of Ontario”

Participant 69 “[Participant 69] works to advance the principles of sustainable urban forest management in Ontario. We work in partnership with all sectors, bringing together professionals, academics, industry, government and the general public in a multi-stakeholder approach to urban forest conservation. We also provide technical support for groups addressing urban forestry issues and offer various workshops on a wide range of topics.”

Participant 70. “To protect, preserve, restore and respect the natural environment in Toronto's High Park by creating awareness, educating and inspiring action”

Participant 73 “From getting your head in the class room to your hands in the dirt, [Participant 73] wants you to join the urban forest movement.”

Appendix E: Heroic Narrative Quotes

Participant 4. “first organization in the world to address the issue of birds in collisions with buildings. “and instituted leading-edge programs and policies that begin to address the issue at the source: the buildings themselves. Our research and initiative has resulted in the publication of collision prevention guidelines for use on both corporate and residential structures that help protect birds from the hazards of buildings.”

Participant 9. “leading the legal fight for a brighter environmental future. We are Canada’s only national environmental law charity. We are 100% donor-funded and have a 25-year track record of winning legal victories for people and the planet.” “environmental laws can be used to limit the use of dangerous chemicals, protect trees from being cut down, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions” “In partnership with our clients, we launch ground-breaking lawsuits that level the playing field so industry interests can’t trump those of people and the planet

Participant 11. “the only legislated heritage organization in Canada responsible for the identification, protection, renewal and promotion of Ontario’s rich and diverse built, cultural and natural heritage.”

Participant 16. “array of 17 award-winning themed gardens spanning nearly four acres, designed to educate and inspire”

Participant 17. “We are championing policy and regulatory change for a more sustainable society powered, heated, cooled and transported by a portfolio of sustainable energy.” “To be Ontario’s most respected sustainable energy advocate and facilitator by providing credible, accurate and timely information and an unparalleled network of community and commercial sector supporters and participants.”

Participant 21. “We spearheaded the fight to secure public access to this section of waterfront. This resulted in reduced condominium densities, and the creation of Humber Bay Shores Park.”

Participant 29. “For the past 2 decades, reBOOT has been a voice on issues of stewardship of the environment and the management of waste created by the growth of personal computer use.”

Participant 32. “CELA gives a voice to those who have the least power to be heard when it comes to decision making.”

Participant 37. “main provider of fresh food to people in need in Toronto, with over seven million pounds of food delivered in the past 12 months. Second Harvest is the largest food rescue program in Canada.”

Participant 40. “Canada’s leading cause-marketing agency focused on social and environmental program development.”

Participant 41. "has been at the forefront of wildlife protection and welfare in Canada since 1984. An aggressive, no-nonsense, professional campaigning organization, Zoocheck has amassed a substantial track record of successes."

Participant 43. "evolved to become a dynamic force in Toronto's urban agriculture scene, as beekeepers and as educators, featured in articles in The Toronto Star, The National Post, The Globe and Mail, and media worldwide, as far away as Korea. Some Co-op alumni tend hives of their own, and members are increasingly seen as authorities in the specialized field of urban beekeeping."

Participant 46. "As a leader and authority in the field of climate change adaptation, ICLEI's expertise and understanding of the unique needs of municipalities has led to a comprehensive adaptation program that assists communities in all areas of the adaptation planning process."

Participant 48. "WCS Canada focuses on saving the best of the wild -- rich landscapes where wildlife conservation can be achieved at a large scale -- because others don't. Governments and industry give too little attention to the effect of cumulative impacts of development and climate change on ecosystems."

Participant 49. "As the only watershed-wide organization dedicated solely to supporting the needs of community-based groups and actions working to protect and restore Great Lakes land and water resources, we are able to help protect and restore the Great Lakes like no other organization." "The groups we help work at the local community level where large environmental organizations cannot."

Participant 52. "proud to be a vocal champion of Ontario's environment and protected areas"

Participant 55. "Tragically, most governments support an economic system that puts unlimited growth above the vital needs of people and the planet. The Council of Canadians is part of a global civil society movement to drive transformative change in the absence of true leadership by governments."

Participant 57. "the largest environmental event in the world. More than six million Canadians"

Participant 59. "Ontario's oldest not-for-profit organization providing energy audits and residential energy efficiency services."

Participant 60. "led the fight to phase out coal-fired electricity in Ontario, the largest single climate change action in North America. After a 15 year campaign, Ontario's final coal plant shut down in April 2014."

Participant 62. "DADA fills a need where schools have long struggled with finding ways to get schoolbus drivers and parents to turn off their engines on school property and ideally get more children to walk to school rather than being driven by their parents"

Participant 65. "This project is conceived, planned and executed by people with extensive real life experiences in underdeveloped communities... We strive to help 'underprivileged countries' to set up projects to help cyclists. This would help them to protect their environment and reduce their own dependency on motorised vehicles which is expensive."

Participant 71. "years of experience in policy and planning on the Oak Ridges Moraine and its well-developed network of local and regional contacts were critical to the campaign that saved (legislatively) the Oak Ridges Moraine." "As a planning organization, STORM remains a leader of moraine protection by focusing on the moraine's natural and cultural heritage, and facilitating and implementing policy monitoring and best planning practices."

Participant 72. "Around the world, all jurisdictions are talking of the need for sustainable development. Few, if any, have an institution comparable to the Conservation Council of Ontario with a mandate to support a coordinated and collaborative voluntary transition strategy."

Appendix F: Hubris and Overconfidence Quotes

Participant 1 “Building Resilience through Applied Science

The OCC provides one-window access to the best climate change expertise in Ontario, to generate the high quality climate information and research required to meet mitigation and adaptation planning needs, and to facilitate and strengthen collaboration between public and private sector climate practitioners to foster the development of world-class climate services in Ontario.”

Participant 2. “we build and implement software programs that inspire and incentive positive behavior change. We did it through VELO. It’s our award-winning proprietary software technology and it makes it possible to accurately measure and manage social and environmental impact.”

Participant 5 “Coordinated conservation efforts among governments, schools, businesses and communities will result in widespread awareness and understanding of ecological realities. A strong sense of environmental stewardship will grow through a sensitive and collaborative approach to conservation. We envision responsible communities living within a flourishing natural environment.” “

Participant 7 “With an incredible crew of volunteers, we’re making good use of healthy food, addressing climate change with hands-on community action, and building community by sharing the urban abundance.”

Participant 8. “provides networking, communications and administration services to support Healthy Communities in Ontario.”

Participant 9. “We achieve legal precedents that keep harmful substances out of the environment, protect wilderness and wildlife and take aim at climate change.”

Participant 14. “The Race to Reduce is on track to take more than 27,000 cars off the road, generate \$26 million dollars in energy savings, and \$13 million annually in perpetuity. Find out more about how [Participant 14’s] non-partisan, inclusive, and results-oriented approach has contributed to this impact.”

Participant 16. “[Participant 16] connects people, plants and the natural world through education, inspiration and leadership.”

Participant 19 “We don’t just talk about an area or an issue. We get to know it inside and out. We understand the players, the pressure points and make sure our contributions add value. We are a small yet highly effective charity that brings scientific rigor, credibility and creative solutions forward.”

Participant 22. “environmental education and certification program for grades K-12 that helps school communities develop both ecological literacy and environmental practices to

become environmentally responsible citizens and reduce the environmental footprint of schools.”

Participant 26. “By improving management and leadership skills and fostering organizational development, we help to strengthen the environmental community. We are about sustaining the organizations that work on sustainability.”

Participant 31. “We tackle the most critical environmental and health issues of the day: clean air and climate change. We get commitments. We get commitments that achieve measureable progress.”

Participant 32. “use existing laws to protect the environment and to advocate environmental law reforms”

Participant 33. “Our collaborative approach with government and private business clients has a proven track record of achieving excellent results while building long-term relationships.” “We know that, driven by the imagination and enthusiasm of our team, our organization’s potential is unlimited.”

Participant 34. “Created to regenerate, celebrate and reconnect people to our Great Lake waterfronts, the Trail has become a well-loved and used recreation, fitness and green transportation amenity and a world-renowned tourism attraction”

Participant 37. “In preventing more than 90 million pounds of food from going to waste, we have also prevented more than 40 million pounds of greenhouse gas equivalents from entering our atmosphere.”

Participant 38. “Impact investing is a form of socially-responsible investing that can guide investment strategies. TAF’s impact investments generate a measurable, beneficial environmental impact – reduced greenhouse gas emissions – in addition to a risk-adjusted rate of return. We target a market rate of return.” “Through our investments and financing approach, we can demonstrate the value of investing in community projects that address climate change and turn a profit.”

Participant 40. “Our team is led by award winning industry experts in the fields of brand and program development; custom content; advertising, marketing and PR; and event management.”

Participant 44. By allowing households to benchmark and compare their carbon footprint to other households at the neighbourhood and city-level, and to municipal reduction targets, [Participant 44] is creating a culture of awareness around greenhouse gas emissions and connecting individuals to actions.

Participant 46 “With our Building Adaptive & Resilient Communities (BARC) suite of solutions, we help communities by providing an array of tools, resources, and consulting services to increase their adaptive capacity in a cost-effective and accessible way. The

components of BARC range from networking platforms, to online tools to a full BARC Program; regardless of the BARC pathway your community chooses, [Participant 46] can help your community become more adaptive and resilient.”

Participant 55. “We develop creative campaigns to put some of the country’s most important issues into the spotlight. We organize speaking tours, days of action, conferences and demonstrations. We also produce research reports, create popular materials, and work with individuals and organizations across the country and around the world. We do all of this to ensure that governments know the kind of Canada we want.”

Participant 60. “As the organization that drove Ontario’s decision to phase out dirty coal, the [Participant 60] is uniquely able to drive new groundbreaking policies, such as putting Conservation First in energy planning and increasing electricity trade with Quebec.”

Participant 72. “Our goal is to make conservation easy, affordable, and desirable. In the end, when people see that the conserver option is a more desired way to live, then the economic and policy will naturally follow.”

Appendix G : Incentivization and Recognition

Participant 2. “we build and implement software programs that inspire and incentive positive behavior change. We did it through VELO. It’s our award-winning proprietary software technology and it makes it possible to accurately measure and manage social and environmental impact.”

“software solution that measures and analyzes people’s actions across multiple engagements simultaneously for the purpose of incentivizing GOOD behaviour. It also powers GOODcoins, a social currency..”

Participant 14. “a friendly corporate challenge that represents unprecedented collaboration between office building landlords and tenants to encourage smart energy use. It encourages behavioral and positive team-building amongst landlords, tenants and their employees.” “recognizes participants with annual awards celebrating successes of landlords and tenants”

Participant 22. “Becoming a certified EcoSchool allows your school to be recognized and celebrated by your school community, board, parents, and peers for achievement in environmental education and action”

Participant 25. “Missions are cool activities and challenges that you and your family can do together to help protect animals, their homes and the environment.

When you accept your mission, you’ll receive a special Brief to help get you started. Once your mission is complete, you’ll earn an online badge on your Achievement Wall”

Participant 33. “Awards are presented annually in recognition of accomplishments made by Ontario's public and private sector fleet managers in making their on-road, licensed motor vehicle fleets more environmentally responsible and/or having reduced fuel consumption, harmful greenhouse gas emissions and smog causing air contaminants, in the previous one-year period.”

Participant 40. “For seven years now, the awards have celebrated Torontonians working towards a more eco-conscious community and world.” “Awards to celebrate and honour the top corporate Canadians dedicated to creating sustainable and ethical practice in business.”

Participant 44. “Compare Yourself to Your Neighbours. A dynamic interface shows residents which of their behaviours and actions are producing the most greenhouse gas emissions. As part of our feedback strategy, PN uses a community based social marketing approach to create “norms” (neighbourhood averages). Households can compare themselves to similar households in their neighbourhood, as well as longer-term municipal reduction targets”

Participant 57. “Commit to green acts, share your profile and achievements, and be recognized for making good green choices!”

Participant 61. "Our annual awards provide an important opportunity to recognize individual and group efforts, as well as to celebrate the many and varied expressions of outdoor education within our organization and the province of Ontario"

Participant 72. "campaign to promote and support businesses that have made a commitment to greening their operations and product or services" "GreenLeaders -- We need a common way to promote green leadership that can be used by businesses, organizations and governments alike."

Appendix H : Promotion of Easy/Simple Actions Quotes

Participant 2. HOW DOES IT WORK?

Easy. [our program] rewards people like you for making measurable change in your everyday life.

In turn, you inspire others around you. They jump on the bandwagon. Before you know it, we're all in it together, making good changes and changing the world. It's not idealistic; it's happening. Right now."

Participant 3. Here are five areas where you can make an immediate impact with simple actions—without spending a lot of money. "Bust that dust" "Go green when you clean" "Renovate Right" "Get drastic with plastic" "Dish safer Fish"

Participant 4 "Turning lights out saves birds, energy and money, and reduces light pollution and CO2 emissions. These direct benefits result in a healthier environment for both humans and wildlife."

Participant 7 "When a homeowner can't keep up with the abundant harvest produced by their tree, they let us know and we mobilize a team of volunteers to pick the bounty. The harvest is split three ways: 1/3 is offered to the homeowner, 1/3 is shared among the volunteers, and 1/3 is delivered by bicycle to local food banks, shelters, and community kitchens. It's a win-win-win solution!"

Participant 14 "All types of office buildings are included
Unprecedented collaboration between landlords and tenants
Easy to join and simple to manage
Four-year race with annual awards"

Participant 19 "Please speak up for a healthier future for the Algonquin by contacting Bill Mauro, the Ontario Minister of Natural Resources, to urge him to phase out logging in Algonquin. Send your email now."

Participant 22. "There are many ways to get involved. You can start by using our free environmental education resources or embark on the certification journey. We encourage schools to start small and work at their own pace."

Participant 28. "promote the use of film and video as a catalyst for public awareness, discussion, and appropriate action and positive change on the ecological and social health of the planet" "To provide the viewing public a layered experience, appreciation and understanding of the aesthetic range of environmental artistic expression in Canada and globally"

Participant 39. "Our new animated series uses simple language and hand drawn animation to help explain the parts that citizens need to know, without trying to tell them what to think about it."

Participant 44. “[Participant 44] uses a community-based social marketing approach to create household level “norms” that make taking action on climate change more achievable, more tangible, and more fun.”

Participant 57 ““Our programs—focused on education, action, recognition and financial support—are successful because they offer simple, easy-to-accomplish actions that can be done by all of us. Each individual action will add up to a substantial improvement for the environment when we all work together.”

Participant 59 “[Participant 59] Sources the best array of energy improvement products and services in the market to ensure every customer reduces their energy bills and enjoys increased comfort for years to come.”

Participant 60 “Help [Participant 60] to knock out coal, reduce Ontario's climate impact and clear our air. Whether it is writing a letter to the premier, distributing pamphlets to your friends or neighbours, finding out what you can do to reduce electricity use or volunteering with the [Participant 60], your efforts can have a big impact.”

Participant 62 “[Participant 62] encourages green/ECO driving practices through educational materials and instruction.” “Idling vehicles is the #1 most common forms of ‘unnecessary air pollution’ that affects your community and our family. It is also one of the easiest to stop. We have the key!”

Participant 66 “To inspire people to choose a healthier, greener, more compassionate lifestyle through plant-based eating.”

Participant 68. “Ecologos creates opportunities for people to reconnect with these deeply-felt experiences, and then from the energy this creates, commit to action for a sustainable future.” “It is abundantly clear that information alone does not trigger action, particularly on the scale so badly needed today. Even so, we press forward with one well-intentioned public information program after another. Image Shifting reaches beyond information to the deeply felt emotional experiences and powerful beliefs that lie at the very heart of resolve and action.”

Participant 72 “We believe that a conserver lifestyle, done right, is more fun, saves money, and can save the planet. It just doesn't get any better than that!”

“It's not as hard as you think. You don't have to be perfect, just better. You get to choose conserver solutions that make sense for you.

Take our Conserver Challenge. Rate yourself as a conserver, then choose where you want to improve.

Check out our infosheets for ideas and links on the top conservation priorities.”