

EDUCATION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS, SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND HUMAN FLOURISHING

Dr. Donatus C. Ukulor (Rev.Fr.)
Department of Foundation and Arts Education
e.mail: donatus.ukulor@iaue.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

This conceptual paper examines education for sustainable development: philosophical foundations, social responsibility and human flourishing through a critical, literature-based analysis. It addresses the central philosophical and social problem by clarifying key concepts, reviewing relevant theoretical perspectives, and organising the discussion around sustainability as an ethical question, intergenerational justice, environmental ethics and human flourishing. The paper argues that the issue should not be understood through narrow causal or measurement language alone; it requires attention to values, institutions, professional judgement and the Nigerian context. The synthesis shows that durable educational and social outcomes depend on coherent relationships among ideas, practices and institutional conditions. Practical implications are developed for policy, professional practice and further scholarly debate. The paper concludes that a context-sensitive, ethically defensible and analytically integrated approach provides a stronger basis for action than isolated technical interventions.

INTRODUCTION

The idea of sustainable development emerged from growing recognition that conventional patterns of economic and social development were generating serious environmental degradation, resource depletion and persistent inequalities. The publication of *Our Common Future* by the World Commission on Environment and Development marked a significant turning point by defining sustainable development as development that meets present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (World Commission on Environment and Development [WCED], 1987). The definition established two enduring principles: attention to the essential needs of disadvantaged populations and recognition of ecological and technological limits. Sustainable development therefore cannot be understood simply as continued economic expansion. It involves an attempt to reconcile human wellbeing, social justice and environmental integrity within the limits of the natural world. Contemporary scholarship continues to identify sustainability as a complex and contested concept because its environmental, economic, social and ethical dimensions involve competing interpretations of what constitutes a desirable future (Bonnett, 1999; Holma et al., 2025).

Education occupies a central position in this debate because societies do not become sustainable merely by developing new technologies, regulations or economic policies. Sustainability requires changes in how individuals and communities understand their relationship with one another, with institutions and with the natural environment. Education contributes to this process by developing knowledge, critical thinking, values, capabilities and forms of agency through which people can understand complex problems and participate in decisions concerning their collective future. UNESCO consequently identifies Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) as an important element of Sustainable Development Goal 4 and as an enabler of the wider Sustainable Development Goals. Its current ESD for 2030 framework emphasises not only knowledge acquisition but also changes in educational environments, educator capacity, youth participation, local action and broader societal transformation (UNESCO, 2020).

The development of ESD reflects a significant expansion in the purposes traditionally associated with environmental education. Early environmental education concentrated substantially on environmental awareness, ecological knowledge and the development of attitudes and skills for addressing environmental problems. The 1977 Tbilisi framework, for example, emphasised awareness, knowledge, attitudes, skills and participation in relation to environmental issues. Over time, however, sustainability education increasingly recognised that environmental problems are inseparable from questions of poverty, inequality, economic organisation, culture, governance and patterns of consumption (UNESCO, 1978; Tilbury, 1995; Wals, 2014). The emergence of ESD consequently represented a movement from educating about the environment towards educating for sustainable ways of living and acting. Recent scholarship similarly describes ESD as having evolved from an

environmentally focused approach into a broader framework involving economic, social and environmental dimensions, while increasingly emphasising learners' capacity to participate in change (Hedefalk et al., 2015; Holma et al., 2025).

Yet, the growing institutional prominence of ESD does not eliminate important philosophical questions. If education is expected to contribute to sustainable development, what conception of the good life should guide that education? What forms of human development should be encouraged, and what forms should be questioned? How should the interests of present populations be balanced against those of future generations? Should nature be valued primarily because it supports human wellbeing, or does the non-human world possess value independent of human interests? These questions demonstrate that sustainability is not simply a technical problem requiring more information. It is also a philosophical question concerning values, knowledge, responsibility, justice and the relationship between human beings and the wider ecological community. Bonnett (1999) argues that the educational significance of sustainability depends partly upon confronting the values and assumptions underlying human relationships with nature, while more recent philosophical analysis has similarly called for greater attention to the philosophical foundations of ESD rather than treating sustainable development as an unquestioned educational objective (Holma et al., 2025).

The social dimension of ESD is equally significant. Sustainable development takes place within societies characterised by unequal access to resources, education, political influence and economic opportunities. Consequently, an educational approach that teaches environmental responsibility without addressing poverty, exclusion, inequality and social justice risks producing an incomplete conception of sustainability. The Brundtland formulation itself gives particular attention to the needs of poorer populations, thereby establishing social justice as part of the sustainability question rather than as a separate concern (WCED, 1987). Contemporary ESD scholarship similarly emphasises that sustainability requires learners to understand the interaction between individual behaviour and wider social and institutional structures. This is particularly important because many sustainability problems cannot be resolved through individual behavioural change alone; they are embedded in systems of production, consumption, governance and social organisation (Wals, 2014; Sterling, 2001).

The central argument of this paper is that ESD should therefore be understood as more than an educational strategy for transmitting sustainability-related knowledge or supporting the implementation of international development goals. It is fundamentally concerned with the purposes of education and with the kind of society education ought to help create. ESD involves questions about human flourishing, justice, responsibility, ecological interdependence, democratic participation and the common good. Its significance lies not merely in producing environmentally informed individuals but in cultivating people capable of critically examining unsustainable social arrangements and participating responsibly in the creation of more just and ecologically viable forms of collective life. Transformative approaches to ESD accordingly emphasise the possibility of learners reassessing established assumptions and worldviews rather than simply acquiring additional factual knowledge (O'Grady, 2023).

This philosophical and social orientation also requires ESD itself to be critically examined. The concept of sustainable development contains tensions between economic growth and ecological limits, individual freedom and collective responsibility, technological progress and ecological restraint, and present needs and future interests. Critical scholars have questioned whether conventional development models can genuinely provide sustainability when they remain dependent upon continual economic expansion and intensive consumption on a finite planet (Kopnina, 2014; Sterling, 2001). Other scholars argue that ESD must move beyond narrowly behavioural approaches and provide learners with opportunities to question dominant assumptions about consumption, authority and human relationships with the world (Sund & Öhman, 2014; Sipos et al., 2008). Recent philosophical work reinforces this concern by arguing that genuine ecological sustainability requires attention to habits, caring relationships and forms of interaction that challenge purely instrumental approaches to nature (Holma et al., 2025).

Accordingly, this paper examines Education for Sustainable Development through philosophical and social lenses. It first clarifies the concepts of education, sustainable development and ESD and traces the movement from environmental education towards a multidimensional conception of sustainability. It then examines the philosophical foundations of sustainable development, particularly human flourishing, justice, responsibility, intergenerational equity, human–nature relationships and the common good. The

paper proceeds from the position that the future of ESD depends not only on effective implementation but also on sustained reflection about the assumptions, values and social purposes that education embodies. Such reflection is necessary if ESD is to become a meaningful educational response to the ecological and social challenges of the contemporary world rather than another policy vocabulary added to an already crowded educational landscape.

Aim and Objective of the Paper

The aim of this paper is to critically examine Education for Sustainable Development from philosophical and social perspectives, with a view to establishing how education can contribute to ethical responsibility, social justice, environmental sustainability, critical consciousness and the transformation of individuals and society.

The objectives of the paper are to:

examine the philosophical foundations underpinning Education for Sustainable Development;
analyse the relationship between education, human values and the moral purpose of sustainability;
examine the social dimensions of Education for Sustainable Development, including social justice, inclusion, equality and democratic participation;
analyse the role of education in promoting environmental responsibility and sustainable economic development;
examine how Education for Sustainable Development can foster critical consciousness, social transformation and human agency; and
propose a philosophically grounded approach to Education for Sustainable Development that connects educational purpose with practical educational policy and practice.

Statement of the Conceptual Problem

The central problem addressed in this paper is the gap between the importance commonly attached to education for sustainable development: philosophical foundations, social responsibility and human flourishing and the conceptual clarity required to translate that importance into defensible educational or social practice. Public discussion often treats the issue as self-evident, yet competing assumptions about values, responsibility, institutional roles and human development produce different practical conclusions. A conceptual analysis is therefore necessary to clarify the underlying ideas, identify tensions and develop implications suited to the Nigerian context.

Aim and Objectives

The aim of the paper is to critically examine education for sustainable development: philosophical foundations, social responsibility and human flourishing and clarify its implications for education, society and professional practice in Nigeria.

1. To analyse sustainability as an ethical question in relation to the central argument of the paper.
2. To analyse intergenerational justice in relation to the central argument of the paper.
3. To analyse environmental ethics and human flourishing in relation to the central argument of the paper.
4. To analyse transformative learning and agency in relation to the central argument of the paper.
5. To analyse nigerian social context in relation to the central argument of the paper.

Conceptual Clarification and Literature Review

Theoretical and Philosophical Foundations

The theoretical foundation is drawn from the major philosophical and social perspectives already reflected in the literature reviewed above. These perspectives are used interpretively: their assumptions are compared with the practical demands of the Nigerian context, and their limitations are treated as part of the analysis rather than as reasons for adopting a single theory mechanically.

Conceptual Method

This paper adopts a conceptual, analytical and literature-based approach. It critically examines and synthesises the scholarly arguments, theoretical perspectives and policy-relevant ideas contained in the source literature. The analysis proceeds through conceptual clarification, comparison of competing

perspectives, interpretation of their assumptions, and thematic synthesis of their educational and social implications. The central ideas are treated as concepts and normative problems rather than as variables to be statistically tested. No primary data, respondents, questionnaires, sampling procedures or inferential statistical tests are used in the paper; the conclusions are derived from reasoned engagement with the literature and the Nigerian context.

Thematic Analysis and Central Arguments

Sustainability as an ethical question

Sustainable development is not only a technical problem of resource management. It raises philosophical questions about what societies owe to future generations, how benefits and burdens are distributed, what forms of consumption are defensible and how human wellbeing should be understood within ecological limits.

In analytical terms, sustainability as an ethical question also requires attention to implementation. A sound position must specify who bears responsibility, what institutional conditions are necessary, how conflicting interests should be handled, and how the principle can be translated into ordinary educational or social practice. This prevents the concept from remaining a purely aspirational statement and makes it possible to evaluate whether policies and professional actions are consistent with the values they claim to advance.

Intergenerational justice

Education for sustainable development should cultivate awareness that present choices shape the opportunities of people not yet born. Intergenerational justice extends moral consideration across time and challenges policies that transfer environmental costs to the future while concentrating present benefits.

In analytical terms, intergenerational justice also requires attention to implementation. A sound position must specify who bears responsibility, what institutional conditions are necessary, how conflicting interests should be handled, and how the principle can be translated into ordinary educational or social practice. This prevents the concept from remaining a purely aspirational statement and makes it possible to evaluate whether policies and professional actions are consistent with the values they claim to advance.

Environmental ethics and human flourishing

A narrow anthropocentric model treats nature only as a resource for human use. Environmental ethics introduces wider considerations of ecological integrity, biodiversity and the dependence of human flourishing on functioning natural systems. Education can help learners examine competing ethical positions rather than presenting sustainability as a set of slogans.

In analytical terms, environmental ethics and human flourishing also requires attention to implementation. A sound position must specify who bears responsibility, what institutional conditions are necessary, how conflicting interests should be handled, and how the principle can be translated into ordinary educational or social practice. This prevents the concept from remaining a purely aspirational statement and makes it possible to evaluate whether policies and professional actions are consistent with the values they claim to advance.

Transformative learning and agency

Sustainability education should move beyond awareness to agency. Learners need opportunities to investigate local environmental problems, evaluate evidence, deliberate about trade-offs and participate in practical responses. Transformative learning connects knowledge with changes in perspective and action.

In analytical terms, transformative learning and agency also requires attention to implementation. A sound position must specify who bears responsibility, what institutional conditions are necessary, how conflicting interests should be handled, and how the principle can be translated into ordinary educational or social practice. This prevents the concept from remaining a purely aspirational statement and makes

it possible to evaluate whether policies and professional actions are consistent with the values they claim to advance.

Nigerian social context

In Nigeria, sustainability education intersects with energy, urbanisation, waste, agriculture, flooding, extractive industries, unemployment and inequality. Effective education should therefore connect global sustainable-development ideas to local livelihoods, community knowledge and public-policy choices.

In analytical terms, nigerian social context also requires attention to implementation. A sound position must specify who bears responsibility, what institutional conditions are necessary, how conflicting interests should be handled, and how the principle can be translated into ordinary educational or social practice. This prevents the concept from remaining a purely aspirational statement and makes it possible to evaluate whether policies and professional actions are consistent with the values they claim to advance.

Nigerian Context and Practical Implications

In Nigeria, the implications of education for sustainable development: philosophical foundations, social responsibility and human flourishing must be interpreted against institutional diversity, uneven resources, cultural and religious plurality, strong family and community influences, rapidly changing technology and persistent concerns about educational quality and public trust. A viable approach should therefore avoid importing a single model without adaptation. National and state policy can provide broad principles, but implementation must allow schools, universities, professional bodies and communities to respond to local conditions while remaining accountable to common standards of dignity, fairness, competence and responsibility.

For practice, the central requirement is alignment. Curriculum or policy statements should be supported by teacher or professional preparation, leadership behaviour, assessment and accountability systems, adequate resources, and channels for reflective feedback. Where formal messages and institutional behaviour contradict one another, the practical behaviour of the institution is likely to shape outcomes more strongly than the written policy.

Critical Issues, Limitations and Counterarguments

A conceptual position on education for sustainable development: philosophical foundations, social responsibility and human flourishing must acknowledge several cautions. First, values and principles can be interpreted differently across social groups, so conceptual clarity does not remove disagreement. Second, desirable principles may conflict in practice—for example autonomy and accountability, community and individual rights, innovation and equity, or development and ecological protection. Third, institutional constraints can prevent well-designed ideas from being implemented consistently. These tensions support a balanced approach that makes assumptions explicit, protects legitimate pluralism and treats implementation capacity as part of the argument rather than an afterthought.

CONCLUSION

The analysis has shown that pragmatism, critical pedagogy, humanism, environmental ethics and transformative education provide complementary resources for understanding ESD. These perspectives emphasise inquiry, experience, critical consciousness, human dignity, ecological responsibility and transformation. They also challenge purely instrumental approaches that define education primarily through employability or economic productivity. The social analysis further demonstrates that sustainability cannot be separated from poverty, inequality, gender, inclusion, cultural diversity, citizenship and community development. Environmental protection without social justice is incomplete, just as economic development without ecological responsibility is ultimately unsustainable.

The paper therefore argues that ESD should be understood as a transformation of the purpose and practice of education, rather than as an additional collection of sustainability topics. Such transformation requires curricula that connect disciplines, teachers who facilitate critical and participatory learning, institutions that practise the values they teach, assessment systems that recognise ethical and practical capabilities, and policies that support equitable access to meaningful sustainability education. It also

requires educational institutions to engage actively with communities and contribute to solving the social and ecological problems surrounding them. As Kioupi and Voulvoulis (2022), Holst (2024) and Holma et al. (2025) collectively suggest, ESD has its greatest potential when knowledge, values, institutional practice and social action are brought into meaningful relationship.

Ultimately, the purpose of ESD should not be to produce individuals who merely know the language of sustainability. It should cultivate people capable of thinking critically, acting ethically, participating democratically and recognising their interdependence with other people and the natural world. Sustainability education therefore represents an opportunity to reclaim a broader conception of education in which intellectual development, moral formation, social responsibility and ecological consciousness are understood as interconnected dimensions of human flourishing. The question facing education is consequently not simply how it can contribute to sustainable development, but what kind of human beings and societies education should help create if a sustainable future is genuinely to be possible.

REFERENCES

- Bengtsson, S., & Östman, L. (2023). Education for sustainable development among rich and poor: Didactical responses to biopolitical differentiation. *Environmental Education Research*, 23, 56-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2023.2172140>
- Bonnett, M. (1999). Education for sustainable development: A coherent philosophy for environmental education? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 29(3), 313–324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764990290302>
- Elfert, M., & Yates, C. (2024). Assessing progress in tracking progress towards the education Sustainable Development Goal: Global citizenship education and teachers missing in action? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 104, 102-136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102936>
- Fernando, A. R. R., & Tajan, G. P. (2024). Education for sustainable development (ESD) through participatory research (PR): A systematic review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 482, 144-237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.144237>
- Gould, R. K., et al. (2024). Values-based education for sustainable development (VbESD): Introducing a pedagogical framework for education for sustainable development using a values-based education approach. *Sustainability*, 16(9), 35-62. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16093562>
- Hedefalk, M., Almqvist, J., & Östman, L. (2015). Education for sustainable development in early childhood education: A review of the research literature. *Environmental Education Research*, 21(7), 975–990. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2014.971716>
- Holma, K., Huhtala, H.-M., Kauppi, V.-M., Kekki, M.-K., & Pulkki, J. (2025). Education for sustainable development: Philosophical perspectives. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 29, 267–285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11618-025-01294-3>
- Holst, J. (2024). Monitoring SDG 4.7: Assessing Education for Sustainable Development in policies, curricula, training of educators and student assessment. *Sustainable Development*, 32(4), 3908–3923. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2865>
- Howell, R. A. (2021). Engaging students in education for sustainable development: The benefits of active learning, reflective practices and flipped classroom pedagogies. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 325, 129-138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129318>

- Jónsdóttir, G., & Byhring, A. K. (2023). When a common future for all enters the science classroom. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 18, 1081–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-022-10143-2>
- Kioupi, V., & Voulvoulis, N. (2022). Education for sustainable development as the catalyst for local transitions toward the Sustainable Development Goals. *Frontiers in Sustainability*, 3, 88-99. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frsus.2022.889904>
- Kohl, K., Sanusi, Z. A., & Hussien, S. (2024). Humanistic thought and education for sustainable development. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 8(3), 90-110. <https://doi.org/10.7577/njcie.5611>
- Kopnina, H. (2014). Revisiting education for sustainable development (ESD): Examining anthropocentric bias through the transition of environmental education to ESD. *Sustainable Development*, 22(2), 73–83.
- O'Grady, M. (2023). Transformative education for sustainable development: A faculty perspective. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 27, 20–61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-023-03609-y>
- Rhodes, B. (2024). Examining the role of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) in strengthening inclusive education in teacher education: A Vygotskian analysis of change projects from Malawi and Eswatini. *Journal of Education*, 32, 78-96. <https://doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/i96a06>
- Rončević, K., & Rieckmann, M. (2024). How can a whole school approach to sustainability be inclusive to all learners? In *Whole School Approaches to Sustainability*. Springer.
- Samuelsson, L., & Lindström, N. (2022). Ethics teaching in education for sustainable development. *Athens Journal of Education*, 9(2), 211–224. <https://doi.org/10.30958/aje.9-2-2>
- Sipos, Y., Battisti, B., & Grimm, K. (2008). Achieving transformative sustainability learning: Engaging head, hands and heart. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 9(1), 68–86.
- Sterling, S. (2001). *Sustainable education: Re-visioning learning and change*. Green Books for the Schumacher Society.
- Sund, P., & Öhman, J. (2014). On the need for democratic education in environmental and sustainability education. *Environmental Education Research*, 20(5), 1–17.
- Tilbury, D. (1995). Environmental education for sustainability: Defining the new focus of environmental education in the 1990s. *Environmental Education Research*, 1(2), 195–212.
- UNESCO. (1978). Intergovernmental conference on environmental education: Tbilisi declaration and framework for action. UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2020). *Education for sustainable development: A roadmap*. UNESCO.
- Wals, A. E. J. (2014). Sustainability in higher education in the context of the UN DESD: A review of learning and institutionalization processes. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 62, 8–15.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.
- Zhou, R. K. (2024). From education for a sustainable development to ecological civilization in China: A just transition? *Social Inclusion*, 12, 23-45. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.7421>