Globalization, Sustainability and Ethics:
What are the Critical Links for Present and Future Generations?

Mago W. Maila* and **Victor J. Pitsoe**

*Department of Teacher Education, University of South Africa, P O Box 392,
UNISA Pretoria, 0003 South Africa*
*E-mail: Mailamw1@unisa.ac.za

ABSTRACT Global policy imperatives, implemented through United Nations (UN) social organs, have undoubtedly refocused humanity's commitment to responsible and accountable agendas directed at resolving global challenges and crises in environmental, ecological and development complexities and uncertainties and contradictions in the understanding of present day realities. All these policy obligations imply bold steps to re-orientate educational, cultural and environmental programmes towards possibilities to foster human and ecological wellness. Sometimes it is less obvious that the linkages are emerging from ordinary people's (grassroots) local practice, which is then being utilized to shape and inform 'global powerful ideas' for ethically grounded and sound practice. The purpose of this document review is to critique the various linkages that exist between the global obligatory policies and their intended practice on the ground. The critique highlights the linkages between globalization, environment, sustainable development and ethics. It advances the notion of the multiplicity and interconnectedness processes of knowledge creation.

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Various scholars concur that the goal of higher education institutions is to offer learners an education that produces a skilled workforce to further the aspirations of developers and economists (Rudman 2005: 16; South African Qualifications Authority 2003: 1; Tabulawa 2008). This view is notably based on the industrial-commercial model that sees education as a 'single purpose' activity only for economic prosperity. However, Duderstadt (2003) cautions that higher education has higher and broader purposes, which cannot be characterized entirely by the promotion of the economy and the development of human wellness. He argues:

Our colleges and universities are expected to produce the educated citizens necessary for a democratic society, transmit our cultural heritage from one generation to the next, and serve responsible critics of society. These roles could be at some risk if market forces alone determine the future of the university (sic).

This is a bitter pill to swallow for humanity. As observed by Maila and Awino (2008: 240), a market-driven global knowledge system as produced by a market-driven education programme may not be able to engage learning qualitatively in critical societal civic purposes, traditions, values and broader purposes of higher education and that, after all, knowledge production is not the prerogative of only higher education. Thus, the researchers concur with Curzon (1990) that the world we live in is not the world of yester day. It has not only evolved but its citizens have also radically changed the world as the *agora* or shared space occupied with other life organisms. Hence, their conviction that life is not only about the economy and even less about development agendas that enable the few to be richer and the poor to get poorer every day (Lotz-Sisitka 2004: 14). It is also about 'living a complete' life that is ethically sound. Arguing for such a life to become a goal of education, Curzon (1990: v) points out:

"How to live? – That is essential question for us. Not how to live in the mere material sense only, but in the widest sense. The general problem which comprehends every special problem is the right ruling of conduct in all directions under all circumstances. To prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to discharge; and the only rational mode of judging of an educational course is to judge in what degree it discharges such function".

Curzon cautions that although material wealth (in this case, the economy and development) is critical for humanity's existence, it should not be hegemonized and in the process

marginalize 'living in the widest sense'. The researchers think that living in the widest sense includes learning in the widest sense, that is, ensuring that curricula are broad and can therefore engage global sustainability and ethical issues. The document, *New South Wales Environment Protection Authority* (1997: 2) concurs that higher education as an educational design should seek to assist people in taking action pertaining to their concerns. Future generations require such an education to develop sustainably and ethically.

Development is essential for any nation to care, advance, and prosper its people, by ensuring that it avails choices and services for a better life for all citizens. This is a lofty goal indeed. It calls for sustainable development that not only promises a better life for future generations, but also ensures the present generation's wellness. Furthermore, such development seeks to ensure that the present world citizenry benefits from available resources/services without incurring the guilt of 'messing up things' for those who are still to come in future. Sustainable development calls for responsible, accountable and ethical checks and balances with regard to the use of natural resources. It calls for adaptation, mitigation and amelioration strategies that promote human wellness and environmental sustainability, be they for this generation or tomorrow's generation.

The eradication of poverty and social, political, economic and environmental injustice depend on the prospects for rapid and sustained economic growth in the long run (Bhorat and Kanbur 2006). Without sustained economic growth, poverty and social, political, economic and environmental ills might have to be endured by the coming generation. Environmental and health risks and vulnerabilities experienced by this generation (Yanda 2010; Hewitson 2010; Makungwa 2010; Lotz-Sisitka 2010; Lotz-Sisitka 2004) are as bad and unacceptable for the next generation. Moreover, 'cancerous corruption', that is, corruption that defeats all ends of justice and human rights responsibilities and the huge sums of money availed to fight it are also detrimental in the present and the future. For that reason, the so-called 'blind-eye-accounting' of the world's nations to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) agenda, without contextualizing these goals with their contextual imperatives, is a limitation to the envisaged benefits of the very imperatives. This is as unacceptable as

ignoring these global goals for humanity's well-being.

Against this backdrop, the purpose of this document review is to critique the various linkages that exist between the global obligatory policies and their intended practice on the ground. The researchers argue in the paper that the benefits of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the United Nations Environment and Sustainability Education (UNESD) policy programmes ('policy' is not used in its strongest sense; it is loosely used) should be employed to address, mitigate, adapt and resolve health and environmental risks and vulnerabilities by underscoring the links between globalization, sustainability and ethics. The researchers caution that although these global imperatives are perceived as 'powerful ideas' by the global community for care of the planet and prosperity for humanity, their implementation is solely dependent on 'willing' individual nations. Without this, they are doomed for failure since they cannot be imposed.

It is undoubtedly not an easy investigative process to establish the links between globalization, sustainability and ethics, since these are not just localized concepts but, are also globalized concepts. Rigour is therefore critical in this process in order to inform the very higher education learning processes about globalized policies, sustainable development (as used interchangeably with sustainability education) and ethics (the morality of environmental and care of humanity). Notwithstanding, the argument that higher education institutions see themselves as custodians of knowledge creation, various scholars have debated (some with success) that knowledge is not only the prerogative of higher education, but also of cultural groupings. Any community is knowledgeable in constructing knowledge that is contextually relevant to address needs at localities. Thus, we posit that knowledge is contextually relevant and useful when it is informed and shaped by contextually grounded events. In this case, globalization, sustainable development and morality interconnections are also shaped by contextually embedded events as illuminated in the ensuing discussion.

The researchers start the paper with an overview that introduces the trajectory of discussion and sketches the various sub-aspects. This is followed by a more detailed discussion of the sub-aspects that frame the discourse to provide a framework for understanding the critiquing of the links in question. Thereafter, non-linear knowledge creation processes in curricula are expounded. The nature of knowledge production within non-linear and linear modes is debated and it is argued that non-linear modes enhance connections between globalized and localized contexts of sustainability and ethics. The last two aspects address knowledge construction and the interconnectedness of knowledge application and reflexive practice and social critical theory. These sub-aspects critique the links/connections between globalization, sustainability and ethics underscored by curricula that acknowledge that construction processes that are non-linear are useful in understanding plurality worldwide and locally. The researchers then argue that any critique of human endeavour requires reflexive action and commitment and should confront pertinent issues to promote robust and responsible sustainable practice. The researchers conclude with the observation that these issues are of vital importance to sustain ethical development globally and locally.

FRAMING THE DISCOURSE

Scholars clarify terms or concepts differently for different reasons, ranging from preference of contextually based understandings and meanings to worldwide grounded meanings. Some scholars ascribe the same meanings to terms or concepts and sometimes use them interchangeably. This tendency is observed differently by different scholars. Some see chaotic or conflicting meanings; others argue that this tendency enriches discourses with varied meanings and broadens arguments or debates advanced. They argue that it is healthy as it encourages varied uses of concepts and the endeavour to contextualize concepts rather than to 'implant' them without noting the harm they may cause if such a route is taken (Ornstein and Hunskins 2004; Maila 2010). We concur with the notion that varied words or concepts as defined should be based on their context-meanings and their value to social critical pedagogy.

Globalization is perceived as a powerful global policy imperative, usually used to refer to dimensions in any sphere of life that embraces the world over processes of partnerships, interconnectedness and interdependency. For example, in most higher education institutions one finds directorates specifically mandated to liaise with international scholars, or partners overseas in order to advance collaboration in certain areas of higher education functioning. According to Tabulawa (2008), these various areas of higher education operation denote globalization as multi-dimensional since it touches on economic, political and cultural dimensions of human existence. Of course, globalization also touches on environmental and ecological dimensions of life. Tikly et al. (2003: 47) say globalization is "the growing interdependence and interconnectedness of the modern world through increased flows of goods, services, capital, people and information. The process is driven by technological advances and educations in the costs of international transactions, which spread technology and ideas, raise the share of trade in world production and increase in the mobility of capital". On the other hand, internationalization seems to focus on partnerships rather than interdependency and interconnectedness. A working partnership of two or more across the globe is seen as both strengthening relations and supporting goods and services needed by the partners. Therefore, internationalization advocates community of practice among member partners.

A community of practice, which is seen as a process of social learning occurring among those nations who collaborate as partners to share ideas, search for solutions and build innovations, is mostly encouraged through globalization or internationalization processes. Globalization facilitates such collaborations through the advancement of technology. Looking at the MDGs, it appears that they are globally 'brewed' but locally implanted. Hence, they are very shaky when it comes to advocating for collaborations in partnerships. This view contrasts with Giddens' (1990: 64) suggestion that globalization can be defined as the intensification of worldwide social relations that link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away, and vice versa. This is a dialectical process because such local happenings may move in an obverse direction from the very distanciated ela-

tions that shape them. Local transformation is as much a part of globalization as "a lateral extension of social connections across time and space". Although globalizing ideas seem to be the product of the interplay between the local and the global, we argue that this dialectical space is severely compromised by the hegemonic stance of the global ideas.

Maila (2006a: 3) posits that most scholars see *sustainable development* as a daily contested global trajectory relating to social justice, political justice, trade justice and environmental justice. His view is supported by Hall (2000) who argues that that the "complex and diverse environmental problems and risks emerging worldwide as a result of development are seen as the cause of the new approach to development – sustainable development". Neefjes (2000) contends that sustainable development requires meeting the basic needs of all and extending to all the opportunity to fulfil their aspirations for a better life. What emerges from the observations made by these scholars is that sustainable development ought to provide answers and alternatives to unsustainable development practices, and in doing so, all people should benefit from development.

However, since sustainable development is to be practised in the spaces of social justice, human trade justice, political justice and environmental justice, contestations regarding the sharing of benefits seem to be the order of the day. These are complex and diverse spaces, which therefore need broad based and robust answers and alternatives to better the lives of all people. But because in most cases the benefits accrued and amassed by the developed and the developing are not shared equally and equitable, contestations are expected to continue unabated through the 21st century. Neefjes (2000) further argues that sustainable development is not simple and easy to define; it is complex, broad and vague. In addition, sustainable development is a contextually based operationalised activity within an internationalized mandate (Maila 2006b). Neefjes (2000) further cautions that there is skepticism about why humanity needs to develop sustainably. Our observation is that irrespective of whether some are keen on sustainable development as the norm worldwide or doubtful of the intentions of proponents of this agenda, all development advancement must be sustainably carried out and should benefit all people equally and equitably.

In this paper the concepts sustainable development and sustainability are used interchangeably as done by other scholars (Bell and Morse 2003: 3; Neefjes 2000). These scholars attribute a common understanding and meaning to both terms.

According to Sterling (2004: 13), unsustainable development is apparent and attested to by the fact that "more than 113 million children have no access to primary education, 880 million adults are illiterate, gender discrimination continues to permeate education systems, and the quality of learning and the acquisition of human values and skills fall far short of the aspirations and needs of individuals and societies … without accelerated progress towards education for all, national and international agreed targets for poverty reduction will be missed, and inequalities between countries within societies will widen". Needless to say, the abuse of women and children persists worldwide and cross border conflicts continue to undermine gains made in other negotiated political and economical settlements.

Ethics is central to the discussion of globalization and sustainable development, which some scholars see as sustainability of the green agenda of nature conservation; social and economic agenda of needs satisfaction; the integrated agenda of caring for the community of life on earth; and the radical political and ethical agenda for social transformation. With these varied notions of sustainable development, it is imperative to locate the operationalization of sustainable development within ethical dimensions of development and human life. This enables humanity to view sustainability as: education dispersed at all levels and in all social contexts (family, school, workplace, community); education that fosters responsible citizenship and promotes democracy by allowing individuals and communities to enjoy their rights and fulfill their responsibilities; education based on the principle of lifelong learning; and education that fosters the individual's balanced development. To achieve such a fit in education, higher education (and other learning institutions) should prepare learners not only to be citizens of their own localities or regions, but also to be citizens of the world. Reiterating the necessity for people to see themselves beyond their local contexts, Nussbaum (1997) quotes the ancient Greek cynic philosopher, Diogenes, who

responded, "I am a citizen of the world", when asked where he came from. Nussbaum points out that the reason for Diogenes' answer: "He meant by this that he refuse to be defined simply by his local origins and group memberships, associations central to the self-image of a conventional Greek male". She further argues that the Stoic developed this notion by viewing it as the 'kosmopolites, "or world citizen, more fully, arguing that each of us dwells, in effect, in two communities-the local community of our birth, and the community of human argument and aspiration that "is truly great and truly common". She claims that it is the latter community that is, most fundamentally, the source of our moral ligations.

The kosmopolites view of the plurality nature of humanity and knowledge creation is also reiterated by Freire (2005: 105) and Tagore (Nussbaum in Qizilbash 2006: 295). These two scholars concur with Nussbaum (1997) that the notion of kosmopolites is undergirded by human values, such as, the respect to fundamental moral values, such as justice. According to Nussbaum (1997), "we should regard all human beings as our fellow citizens and local residents". The crux of global contexts is in the notion that both the global nature and local nature of human beings is grounded in the understanding that both these contexts are mutually complementary and not exclusive to each other. Broad based curricula that deliberately encourage and compel learners to understand the world as a plural space worthy to be explored with one self and with others is critical.

THE WORLD AS PLURAL/DIVERSE KOSMOPOLITES

Sterling (2004: 14) who argues that change in education is based on 'first order' change and 'second order' change or between 'first order' learning and 'second order' learning, clarifies the meaning of these types of change in learning. First order change in learning takes place within accepted boundaries and is adaptive learning that leaves basic values unexamined and unchanged, hence, the stress is on giving 'pieces' of incoherent information (Sterling 2004: 14). On the other hand, second order change and learning "involves critically reflective learning, when an individual/collectives examine the assumptions that influence the first order learning, and that this is sometimes called learning about learning or thinking about our thinking." This is transformative learning, that is, learning that calls for those involved in learning to continuously question how they are learning and why they are learning so. Sterling further argues that, at a deeper level, third order learning occurs. This involves creative and deep awareness of alternative worldviews and ways of doing things. It is a shift of consciousness and therefore a transformative level of change and learning. This kind of learning is needed for sustainability education and ethical humanness in the present and the future.

Grounding transformative learning in curricula, Cummins (2000: 246) argues:

Transformative pedagogy is realized in interactions between educators and students that attempt to foster collaborative relations of power. Empowerment understood as the collaborative creation of power, results from classroom interactions that enable students to relate curriculum contents to their individual and collective experience and to analyze broader social issues relevant to their lives.

Cummins further posits that learning that transforms the ways of peoples living are contextually bound by individual and collective critical inquiry underscored by social realities that downplay power relations that undermine various actions which promote meaningful critiquing of uncritical actions in learning and social life. According to Banks (1996: 9), transformative academic knowledge is more than just the facts, concepts, paradigms, themes and explanations that challenge mainstream academic knowledge. It also expands and substantially revises established cannons, paradigms, theories, explanations and research methods. This kind of learning, according to Nussbaum (1997), enables learners to own their minds in the process of cultivating their own world citizenry (sustainable development).

The interrelationship between human development and economic development cannot be over-emphasized. Notwithstanding that business seems to be leaning towards economic development, civil society seems advocate economic growth that does not compromise human development. Therefore, economic benefits cannot override the human need to grow and sustain development for the sake of people and not the sake of business per se.

Economic development is probably the most modernizing factor in the 21st century. Most needy people seem to think that if they can have employment, they can automatically pull themselves out of poverty. Sometimes governments also think in this way. However, research has shown that economic benefits are but one factor that can contribute to poverty eradication. There are a host of other factors which are important in poverty redress. Top of the list is the knowledge that human development is just as important to sustainable development as economic development. The following factors will clarify our claim that human development is important for sustainable growth.

Re-orienting Education for Transformative Change

Education is a human activity, which is practised as a social activity geared towards enhancing human progress in all human dimensions. Lifelong learning strategies ensure sustainability of our human efforts to achieve ecological and human sustainability. Supporting learning is critical to sustainable development, Sterling (2004: 12) argues:

Learning is the change of mind on which change towards sustainability depends; the difference of thinking that stands between a sustainable or chaotic future. The qualities, depth and extent of learning that takes place globally in the next ten to twenty years will determine which path is taken: either moving towards or further away from ecological sustainability. (Human and economic sustainability included – authors' emphasis*).*

Needless to say, if learning promotes minds that allow transformation to take place regarding how the world is viewed and how actions for sustainability are needed, meaningful opportunities to continue engaging all people in learning are essential.

Indigenous Ways of Knowing in Curricula

Cultural diversity and cultural tolerance are the most needed imperatives worldwide for sustainable development. To deny learners learning these values is ethically wrong. Attesting to this view, Freire (2005) proposes values that are similar to these which should underscore all learning programmes. However, the challenge

is: How can we talk of transformative change when most of the world's population does not participate in education? Learning brings change if organized properly. Not only does it transform the minds of people, but it also provides them with capabilities (knowledge, skills, values), which are critical to sustainability. To acquire such skills, indigenous ways of knowing cannot be marginalized.

KNOWLEDGE CONSTRUCTION AND INTERCONNECTEDNESS OF KNOWLEDGE APPLICATION

The eight (8) MDGs are seen as imperatives for the global community to advance in the ecological dimension of our planet and humanity's prosperity and are inextricably interconnected in terms of knowledge construction and application. Knowledge application includes emphasis of the interconnectedness of what is learned. Without knowledge, action is useless and knowledge without action is futile. Thus, interconnectedness requires that students combine discipline-based knowledge to solve problems.

Interconnectedness is part of the terminology of a worldview which sees a oneness in all things. This oneness refers to a state of being connected reciprocally. The interconnectedness of knowledge constitutes a key feature of education. For Dewey (1963: 49), any experience is "mis-educative that has the effect of arresting or distorting the growth of further experience … . Experiences may be so disconnected from one another that, while each is agreeable or even exciting in itself, they are not linked cumulatively to one another … . Each experience may be lively, vivid and 'interesting', and yet their disconnected-ness may artificially generate dispersive, disintegrated, centrifugal habits. The consequence of formation of such habits is inability to control future experience."

Interconnectedness is a *condition* for new knowledge creation. Coming to know is self-consciously active and inherently connected to the situation at hand. Bradbury and Bergmann (2000) assert that it is through interconnectedness that knowledge is generated. However, becoming part of the system does not mean giving up responsibility for the knowledge one generates. The interconnectedness of knowledge acts not just as a metaphor for strategy but as a meta-level analysis of strategy, that is, the glue that

binds different forms of strategic thinking together (McGee and Thomas 2007). The resource (knowledge) element defies construction in linear form; it is an interconnected whole (via the multiple arrows). Learning, moreover, creates multiple feedback effects.

Interconnectedness that defies construction in linear construction of knowledge in this context is linked to social constructivism as a theory of knowledge construction. Social constructivism is based on ontology, the nature of being, and epistemology, the nature of knowledge. It is a theory of learning pioneered by the work of Vygotsky, which builds on the idea that culture and context are very important in creating understanding. It is a sociological theory of knowledge that considers how social phenomena or objects of consciousness develop in social contexts and argues that humans generate knowledge and meaning from an interaction between their experiences and their ideas. In addition, it assumes that knowledge is socially constructed – through language, social, political and legal institutions and through the exercise of power.

Social constructivism encourages the student to arrive at his or her version of the truth, influenced by his or her background, culture or embedded worldview. At the heart of this school of thought, is the assumption that the context is inextricably interconnected to the social construction of knowledge. The social constructivist paradigm views the context in which the learning occurs as central to the learning itself. Furthermore, it holds that the truth or falsity of knowledge depends upon the circumstances and the context within it is produced.

In the light of these, the interconnectedness of the eight (8) MDGs should be explored within the constructivist framework. The constructivist framework provides the basis of the philosophical interconnectedness of the knowledge construction and application of globalization, sustainability and ethics. Interconnectedness defies linear construction of knowledge and its application within the MDGs context promotes oneness among the MDGs.

REFLEXIVE PRACTICE

The concepts globalization, sustainability and ethics are fluid and relative social constructs. At philosophical level, they are consistent with the assumptions that underpin the emergent worldview and critical pedagogy. Flowing from this, critiquing of any human endeavour or any endeavour within the context of the links/connection between globalization, sustainability and ethics, requires reflexive action, commitment and deliberate will to square up with, and raise pertinent issues to oneself first and then with others for the sake of noting or improving practice. The link/connection between globalization, sustainability and ethics reflects and shapes ongoing social development and debates surrounding sustainability. Hence, critiquing the link/connection should be guided by critical social theory and reflexive practice.

Critical social theory is a multidisciplinary knowledge base with the implicit goal of advancing the emancipatory function of knowledge (Leonardo 2004: 11). It also promotes a language of transcendence that complements a language of critique in order to forge alternative and less oppressive social arrangements. Leonardo (2004) notes that a critical social theory-based movement in education highlights the relationship between social systems and people, how they produce each other, and ultimately how critical social theory can contribute to the emancipation of both. Critical theory is known for its propensity for criticism, a tradition it arguably owes to predecessors, such as, Marx and Kant. Critical social theory represents an expanded set of criticism with the advent of more recent discourses, such as postmodernism and cultural studies. Critical social theory is a multidisciplinary framework with the implicit goal of advancing the emancipatory function of knowledge.

On the other hand, in terms of theory and practice, the idea of reflexive practice, has been part of the educational landscape since the late 1980s. It has made a significant contribution to the development of social sciences. The concept "reflexive" comes from the Latin word, reflectere meaning to be directed (reflected) back to the subject or thing. Reflexive practice is a very broad concept and has many definitions. Despite these multiple definitions, there is greater overlap than there are variations. The central thread running through these definitions is that reflexive practice is specifically about reflecting on oneself and one's own inner world with regard to behaviours and impact. It is also concerned with how we construct our sense of human knowledge (epistemology). Reflexivity is also per-

ceived as a paradigm and a methodological lens. It is underpinned by social constructivism, critical theory and appreciative and complexity principles.

Lisle (2000: 113) argues that we can analyse this meaning by breaking it down into two. One meaning is that of reflection: long considerative analytic critical evaluative thought. The other meaning is that of reflexion: through observation (sensing) acquiring a mirror image of our actions, almost like a reflex arc. The first meaning describes the process: the mirror image of our actions impinges on 'the mind's surface' (*Dasein* as in 'Being in', 'Being there' and 'Being-with'). The second meaning is related to conscious awareness itself, as direct experience is received from external sources: a reflex action to stimuli (being as aesthesia).

Nature and society should not be seen as separate realms (modern dualism). Reality is always the product of both ecological (bio-physical) and social relations and processes. Thus, the links/connection between globalization, sustainability and ethics illustrates how the relations between objects in the bio-physical and social worlds enable ecological and social processes, how these processes affect one another constantly, and how our understanding of such links can never be entirely neutral or objective because it is always partly a product of those social or power relations it needs to explain.

In the light of the above discussion, reflexive practice and critical social theory have the potential of providing conceptual features to understand the discourses dealing with the link/connection between globalization, sustainability and ethics. Seen through the lens of critical social theory, globalization, sustainability and ethics should not be perceived as separate silos. The link/connection of the concepts has a philosophical relationship and is a policy imperative. For this reason, global obligatory policies will fail, not because politicians and bureaucrats are misinformed about the conditions of the ordinary people's (grassroots) local practice, but because the policy is driven by political imperatives which have little to do with the realities of multiplicity and interconnectedness. In addition, it will undermine the already fragile environment in underdeveloped countries.

When linked to a critical pedagogy that recognizes the impact of globalisation upon knowledge production and identity, critical social theory provides a contemporary rationale for a val-

ue-driven development education that builds further upon its radical foundations. Teaching and learning based on critical theory and pedagogy allow the rhetoric of such terms as empowerment, critical thinking and participation to become realities. Development education provides teachers with appropriate intellectual resources so that they can enable students and communities to reflect and act on critical ideas that may promote development. At global level, development education assumes that the links can be made between local and global issues and that what is taught is informed by international and global matters. It also means that young people are given opportunities to examine their own values and attitudes. This in turn gives people the knowledge, skills and understanding to play an active role in the global community.

CONCLUSION

Have the researchers managed to answer the question that the posed earlier? The researchers argue that they have done so. Certainly globalization, sustainability and ethics are all concepts of practice linked by, not only a relationship of risks and vulnerabilities, adaptation and mitigation and redress strategies for human and biodiversity wellness, but also by humanity's need for quality lifestyles based on human rights, human justice and environmental justice. However, we emphasize that in the process of human and economic development, be it within local or global imperatives, ongoing reflexive critical paradigms are critical and integral aspects of any initiatives that seek to ensure sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles for present and future generations. Development initiatives therefore, need to consciously integrate global sustainability and sound ethical considerations in all programmes in order to advance the understanding and use of knowledge as interconnected and multifaceted in nature

REFERENCES

Banks JA 1996. The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. In: JA Banks (Ed.): *Multicultural education, Transformative Knowledge and Action: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 3-29.
Bell S, Morse S 2003. *Measuring Sustainability Learning by Doing*. London: Earthscan Publications.

Bhorat H, Kanbur R 2006. Introduction: Poverty and well-being in post-apartheid South Africa. In: H Bharot, R Kanbar (Eds.). *Poverty and Policy in Post-Apartheid South Africa.* Cape Town: HSRC Press, pp. 1-17.

Bradbury H, Bergmann BM 2000. Relationality in organizational research: Exploring the space between. *Organizations Science*, 11(5): 551-564.

Cummins J 2000. *Language, Power, and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Curzon LB 1990. *Teaching in Further Education: An Outline of Principles and Practice.* London: Cassell Educational.

Dewey J 1963. *Experience and Education.* New York: Collier.

Duderstadt J 2003. *A University for the 21st Century.* Michigan: Michigan University.

Freire P 2005. *Teachers as Cultural Workers: Letters to Those Who Dare Teach.* Expanded Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge Press.

Giddens A 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hall CAS 2000. The theories and myths that have guided development. In: CAS Hall, CL Perez, G Leclere (Eds.): *Quantifying Sustainable Development: The Future of Tropical Economies.* San Diego: Academic Press, pp. 45-89.

Hewitson BC 2010. Climate change scenario development in Sub-Saharan Africa. In: Z Yanda, BC Hewitson, S Makungwa, D Mazvimavi, H Lotz-Sisitka, C Vogel (Eds.): *Climate Change, Adaptation and Higher Education: Securing Our Future.* Johannesburg: Wits, SARUA, pp. 46-67.

Leonardo Z 2004. Critical social theory and transformative knowledge: The functions of criticism. *Educational Researcher*, 33 (6): 11–18.

Lisle AM 2000. All hail reflexivity. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology*, 2: 109-129.

Lotz-Sisitka H 2010. Knowledge questions associated with the public health and climate change relationship: Some implications for Universities in Southern Africa. In: PZ Yanda, BC Hewitson, S Makungwa, D Mazvimavi, H Lotz-Sisitka and C Vogel (Eds.): *Climate Change, Adaptation and Higher Education: Securing our Future*. Wits: SARUA.

Lotz-Sisitka H 2004. *Positioning Southern Africa: Environmental Education in a Changing Landscape.* Howick: SADC-REEC/Share-Net.

Maila MW 2010. Curriculum as open-ended inquiry in higher education. *Africa Education Review,* 7(2): 263-282.

Maila MW 2006a. Grounding sustainable development in praxis: Furthering accountability and collaboration. In: Allam Ahmed (Ed.): *World Sustainable Development Outlook 2006: A Global and Local Resources in Achieving Sustainable Development. Allan Ahmed.* Falmer, Brighton: Inderscience, pp. 1-11.

Maila MW 200b. Producing provisioning enabling knowledge: A priori for higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 19 (Special Issue): 1456-1463.

Maila MW, Awino JO 2008. Reflections on quality in African higher education. *Africa Education Journal,* 5(2): 239-252.

Makungwa S 2010. Adaptation, agriculture and food security. In: PZ Yanda, BC Hewitson, S Makungwa, D Mazvimavi, H Lotz-Sisitka, C Vogel (Eds.). *Climate Change, Adaptation and Higher Education: Securing our Future*. Johannesburg: Wits, SARUA, pp. 68-80.

McGee J, Thomas T 2007. Knowledge as a lens on the jigsaw puzzle of strategy: Reflections and conjectures on the contribution of a knowledge-based view to analytic models of strategic management. *Management Decision*, 45(3): 539 – 563.

Neefjes K 2000. *Environments and Livelihoods: Strategies for Sustainability*. London: Oxfam.

Nussbaum M 1997. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defence of Reform in Liberal Education*. London: Harvard University Press.

Ornstein AC, Hunkins FP 2004. *Curriculum Foundations, Principles, and Issues*. 4th Edition. Boston: Pearson.

Qizilbash M 2006. Introduction: Diverse voices and conversations. *Journal of Human Development*, 7 (3): 291-298.

Rudman R 2005. *The Role of An Employer in Promoting Environmental Ethics Amongst Employees.* MEd Dissertation, Unpublished. University of South Africa, Pretoria.

South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) 2003. Mission of SAQA. From<http: //www.saqa.org.za> [Retrieved 31 August 2003].

Sterling S 2004. *Sustainable Education: Re-visioning Learning and Change*. Bristol, UK: Green Books.

Tabulawa R 2008. Curriculum form in Botswana: Contradictions and Paradoxes in the Production of a 'Self-programmable Learner'. *Paper presented at the Department Languages and of Social Sciences Education,* April, University of Botswana.

Tikly L, Lowe J, Crossley M, Dachi H, Garrett, R, Mukabarangu B 2003. Globalisation and Skills for Development in Rwanda and Tanzania. *Educational Papers*, *Paper No. 51*. London, UK: DFID, p. 163.

Yanda PZ 2010. Climate change impacts, vulnerability and adaptation in Southern Africa. In: PZ Yanda, BC Hewitson, S Makungwa, D Mazvimavi, H Lotz-Sisitka, C Vogel. In: *Climate Change, Adaptation and Higher Education: Securing Our Future*. Johannesburg: Wits, SARUA, pp.11-30.