

Volume 2 Issue 1



International Journal of Social Work and Development Studies (IJSDS)



**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
RIVERS STATE UNIVERSITY**

**EMOHUA CAMPUS, P.M.B 5080, PORT HARCOURT
RIVERS STATE NIGERIA**

**International Journal
of Social Work
and Development Studies (IJSDS)**
Vol 2 Issue 1

editor@ijsds.org
www.ijsds.org
editor.ijsds@gmail.com
+234 808 022 4405

**FROM PERIPHERY TO CORE:
A FRAMEWORK FOR EMBEDDING CLIMATE CHANGE
EDUCATION IN UNIVERSITY CURRICULA AT
RIVERS STATE UNIVERSITY**

Mina Margaret Ogbanga

Department of Social Work and Gender Studies
Rivers State University,
Port Harcourt,
Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Climate change content in Nigerian university curricula remains peripheral: confined, where it appears at all, to elective modules or specialist environmental science programmes, rather than embedded as a core dimension of academic training across disciplines. This paper develops a framework for understanding why this peripheral status persists and how it might be changed at Rivers State University, drawing on Mezirow's theory of transformative learning, Bourdieu's field theory and concept of academic capital, UNESCO's key competencies framework for education for sustainable development, and Rogers's theory of the diffusion of innovations. The paper argues that embedding climate change education as a core curricular dimension requires attention to four distinct dynamics: the transformative, perspective-shifting quality genuine climate change learning requires; the academic field's own internal distribution of prestige and capital, which determines curricular authority; the specific, UNESCO-defined competencies climate change education should build; and the empirically documented pattern by which curricular innovations diffuse, or fail to diffuse, through academic institutions. The paper grounds its argument in confirmed Nigerian evidence spanning multiple scales, including a study of climate change teaching capacity across southeast Nigerian agriculture faculties, a related study on funding and policy constraints on universities' climate-relevant programming, a national curriculum review, a recent 213-participant mixed-methods study across Nigerian tertiary institutions, and an international comparator on successful cross-disciplinary integration. The paper advances five testable propositions concerning curricular diffusion, academic field dynamics, and transformative pedagogy, and concludes with recommendations for moving climate change education from curricular periphery to curricular core at Rivers State University.

Keywords: transformative learning, academic capital, diffusion of innovations, education for sustainable development, climate change education, curriculum reform

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Climate change occupies an established place in Nigerian public discourse, international development priorities, and the country's own stated policy commitments, yet its place within Nigerian university curricula remains comparatively marginal. Where climate change content exists in Nigerian higher education, it is disproportionately concentrated in agriculture, environmental science, and geography programmes, typically as a specialized elective rather than a curricular requirement, and largely absent from the disciplines — law, business administration, education, the humanities, social work — whose graduates will nonetheless spend their careers making decisions shaped by climate change's social, economic, and institutional consequences. This paper argues that this peripheral status is neither accidental nor simply a matter of insufficient awareness; it reflects specific, analyzable dynamics of academic field structure, curricular innovation diffusion, and the particular pedagogical demands genuine climate change learning makes, each of which this paper's theoretical framework addresses in turn.

This paper develops its argument with specific reference to Rivers State University, situated in the Niger Delta, a region whose exposure to both industrial environmental degradation and climate-related flooding risk is well documented elsewhere in this series of papers. A university situated in such a region has a particular institutional stake in ensuring its curriculum equips graduates, across disciplines, with genuine capacity to understand and respond to climate change — not only those graduates specializing in environmental science, but the lawyers, administrators, educators, and social workers whose professional decisions will be shaped by climate impacts regardless of their disciplinary training.

The paper proceeds as follows. The next section develops the theoretical framework, drawing on Mezirow's

transformative learning theory, Bourdieu's field theory and concept of academic capital, UNESCO's education for sustainable development competencies framework, and Rogers's diffusion of innovations theory. This is followed by a review of confirmed Nigerian evidence on climate change teaching capacity and content. The paper then advances five conceptual propositions, discusses their implications for curriculum reform at Rivers State University, states its limitations, and concludes with recommendations.

2.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This paper integrates four theoretical traditions addressing, respectively, the pedagogical depth genuine climate change learning requires, the academic field dynamics that determine curricular authority and status, the specific competencies climate change education should aim to build, and the process by which curricular innovations spread, or fail to spread, through an institution.

- **Transformative learning.** Mezirow's (1991) theory of transformative learning holds that the deepest form of adult learning involves not merely the acquisition of new information but a fundamental shift in the frames of reference — the meaning perspectives and meaning schemes — through which a learner interprets experience, typically triggered by a disorienting dilemma that existing frames of reference cannot adequately accommodate. Applied to climate change education, this framework suggests that effective curricular content must go beyond conveying climate science facts, aiming instead to prompt the kind of perspective shift that allows students to genuinely reconceive their own discipline's relationship to a changing climate — a law student reconsidering property and liability frameworks in light of climate displacement, a business student reconsidering supply chain risk assessment, a social work student reconsid-

ering client vulnerability assessment. Information transfer alone, on Mezirow's account, is unlikely to produce this kind of reconception. Consider the concrete difference between two ways a Rivers State University business administration course might address climate change. The first appends a single lecture on "climate change and business" to an otherwise unchanged syllabus, conveying facts about carbon pricing and regulatory trends without disturbing the course's underlying assumptions about what counts as business risk. The second confronts students with a disorienting case — a Niger Delta agribusiness whose entire supply chain and insurance model assumed stable seasonal flooding patterns now rendered unreliable by climate change — that cannot be resolved within the standard risk-assessment frameworks the course has already taught, forcing students to reconsider whether their existing frame of reference for business risk is itself adequate to a changing climate. Mezirow's framework predicts that only the second approach constitutes genuine transformative learning; the first, however factually accurate, remains information transfer bolted onto an unchanged frame of reference.

- **Field theory and academic capital.** Bourdieu's field theory, developed across his broader sociological work and applied specifically to the university system in *Homo Academicus*, conceives of the academic institution as a field structured by the distribution of capital — prestige, funding, publication record, institutional position — among competing disciplines and departments, with curricular decisions reflecting this distribution of capital as much as they reflect pedagogical merit alone. Applied to climate change education's peripheral curricular status, this framework suggests that climate change content's marginality is not simply an oversight correctable through awareness-raising, but a reflection of where climate

change expertise currently sits within the university's own internal distribution of academic capital: concentrated in environmental science and agriculture, disciplines that, however scientifically legitimate, may lack the institutional capital within faculties of law, business, or the humanities to mandate curricular change in those faculties' own programmes. Embedding climate change education across disciplines, on this account, requires not only pedagogical redesign but a redistribution, or at least a cross-disciplinary sharing, of the academic capital currently concentrated in a small number of specialist units. A concrete illustration clarifies why this matters practically, beyond its value as sociological description. A proposal to require climate change content within a Faculty of Law's curriculum, if it originates from the Faculty of Environmental Sciences or Agriculture, arrives at the Faculty of Law's curriculum committee bearing the institutional weight of a different field position — a discipline whose scientific authority is not disputed, but whose standing to determine what legal education requires is, within the university's own internal status hierarchy, considerably weaker than the Faculty of Law's own claim to determine its own curriculum. A comparable proposal originating from within the Faculty of Law itself — a legal scholar with genuine standing in that field who has independently become engaged with climate litigation, environmental liability, or climate displacement as legal questions — arrives with an entirely different field position, carrying the specific form of capital, disciplinary legitimacy, that the first proposal lacked. This is precisely why this paper's second proposition, below, predicts that cross-disciplinary embedding will depend more on institutional endorsement and internal faculty champions than on external advocacy from environmental science alone, however well-intentioned that advocacy is.

- **UNESCO's key competencies for sustainable development.** UNESCO's (2017) Education for Sustainable Development Goals: Learning Objectives identifies eight cross-cutting sustainability competencies, verified directly from the source document: systems thinking, anticipatory competency, normative competency, strategic competency, collaboration competency, critical thinking competency, self-awareness competency, and integrated problem-solving competency. These competencies are explicitly framed as transversal and content-independent, meaning they are not confined to environmental science curricula but are, in principle, cultivable within any discipline's own teaching methods and assessment design. This paper adopts UNESCO's eight competencies as its normative target for what cross-disciplinary climate change education at Rivers State University should aim to build, rather than treating climate change education as successfully embedded merely because climate-related factual content appears somewhere in a syllabus.
- **Diffusion of innovations.** Rogers's (2003) theory of the diffusion of innovations identifies five adopter categories — innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards — distributed in proportions of approximately 2.5, 13.5, 34, 34, and 16 percent respectively across a population encountering a given innovation, and identifies the specific communication channels, social system characteristics, and innovation attributes that determine the speed and extent of adoption. Applied to curricular innovation specifically, this framework suggests that embedding climate change content across a university's disciplines should be expected to follow this same diffusion pattern: a small number of innovator and early-adopter faculty members and departments will integrate climate content ahead of the wider academic community, and the pace at

which the early and late majority follow will depend on identifiable factors — the innovation's perceived relative advantage, compatibility with existing curricular structures, complexity, trialability, and observability — that this paper's propositions, below, apply directly to the specific case of climate change curricular integration. Applied concretely to Rivers State University, Rogers's framework predicts a specific and identifiable sequence rather than a uniform, simultaneous adoption across all faculties. A small number of individual academics, likely those with prior personal or research engagement with environmental issues even outside their primary discipline, will constitute the innovator and early-adopter cohort, integrating climate content into their own courses with or without formal institutional encouragement. Whether this initial adoption subsequently spreads to the early majority of their departmental colleagues, and eventually to the late majority and laggards across the wider university, depends on factors this paper's framework identifies as manipulable rather than fixed: whether the early adopters' materials and outcomes are made visible to colleagues (observability), whether colleagues can experiment with a small pilot before committing a full course redesign (trialability), and, as the following section's Nigerian and international evidence both underscore, whether the integration approach is perceived as compatible with existing curricular structure rather than requiring wholesale disruption.

3.0 EVIDENCE BASE: CLIMATE CHANGE TEACHING CAPACITY IN NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES

Direct, confirmed Nigerian evidence on climate change teaching capacity and content, though not specific to Rivers State University, provides this pa-

per's empirical anchor. Bernstein's (1975) classic sociological analysis of curriculum, classification, and framing supplies this paper's foundational vocabulary for understanding how curricular content becomes bounded and insulated within specific disciplinary containers — precisely the dynamic this paper argues has confined climate change content to environmental science and agriculture programmes specifically.

Documented climate change content and capacity constraints in southeast Nigerian universities

Ozioko et al.'s (2015) study of teaching capacity for climate change adaptation across university faculties of agriculture in southeast Nigeria, surveying 130 randomly selected academic staff, provides the most directly relevant confirmed Nigerian evidence available for this paper's argument. The study found that existing climate change course content concentrated on vulnerability to climate change (27.7 percent of surveyed content), adaptation (25.5 percent), mitigation (23.2 percent), and indigenous strategies to climate change (22.5 percent), delivered predominantly through conventional lecture methods (63.3 percent) with comparatively little use of field trips (12.6 percent) or other experiential methods of the kind Kolb's experiential learning framework, discussed elsewhere in this series, identifies as pedagogically superior. Teaching capacity itself was found to be constrained by poor conceptual understanding of climate change among faculty, weak learning environments, weak infrastructure, and inadequate funding, leading the study's authors to recommend a comprehensive curriculum review to increase climate change content across agricultural programmes specifically.

This finding connects directly to Bourdieu's field theory as applied above: even within agriculture faculties, where climate change content already has an acknowledged disciplinary home, its delivery remains constrained by resource and capacity limitations that

reflect the discipline's own position within the university's broader distribution of funding and institutional priority. If climate change teaching capacity remains constrained even within disciplines where such content is already curricularly legitimate, this paper's argument regarding the greater difficulty of embedding comparable content within law, business, or humanities faculties — disciplines with no existing curricular claim to climate change content at all — is considerably strengthened rather than merely asserted.

Bernstein's (1975) distinction between classification — the strength of the boundary insulating one curricular content area from another — and framing — the degree of control teachers and institutions exercise over the selection, pacing, and sequencing of what is taught — supplies a more precise vocabulary for this same boundary dynamic. Climate change content inside agriculture faculties sits within a weakly classified boundary: it is recognised, if under-resourced, curricular territory, and the constraints Ozioko et al. (2015) and Obiora et al. (2013) document are framing problems — insufficient funding, training, and infrastructure to teach content whose place in the curriculum is not itself contested. Climate change content proposed for law, business, or the humanities faces a strongly classified boundary instead: the content's very right to occupy curricular space in those faculties is what is contested, prior to any question of how well-resourced its teaching might be. This distinction matters for curriculum reform strategy, since a framing problem is addressed by resourcing existing curricular territory more adequately, while a classification problem requires the kind of field-level institutional endorsement this paper's second proposition, below, identifies as the binding constraint.

Institutional capability constraints on climate-relevant university programming

Obiora et al.'s (2013) related study of university ca-

pabilities in achieving Nigeria's agricultural transformation agenda, examining climate change-related teaching and research capacity specifically, identified funding and manpower factors (with a factor loading of 0.657), organizational factors (0.575), and weak policy factors (0.565) as the principal constraints on Nigerian universities' capacity to develop climate change-related teaching and research programming. The study's recommendation — that the federal government provide adequate funding for climate change teaching and research capacity, alongside regular in-service training for academic staff — reinforces this paper's Bourdieusian argument that curricular marginality is substantially a resource and institutional-capital problem, not solely a matter of individual faculty awareness or willingness.

It is worth being precise about what this evidence does, and does not, establish for Rivers State University specifically. Both studies examine university agriculture faculties in southeast Nigeria, not Rivers State University directly, and not disciplines beyond agriculture. This paper's claim is not that these findings have been demonstrated to hold at Rivers State University across all disciplines — that would overstate the existing evidence — but that the same underlying capacity, funding, and disciplinary-boundary dynamics these studies document provide strong reason to expect a comparable, or more pronounced, pattern in disciplines further from climate change's traditional disciplinary home than agriculture already is.

Nigeria-wide and tertiary-level evidence beyond agriculture

Two further sources extend this paper's evidence base beyond the agriculture-faculty-specific studies discussed above, in ways that more directly support this paper's cross-disciplinary argument. Amanchukwu et al.'s (2015) review of climate change education in Nigeria, published in the peer-reviewed journal Edu-

cation, examined curriculum content nationally rather than within a single discipline, and concluded that the Nigerian formal education curriculum does not sufficiently expose learners to the substance of climate change, notwithstanding Nigeria's own Building Nigeria's Response to Climate Change policy framework. This finding is significant for this paper's argument because it establishes that the curricular marginality this paper is concerned with is not confined to agriculture faculties specifically, but reflects a broader, national pattern in Nigerian education generally, of which university-level disciplinary boundaries are one specific instance.

More directly still, Ajayi et al.'s (2025) recent mixed-methods study, examining climate change education specifically across Nigerian tertiary institutions — universities, polytechnics, and colleges of education — through surveys and interviews with 213 participants including students, faculty, and administrators, found that while general awareness of climate change was present across the sample, significant gaps in knowledge and engagement persisted. Published as part of an international volume on university climate change education and research, this study is, to date, the most direct and current confirmed evidence available on climate change education specifically at the Nigerian tertiary level, spanning institution types and, implicitly, a broader range of disciplines than the agriculture-faculty-specific studies discussed above. Its finding of a persistent knowledge and engagement gap, even amid general awareness, is directly consistent with this paper's Bourdieusian argument that awareness alone, without institutional resource allocation and cross-disciplinary curricular authority, is insufficient to produce genuine curricular embedding.

A useful international comparator, illustrating what successful cross-disciplinary integration outside a subject's traditional disciplinary home can look like in practice, comes from Ogunseitan's (2022) account of integrating climate change content across the health

sciences — nursing, medicine, pharmacy, and public health — at the University of California, Irvine. Following a systemwide initiative and two faculty workshops exploring curriculum integration models, the study found that models of integration which minimized disruption to the existing sequence of topics in pre-existing courses were preferentially adopted by faculty, a finding that maps directly onto Rogers's (2003) compatibility principle within the diffusion of innovations framework: innovations perceived as compatible with existing practice diffuse more readily than those requiring wholesale restructuring. This is not a Nigerian study, and this paper does not claim its specific findings transfer unmodified to Rivers State University's law, business, or humanities faculties; but it demonstrates, in a discipline cluster with no more inherent claim to climate change content than law or business administration have, that successful cross-disciplinary integration is achievable when curriculum designers work with, rather than against, existing disciplinary structures — a design principle this paper's propositions and recommendations, below, apply directly to the Rivers State University context.

A direct precedent from social work curriculum: the ecosocial work model

The most directly relevant comparator available to this paper, given its own disciplinary standpoint, comes not from health sciences or agriculture but from social work curriculum itself. Tadesse and Obeng's (2023) analysis, published in the *African Journal of Social Work*, is built on a systematic review of Bachelor of Social Work curricula across twelve universities in four African countries, undertaken specifically to determine the extent to which ecosocial content — environmental and climate-related material integrated into social work training — was addressed. The review's finding was direct and, for this paper's argument, significant: an ecosocial approach was found

to be absent from the reviewed curricula. In response, the authors developed and propose a specific ecosocial work course model intended for adoption within African undergraduate social work programmes, addressing precisely the curricular gap their review documented.

This finding is of particular significance for this paper's argument because it demonstrates that the curricular marginality this paper has documented for climate change content generally extends, specifically and empirically, to social work itself — the disciplinary home of this paper's own authorship and of Rivers State University's Department of Social Work. This paper's broader argument for cross-disciplinary curricular integration is not, on this evidence, a call directed outward at other disciplines while social work's own curriculum remains assumed adequate; Tadesse and Obeng's twelve-university review indicates that Nigerian and African social work curricula generally, absent evidence to the contrary, are as likely to exhibit the same climate curricular gap this paper documents in law, business, and the humanities. Tadesse and Obeng's proposed ecosocial work course model, moreover, offers Rivers State University's own Department of Social Work a directly available, discipline-appropriate template that could be reviewed and adapted for local curricular integration well ahead of the more extended cross-disciplinary reform process this paper's propositions address for other faculties, since it requires no cross-departmental negotiation of the kind this paper's Bourdieusian analysis identifies as the binding constraint elsewhere.

4.0 CONCEPTUAL PROPOSITIONS

Building on the framework and evidence above, this paper advances the following propositions as a structured agenda for future empirical investigation and curriculum reform at Rivers State University. These are offered as testable propositions, not as established

findings.

- **Proposition 1.** Consistent with Ozioko et al.'s (2015) findings and with Ajayi et al.'s (2025) tertiary-level, multi-institution evidence of persistent knowledge and engagement gaps despite general climate change awareness, climate change content at Rivers State University, where it currently exists, will be found concentrated in agriculture, environmental science, and geography programmes specifically, with minimal or no curricular presence in law, business administration, education, the humanities, and social work programmes, reflecting both the disciplinary boundary pattern documented in the southeast Nigerian agriculture faculties literature and the broader national pattern Amanchukwu et al. (2015) identified.
- **Proposition 2.** Following Bourdieu's field theory, successful cross-disciplinary embedding of climate change content at Rivers State University will depend more heavily on cross-departmental resource sharing and institutional endorsement from central university leadership than on the individual motivation of faculty members within non-environmental disciplines, since the binding constraint is the distribution of academic capital and institutional authority across departments, not merely individual awareness or willingness.
- **Proposition 3.** Consistent with Rogers's (2003) diffusion of innovations framework and with Ogunseitan's (2022) documented finding that curriculum integration models minimizing disruption to existing course sequences were preferentially adopted by health sciences faculty at the University of California, Irvine, curricular integration of climate change content across Rivers State University's non-environmental disciplines will follow the standard adoption-category distribution, with an initial small cohort of innovator and early-adopter faculty and departments integrating climate content well ahead of the university-wide early and late majority, and the pace of wider adoption will depend measurably on the perceived compatibility of climate content with each discipline's existing curricular structure — favouring integration strategies that embed climate content within existing courses over strategies requiring the creation of entirely new standalone modules.
- **Proposition 4.** Following Mezirow's (1991) transformative learning framework, climate change curricular content designed around disorienting, perspective-shifting pedagogical experiences — case studies requiring students to reconceive their own discipline's assumptions in light of climate impacts, rather than supplementary factual content appended to existing syllabi — will produce measurably deeper engagement with UNESCO's (2017) eight sustainability competencies than climate content delivered as conventional lecture-based information transfer, consistent with Ozioko et al.'s (2015) finding that existing Nigerian climate change teaching relies heavily on lecture-based rather than experiential methods.
- **Proposition 5.** Given Obiora et al.'s (2013) identification of funding and organizational factors as the principal constraints on Nigerian universities' climate-relevant teaching capacity, Rivers State University's success in embedding climate change content beyond its traditional disciplinary home will depend more heavily on securing dedicated institutional funding and organizational support for cross-disciplinary curriculum development than on any additional awareness-raising activity directed at individual faculty members.

5.0 DISCUSSION AND CURRICULUM IMPLICATIONS

These propositions, if borne out through the empirical research this paper calls for, carry several concrete

implications for curriculum reform at Rivers State University.

First, moving climate change education from curricular periphery to curricular core will require institutional endorsement and resource allocation from central university leadership, not merely encouragement directed at individual faculty members in non-environmental disciplines, consistent with this paper's Bourdieusian analysis. A cross-disciplinary climate change curriculum working group, convened with genuine authority and dedicated funding from the university's central administration, is more likely to succeed than a series of individual departmental initiatives left to develop independently.

Second, curriculum designers should apply Rogers's diffusion framework deliberately, identifying likely innovator and early-adopter faculty across non-environmental disciplines — individual academics already personally engaged with climate change issues, even without institutional mandate — and resourcing their curricular experimentation first, using their resulting course materials and outcomes as the demonstration and observability mechanism Rogers's framework identifies as critical for subsequent adoption by the wider faculty. Following Ogunseitan's (2022) documented experience integrating climate content into health sciences curricula, this experimentation should prioritize integration models that embed climate content within existing courses and their existing topic sequence, rather than models requiring the creation of new standalone modules, since compatibility with existing structure was the specific factor that determined which integration models health sciences faculty actually sustained beyond initial adoption.

Third, climate change curricular content designed for non-environmental disciplines should be built around Mezirow's transformative learning framework specifically, using discipline-relevant disorienting case studies rather than generic climate science content,

and should be explicitly mapped against UNESCO's eight sustainability competencies to ensure the content aims at competency development, not merely information transfer, addressing the lecture-dominant delivery pattern Ozioko et al. (2015) documented as a limitation in existing Nigerian climate change teaching. This recommendation is consistent with Monroe et al.'s (2019) systematic review of climate change education research, which identified active, engaging teaching methods, rather than passive information transfer, as one of the strategies most consistently associated with effective climate change education.

Fourth, given the documented funding and organizational constraints Obiora et al. (2013) identify, Rivers State University should pursue dedicated external funding specifically earmarked for cross-disciplinary climate change curriculum development, rather than expecting this work to be absorbed within existing departmental budgets already constrained, as the wider Nigerian literature documents, even within climate change's traditional disciplinary home in agriculture.

6.0 LIMITATIONS

This paper is conceptual and theoretical. It synthesizes established educational, sociological, and diffusion theory with confirmed evidence — Ozioko et al. (2015), Obiora et al. (2013), Amanchukwu et al. (2015), Ajayi et al. (2025), and Ogunseitan (2022) — to advance propositions for future testing; it does not report new primary data collection at Rivers State University. The evidence base assembled here now spans agriculture-faculty-specific capacity studies, a national Nigerian curriculum review, a recent multi-institution Nigerian tertiary study, and an international cross-disciplinary integration case study, providing considerably broader coverage than agriculture-faculty evidence alone. Even so, no study directly examining curricular content and capacity across Rivers State University's full range of faculties specifically

is known to exist at the time of writing, and the inference this paper draws to Rivers State University's non-environmental disciplines, while reasonable given the underlying capacity and disciplinary-boundary dynamics this broader evidence base documents, remains to be empirically confirmed through an institution-wide curriculum audit. This remains the most valuable immediate next step for testing this paper's propositions directly.

7.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper has argued that climate change education's peripheral status in Nigerian university curricula, including at Rivers State University, reflects identifiable dynamics of academic field structure, curricular innovation diffusion, and pedagogical design, rather than a simple, correctable deficit of awareness. Mezirow's transformative learning theory, Bourdieu's field theory and concept of academic capital, UNESCO's sustainability competencies framework, and Rogers's diffusion of innovations theory together provide a framework for understanding this peripheral status and for designing a deliberate strategy to change it, grounded in confirmed Nigerian evidence on the specific capacity and content constraints climate change teaching currently faces even within its traditional disciplinary home.

On the basis of the analysis above, this paper recommends that:

- Rivers State University's central administration convene and resource a cross-disciplinary climate change curriculum working group with genuine institutional authority, rather than leaving cross-disciplinary integration to individual departmental initiative;
- Curriculum designers identify and resource likely innovator and early-adopter faculty across

non-environmental disciplines first, using Rogers's diffusion framework to structure a deliberate adoption strategy;

- Climate change curricular content for non-environmental disciplines be designed around discipline-specific transformative case studies, explicitly mapped against UNESCO's eight sustainability competencies, rather than generic information transfer;
- The university pursue dedicated external funding earmarked specifically for cross-disciplinary climate change curriculum development, given the documented funding constraints affecting climate change teaching capacity even within Nigerian agriculture faculties; and
- Rivers State University's own Department of Social Work review and adapt Tadesse and Obeng's (2023) ecosocial work course model as an immediate, discipline-internal starting point, requiring no cross-departmental negotiation, ahead of and in parallel with the broader cross-disciplinary reform process this paper's other recommendations address.

A university that treats climate change curricular integration as a field-level, resource-dependent institutional change process, rather than an awareness problem to be solved through appeals to individual faculty goodwill, is better positioned to move climate change education from the periphery of its curriculum to its core. The evidence assembled in this paper — from agriculture-faculty-specific Nigerian capacity studies, a national Nigerian curriculum review, a current 213-participant tertiary-level Nigerian study, and an international demonstration of what successful cross-disciplinary integration looks like when designed around compatibility with existing structures — converges on a consistent diagnosis: Nigerian climate change education's peripheral status is a documented, multi-scale pattern, not a problem specific to

any single faculty or institution, and the tools available to address it are neither untested nor exotic, but grounded in established theory and a growing, genuinely applicable evidence base.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The author has no conflicts of interest to declare. Please ensure every paper has this just before the reference list.

REFERENCES

- Ajayi, B., Muraina, I., Elegbede, I., Ajagbe, T., Adeleke, I., & Rahman, M. (2025). Climate change education in Nigerian tertiary institutions: Current initiatives and future directions. In W. Leal Filho, M. Sima, A. Lange Salvia, M. Kovaleva, & E. Manolas (Eds.), *University initiatives on climate change education and research*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-25960-9_139-1
- Amanchukwu, R. N., Amadi-Ali, T., & Ololube, N. P. (2015). Climate change education in Nigeria: The role of curriculum review. *Education*, 5(3), 71–79. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.edu.20150503.01>
- Bernstein, B. (1975). *Class, codes and control: Volume 3, towards a theory of educational transmissions*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus* (P. Collier, Trans.). Polity Press.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- Monroe, M. C., Plate, R. R., Oxarart, A., Bowers, A., & Chaves, W. A. (2019). Identifying effective climate change education strategies: A systematic review of the research. *Environmental Education Research*, 25(6), 791–812. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2017.1360842>
- Obiora, C. J., Madukwe, M. C., & Matthews-Njoku, E. C. (2013). Capabilities of universities in achieving the agricultural transformation agenda in Nigeria: Evidence from climate change study in southeast, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 17(1), 135–141. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jae.v17i1.13>
- Ogunseitán, O. A. (2022). Broad spectrum integration of climate change in health sciences curricula. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10, Article 954025. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.954025>
- Ozioko, R. I., Dimelu, M. U., & Madukwe, M. C. (2015). Capacity for teaching climate change adaptation in the university faculties of agriculture in south east Nigeria. *Agro-Science*, 12(1), 48–58. <https://doi.org/10.4314/as.v12i1.6>
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- Tadesse, M. E., & Obeng, J. K. (2023). An ecosocial work model for social work education in Africa. *African Journal of Social Work*, 13(2), 57–69. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ajsw.v13i2.2>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2017). *Education for sustainable development goals: Learning objectives*. UNESCO.



**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
SOCIAL WORK AND DEVELOPMENT
STUDIES**



International Journal of Social Work and Development Studies (IJSWDS)



PUBLISHED BY PARAKLETUS PUBLISHING

**CONTACT THE UNIVERSITY @
dsw@ust.edu.ng**

