Exploring Interdisciplinary Research in Humanities and Sustainable Innovation: Theoretical Models, Methodological Frameworks, and Policy-Oriented Applications for Societal Transformation

Joshua Alan Brooks
Wildlife Research Center, Colorado State University, USA

* Corresponding Author: **Joshua Alan Brooks**

Article Info

E-ISSN: 3107-7129
Impact Factor (RSIF): 8.29
Volume: 02
Issue: 02
March-April 2026
Received: 29-12-2025
Accepted: 31-01-2026
Published: 06-03-2026
Page No: 32-39

Abstract
The integration of humanities perspectives into sustainable innovation research represents a critical advancement in addressing complex global challenges through culturally grounded, ethically informed approaches. This article reviews the evolution of sustainability discourse within humanities and social sciences scholarship, examining how interdisciplinary theoretical models and methodological frameworks are reshaping both academic understanding and practical applications for societal transformation. Drawing on sustainability ethics, social innovation theory, institutional governance perspectives, and socio-technical transition models, the analysis synthesizes contributions from multiple disciplines to propose integrated pathways for sustainable development. The review examines applications across three interconnected domains: policy and governance systems, urban planning and sustainable development, and education and socio-technical systems. Through critical analysis of participatory research methodologies, mixed-method approaches, and comparative global sustainability research, the article identifies both achievements and persistent challenges in humanities-based sustainability scholarship. Key findings emphasize the necessity of embedding cultural narratives, ethical considerations, and institutional contexts within innovation processes to achieve durable and equitable outcomes. The article concludes that interdisciplinary humanities perspectives provide essential interpretive frameworks for understanding resistance to change, enabling more nuanced policy design, and fostering the cultural shifts necessary for long-term sustainability transitions. Future research directions emphasize methodological pluralism, deeper integration of qualitative insights into policy frameworks, and sustained attention to ethical and cultural complexities in global sustainability governance.

Keywords: Interdisciplinary Research, Sustainable Innovation, Humanities Methodologies, Policy Frameworks, Socio-Technical Transitions, Societal Transformation

1. Introduction

The discourse surrounding sustainability has undergone profound transformation since the Brundtland Commission articulated development that "meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" [1]. Initially dominated by technological solutionism and economic optimization, sustainability scholarship has progressively incorporated insights from humanities disciplines, recognizing that environmental and social challenges are fundamentally intertwined with questions of values, culture, ethics, and meaning-making [2]. This evolution reflects a growing

awareness that technical fixes alone cannot address the complex, adaptive challenges of sustainability without accompanying shifts in cultural narratives, institutional practices, and governance arrangements.

Innovation, traditionally conceptualized as technological novelty or market introduction, requires reconceptualization as a socio-cultural and institutional phenomenon embedded in specific historical, cultural, and political contexts [3]. This reframing has profound implications for how sustainability transitions are understood and governed. Rather than viewing innovation as the linear application of scientific knowledge to practical problems, humanities perspectives emphasize the co-evolution of technology and society, the cultural meanings attached to new practices, and the institutional conditions that enable or constrain transformative change [4].

The importance of interdisciplinary integration in sustainability research stems from the multi-dimensional nature of contemporary challenges. Climate change, biodiversity loss, social inequality, and resource depletion cannot be adequately addressed within single disciplinary frameworks [5]. They require approaches that combine insights from natural sciences about biophysical processes, social sciences about institutional dynamics, and humanities about cultural meanings and ethical values. This integration is not merely additive but transformative, generating new questions, methods, and forms of understanding that would not emerge from disciplinary silos.

This article aims to synthesize current scholarship on interdisciplinary research in humanities and sustainable innovation, examining both theoretical models and practical applications across policy, governance, urban development, education, and socio-technical systems. The scope encompasses methodological frameworks that bridge humanities, social sciences, policy studies, and governance theory, with particular attention to how these approaches inform societal transformation. By adopting a comparative global perspective, the review identifies patterns of convergence and divergence in how different societies conceptualize and implement sustainability innovations, while attending to the ethical and cultural complexities that shape transition pathways toward sustainable global transformation.

2. Conceptual Frameworks and Methodological Approaches

2.1. Theoretical Models in Humanities and Sustainability Sustainability Ethics

The ethical dimensions of sustainability transitions have received sustained attention from philosophical and humanities scholarship. Environmental ethics examines questions concerning the moral status of non-human nature, the grounds of obligations to future generations, and the principles that should guide human relationships with the natural world [6]. These inquiries provide normative foundations for sustainability policy, challenging assumptions that ethical questions can be reduced to technical optimization or preference aggregation.

Climate ethics addresses the distinctive ethical challenges posed by climate change: its global scope, intergenerational dimensions, and profound uncertainties [7]. Scholars in this tradition examine questions of responsibility for historical emissions, principles for burden-sharing in mitigation and adaptation, and the ethical implications of technological responses. These analyses reveal that seemingly technical policy choices embody normative commitments that require explicit ethical justification.

Development ethics contributes frameworks for evaluating alternative pathways to sustainable development, attending to questions of human flourishing, distributional equity, and cultural appropriateness [8]. Drawing on capabilities approaches and human development theory, this scholarship emphasizes that sustainability must be assessed not merely in terms of biophysical indicators but in relation to substantive human freedoms and opportunities.

2.1.2. Social Innovation Theory

Social innovation theory provides conceptual resources for understanding innovation processes that explicitly address social needs and relationships. Unlike technological innovation, which focuses on novel artifacts or processes, social innovation emphasizes new ways of organizing social relations, meeting human needs, and addressing societal challenges [9]. This framework is particularly valuable for sustainability scholarship because it attends explicitly to the social and cultural dimensions of transformation.

The concept of social innovation encompasses diverse phenomena: new organizational forms, participatory governance arrangements, alternative economic practices, and community-based initiatives [10]. Common across these manifestations is an emphasis on social relationships, collective action, and the empowerment of marginalized groups. For sustainability transitions, social innovation offers pathways that complement and sometimes substitute for technological approaches, addressing the social and institutional dimensions of change.

Critical perspectives on social innovation caution against depoliticized accounts that ignore power relations and structural inequalities [11]. Attending to these dimensions requires analysis of who benefits from innovation, whose interests are served, and how innovation processes might reproduce or challenge existing patterns of advantage and disadvantage.

2.1.2. Institutional and Governance Perspectives

Institutional theory provides frameworks for understanding how rules, norms, and practices shape sustainability outcomes. Drawing on sociological institutionalism, historical institutionalism, and rational choice approaches, this scholarship examines how institutional arrangements enable or constrain sustainable innovation [12]. Key insights include the path-dependent nature of institutional development, the role of institutional entrepreneurs in promoting change, and the conditions under which institutional transformation occurs.

Governance perspectives on sustainability have evolved from hierarchical state-centered approaches toward more distributed arrangements involving multiple actors and levels. Multi-level governance frameworks examine interactions across local, regional, national, and global scales, attending to how decisions at one level enable or constrain possibilities at others [13]. Adaptive governance approaches emphasize learning, flexibility, and stakeholder participation in the face of uncertainty and complexity [14].

Table 1: Major Theoretical Frameworks in Interdisciplinary Humanities-Based Sustainable Innovation

Framework	Core Principles	Key Contributors	Application Domains	Societal Relevance
Environmental Ethics	Moral status of nature; intergenerational justice; intrinsic value	Leopold, Naess, Rolston	Conservation policy; resource management	Provides normative foundations for sustainability governance
Climate Ethics	Responsibility for emissions; burden-sharing; justice dimensions	Gardiner, Caney, Shue	Climate policy; international negotiations	Addresses equity in global climate action
Development Ethics	Human flourishing; capabilities; distributional equity	Sen, Nussbaum, Drydyk	Development policy; poverty reduction	Ensures sustainability serves human wellbeing
Social Innovation Theory	Social relationships; collective action; empowerment	Moulaert, Mulgan, Nicholls	Community development; social economy	Emphasizes cultural and social dimensions of transformation
Institutional Theory	Rules, norms, practices; path dependence; institutional change	Scott, Powell, DiMaggio	Policy design; organizational change	Analyzes how institutions shape sustainability outcomes
Adaptive Governance	Learning; flexibility; stakeholder participation	Folke, Dietz, Ostrom	Natural resource management; climate adaptation	Enables governance under uncertainty

2.2. Frameworks for Innovation Adoption and Assessment

2.2.1. Socio-Technical Transition Models

The Multi-Level Perspective (MLP) on socio-technical transitions has emerged as a particularly influential framework for analyzing systemic change [15]. The MLP distinguishes between three analytical levels: niches where radical innovations emerge protected from mainstream selection pressures; regimes representing the dominant configurations of technology, policy, culture, and practice; and landscapes comprising the broader exogenous environment. Transitions occur when developments at multiple levels align, creating windows of opportunity for regime change.

This framework is valuable for interdisciplinary humanities research because it explicitly incorporates cultural and institutional dimensions alongside technological factors. Regimes are understood not merely as technical configurations but as alignments of rules, practices, and meanings shared across social groups [16]. Niches, similarly, are not simply technological experiments but protected spaces where alternative cultural meanings and social practices can develop alongside new technologies.

Strategic Niche Management extends the MLP framework by examining how niches can be deliberately nurtured to enable broader transitions [17]. This approach emphasizes the importance of learning, expectation alignment, and network building in creating conditions for niche innovations to challenge and transform incumbent regimes.

2.2.2. Diffusion of Innovation Theory

Classic diffusion of innovation theory, originating with Rogers, examines how innovations spread through social systems over time [18]. Key insights include the role of communication channels, social networks, and adopter characteristics in shaping diffusion trajectories. Adopter categories—innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, laggards—reflect different dispositions toward novelty and different positions within social structures.

Extensions of diffusion theory have attended more closely to the cultural and institutional contexts that shape adoption decisions. Recent work emphasizes that diffusion is not merely a communication process but involves the co-evolution of innovations with their environments, including institutional adaptation and cultural accommodation [19]. This perspective aligns with humanities approaches by recognizing that adoption involves meaning-making and identity work, not merely rational calculation.

2.2.3. Policy-Driven Innovation Systems

Innovation systems approaches have been extended to analyze the policy contexts that shape innovation trajectories. The concept of policy mixes recognizes that innovation outcomes are influenced not by single policies but by combinations of instruments operating across multiple levels and domains [20]. Effective policy mixes achieve consistency (instruments work together rather than at cross-purposes), coherence (instruments align with policy goals), and credibility (commitments are durable and credible).

Mission-oriented innovation policy represents a significant evolution in thinking about the role of government in directing innovation toward societal challenges [21]. Drawing on historical examples such as the Apollo program, this approach argues that well-designed missions can mobilize innovation across sectors and disciplines to address defined problems. Sustainability challenges, with their complexity and urgency, are prime candidates for mission-oriented approaches.

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of Sustainable Innovation Models across Governance and Societal Contexts

Model	Governance Level	Stakeholders	Innovation Mechanism	Long-Term Impact
Multi-Level Perspective	Multiple (niche to landscape)	Firms, policymakers, users, civil society	Alignment of developments across levels	Fundamental regime transformation
Strategic Niche Management	Local/niche	Entrepreneurs, activists, early adopters	Protected experimentation; learning	Creation of alternative pathways
Technological Innovation Systems	National/regional	Industry, research, government, finance	System building; functional strengthening	Sectoral innovation capacity
Diffusion of Innovation	Social networks	Adopters, opinion leaders	Communication; social influence	Technology and practice spread
Policy Mixes	Multiple (policy domains)	Government agencies, regulated actors	Instrument combinations; policy coordination	Policy coherence and effectiveness
Mission-Oriented Innovation	National/supranational	Government, industry, research	Directed innovation toward societal goals	Targeted challenge resolution

2.3 Emerging Interdisciplinary Methodologies

2.3.1. Participatory and Community-Based Research

The recognition that sustainability challenges involve multiple stakeholders with diverse perspectives has driven methodological innovation toward participatory and community-based approaches. Participatory action research engages communities as co-researchers in sustainability projects, combining knowledge production with social change objectives [22]. These approaches are particularly valuable for ensuring that sustainability interventions are culturally appropriate and responsive to local needs and aspirations.

Community-based participatory research extends participatory principles to the design and implementation of research projects, emphasizing collaborative partnerships between academic researchers and community members [23]. For sustainability transitions, these methodologies offer pathways to develop solutions that are not only technically sound but also socially acceptable and contextually appropriate.

2.3.2. Mixed-Method Approaches

Mixed-method research designs combine quantitative and qualitative approaches to address the multi-dimensional nature of sustainability challenges [24]. Quantitative methods provide breadth, enabling identification of patterns and testing of hypotheses across cases. Qualitative methods provide depth, enabling understanding of processes, meanings, and contexts. Their combination enables research that is both generalizable and contextually sensitive.

Integration of methods raises epistemological challenges, requiring attention to how different knowledge claims are warranted and how they can be combined without contradiction. Pragmatic approaches emphasize that methodological choices should be guided by research questions rather than prior commitments, enabling flexible combinations adapted to specific inquiries [25].

2.3.3. Comparative Global Sustainability Research

Comparative research across cultural and institutional contexts is essential for understanding how sustainability transitions are shaped by local conditions. Comparative case study designs enable identification of both general patterns and context-specific factors that influence transition trajectories [26]. Careful case selection, attention to comparability, and systematic analysis of similarities and differences enable learning across contexts while respecting particularity.

Postcolonial and decolonial perspectives critique comparative approaches that impose Western categories and assumptions on non-Western contexts [27]. These critiques emphasize the importance of attending to diverse knowledge systems, alternative ontologies, and the historical legacies of colonialism that continue to shape sustainability challenges and responses.

Indigenous and local knowledge systems offer alternative frameworks for understanding human-environment relationships, often embodying sustainable practices developed over generations [28]. Integrating these knowledge systems into sustainability research requires methodologies that respect their integrity and the rights of knowledge-holders, moving beyond extraction toward genuine collaboration and mutual learning.

Table 3: Methodological Approaches in Humanities and Sustainable Innovation Research

Methodology	Research Design	Strengths	Limitations	Suitable Application Contexts
Participatory Action Research	Collaborative inquiry; action orientation	Empowers communities; local knowledge integration; practical relevance	Role conflicts; quality criteria; scalability	Community development; indigenous research
Community-Based Participatory Research	Academic-community partnerships	Mutual learning; culturally appropriate; sustainable outcomes	Time intensive; power dynamics	Health; environmental justice; urban planning
Mixed-Methods Research	Integration of quantitative and qualitative	Combines breadth and depth; triangulation	Integration challenges; resource demands	Complex sustainability assessments
Comparative Case Studies	Systematic comparison across contexts	Contextual understanding; pattern identification	Limited generalizability	Cross-national research; policy learning
Ethnographic Methods	Long-term engagement; participant observation	Deep contextual understanding; emic perspectives	Limited scope; time intensive	Community studies; organizational culture
Discourse Analysis	Analysis of texts, talk, and representations	Reveals assumptions and power relations; cultural meanings	May neglect material dimensions	Policy analysis; media studies

3. Applications and Case Studies

3.1. Policy and Governance Systems

3.1.1. Public Sector Innovation

The integration of humanities perspectives into public sector innovation has yielded new approaches to policy design and service delivery. Behavioral insights, drawing on psychology and behavioral economics, have informed policy interventions that nudge individuals toward more sustainable choices while preserving freedom of choice [29]. These approaches recognize that policy effectiveness depends on understanding actual human decision-making rather than assuming rational actors.

Cultural considerations in policy design extend beyond behavioral insights to address questions of meaning, identity, and value. Policies that ignore cultural contexts often face resistance or produce unintended consequences, regardless of their technical sophistication. Humanities scholarship contributes to understanding these dynamics and designing policy processes that attend to cultural dimensions [30].

Narrative approaches to policy recognize that stories and framing shape how problems are understood and what solutions appear plausible. Competing narratives about climate change, for example, construct different problem definitions, attribute responsibility differently, and imply different policy responses [31]. Attending to narrative dynamics is essential for understanding policy debates and designing communications that resonate with diverse audiences.

3.1.2. Institutional Transformation

Institutional transformation for sustainability involves redesigning rules, practices, and organizations to align with sustainability objectives. This may involve creating new institutions, such as climate councils or sustainability commissions, or transforming existing ones through changes in mandates, procedures, or cultures [32].

The concept of institutional work examines how actors create, maintain, or disrupt institutions through their purposive actions [33]. This perspective is valuable for understanding how institutional change for sustainability actually occurs, attending to the agency of diverse actors in shaping institutional arrangements. It also highlights the challenges of institutional change, including resistance from those invested in existing arrangements and the unintended consequences of reform efforts.

3.2 Urban Planning and Sustainable Development

3.2.1. Cultural Sustainability

Cultural sustainability has emerged as a distinct dimension of sustainable development, attending to the preservation and flourishing of cultural heritage, diversity, and expression [34]. In urban contexts, cultural sustainability involves protecting historic fabric, supporting cultural practices and communities, and ensuring that development respects and enhances cultural identity.

Heritage conservation and sustainable development, often framed as conflicting objectives, can be productively integrated through approaches that recognize cultural heritage as a resource for sustainability rather than an obstacle to change. Historic preservation, adaptive reuse of buildings, and maintenance of cultural landscapes contribute to sustainability by conserving embodied energy, maintaining cultural continuity, and supporting community identity [35].

Cultural quarters and creative city strategies represent attempts to harness culture for urban regeneration and development. Critical assessments examine whether these strategies benefit existing communities or primarily serve elite interests, and whether they support authentic cultural expression or produce commodified spectacle [36].

3.2.2. Community-Centered Innovation

Community-centered development approaches emphasize local participation, control, and benefit in innovation processes. These approaches recognize that sustainability cannot be imposed from above but must be built through engagement with communities who will live with its consequences [37].

Asset-based community development starts from existing community strengths rather than deficits, identifying and mobilizing local assets—skills, relationships, institutions, physical resources—as foundations for development [38]. This approach aligns with sustainability principles by emphasizing local resources, reducing dependence on external inputs, and building community capacity.

Co-housing and collaborative housing models represent community-centered approaches to sustainable urban development, creating intentional communities that share resources, reduce environmental footprints, and build social connections [39]. These models demonstrate how social innovation can enable more sustainable ways of living while addressing social needs for community and belonging.

3.3 Education, Culture, and Socio-Technical Systems

3.3.1. Sustainability Education Reform

Education for sustainable development has evolved from transmitting environmental knowledge toward fostering the competencies, values, and motivations necessary for active engagement with sustainability challenges [40]. This evolution reflects recognition that knowledge alone is insufficient to generate action; education must also address emotions, values, and capacities for collective action.

Competency frameworks for sustainability education identify key capabilities including systems thinking, anticipatory competence, normative competence, and strategic competence [41]. These competencies integrate cognitive, affective, and volitional dimensions, preparing learners to address complex sustainability challenges that have no simple solutions.

Place-based education connects learning to local environments and communities, grounding sustainability education in specific contexts where students can observe, experience, and act [42]. This approach counters the abstraction that can make sustainability seem remote and irrelevant, demonstrating its local manifestations and possibilities for action.

3.3.2. Digital Transformation and Knowledge Societies

Digital technologies are reshaping knowledge production, dissemination, and application, with profound implications for sustainability and culture. Open access publishing, citizen science platforms, and online learning resources democratize access to knowledge while raising questions about quality, equity, and the digital divide [43].

Smart city initiatives deploy digital technologies to manage urban systems more efficiently, promising sustainability

gains through optimized resource use. Critical humanities scholarship examines whether these benefits are equitably distributed, whether surveillance and control accompany efficiency gains, and whether technological solutions address underlying social and political causes of unsustainability [44]. Digital humanities approaches apply computational methods to humanities research, enabling new forms of analysis while raising questions about the transformation of humanistic inquiry [45]. For sustainability research, digital humanities methods enable analysis of large text corpora, visualization of cultural patterns, and new forms of public engagement.

4. Challenges and Future Research Directions

4.1. Methodological Limitations

Humanities-based sustainability research faces persistent challenges related to generalization, integration with quantitative approaches, and demonstrating impact. Qualitative methods produce rich contextual understanding but limit the ability to generalize across cases. Interdisciplinary integration requires navigating different epistemological assumptions and standards of evidence. Demonstrating policy and practical relevance remains challenging within evaluation frameworks oriented toward measurable outcomes.

Addressing these limitations requires methodological pluralism and the development of mixed-methods approaches that combine strengths of qualitative and quantitative traditions. It also requires building bridges between humanities scholarship and policy communities, translating interpretive insights into forms accessible to decision-makers without sacrificing complexity and nuance.

4.2. Institutional and Governance Barriers

Despite growing recognition of cultural and ethical dimensions, sustainability policy and governance remain dominated by technocratic approaches. Institutional barriers include disciplinary silos in academia, sectoral divisions in government, and evaluation frameworks that privilege quantitative indicators over qualitative insights.

Overcoming these barriers requires institutional innovations that bring humanities perspectives into policy processes. This includes research funding that supports interdisciplinary collaboration, governance arrangements that include cultural expertise alongside technical and economic analysis, and capacity building within policy communities to engage with humanities scholarship.

4.3. Ethical and Cultural Complexities

Sustainability transitions raise profound ethical questions about justice, responsibility, and the good life that cannot be resolved through technical means alone. Distributional questions concern who bears costs and enjoys benefits of transitions; procedural questions concern who participates in decisions about transition pathways; recognition questions concern whose values and knowledge systems are acknowledged.

Cultural complexities include questions of identity, meaning, and belonging. Sustainability transitions may threaten established ways of life and cultural identities, generating resistance that cannot be understood solely in terms of material interests. Attending to these dimensions requires approaches that take seriously emotional and existential dimensions of change.

4.4. Future Interdisciplinary Research Pathways

Future research should pursue deeper integration across humanities disciplines and between humanities and other knowledge domains. Promising directions include:

- Historical analysis of past transitions to inform understanding of contemporary challenges
- Philosophical work on values in transition processes and ethical dimensions of innovation
- Cultural analysis of narratives and imaginaries shaping sustainability discourse
- Methodological innovation in participatory and deliberative approaches
- Comparative research on cultural variation in sustainability pathways
- Integration of humanities insights into modeling and scenario development
- Examination of power relations in sustainability transitions
- Attention to diverse knowledge systems and decolonial approaches

5. Conclusion

This review has examined interdisciplinary research in humanities and sustainable innovation, focusing on theoretical models, methodological frameworks, and policy-oriented applications for societal transformation. The analysis demonstrates that humanities perspectives are not merely supplementary to technical and economic analyses but essential for understanding the cultural, ethical, and institutional dimensions of sustainability challenges.

Theoretical contributions include frameworks from sustainability ethics that provide normative foundations for policy; social innovation theory that emphasizes social and cultural dimensions of transformation; institutional and governance perspectives that analyze how rules and practices shape outcomes; and socio-technical transition models that capture the multi-dimensional nature of systemic change. These frameworks share attention to interplay between material, institutional, and cultural factors, recognizing that durable change requires alignment across multiple dimensions.

Methodological implications include the value of participatory and community-based approaches that engage stakeholders in knowledge production and decision-making; mixed-method designs that combine breadth and depth; comparative studies that enable learning across contexts while respecting particularity; and attention to narrative, meaning, and culture in sustainability research.

Policy and societal impact depends on translating humanities insights into practice through policy design, institutional innovation, and cultural engagement. The applications examined across governance, urban development, and education demonstrate both the potential and challenges of humanities-informed approaches, highlighting importance of stakeholder participation, attention to local context, and adaptive governance arrangements.

The vision for sustainable global transformation embraces methodological pluralism, sustained engagement with policy and practice communities, and commitment to addressing both technical challenges and deeper questions of meaning, value, and purpose. Interdisciplinary humanities perspectives have indispensable contributions to make to this endeavor,

ensuring that sustainability transitions serve human flourishing in all its diversity and complexity while respecting the more-than-human world on which all life depends.

References

1. World Commission on Environment and Development. Our Common Future. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1987.
2. Sörlin S. Environmental humanities: Why should biologists interested in the environment take the humanities seriously? BioScience. 2012;62(9):788-9.
3. Jasanoff S. The ethics of invention: Technology and the human future. New York: W.W. Norton; 2016.
4. Castree N. Making sense of nature. London: Routledge; 2014.
5. Jerneck A, Olsson L, Ness B, Anderberg S, Baier M, Clark E, *et al*. Structuring sustainability science. Sustain Sci. 2011;6(1):69-82.
6. Leopold A. A Sand County almanac. New York: Oxford University Press; 1949.
7. Gardiner SM. A perfect moral storm: The ethical tragedy of climate change. New York: Oxford University Press; 2011.
8. Sen A. Development as freedom. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1999.
9. Moulaert F, MacCallum D, Mehmood A, Hamdouch A, editors. The international handbook on social innovation: Collective action, social learning and transdisciplinary research. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar; 2013.
10. Nicholls A, Simon J, Gabriel M. Introduction: Dimensions of social innovation. In: Nicholls A, Simon J, Gabriel M, editors. New frontiers in social innovation research. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2015. p. 1-26.
11. Jessop B, Moulaert F, Hulgård L, Hamdouch A. Social innovation research: A new stage in innovation analysis? In: Moulaert F, MacCallum D, Mehmood A, Hamdouch A, editors. The international handbook on social innovation: Collective action, social learning and transdisciplinary research. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar; 2013. p. 110-30.
12. Scott WR. Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE; 2014.
13. Hooghe L, Marks G. Unraveling the central state, but how? Types of multi-level governance. Am Polit Sci Rev. 2003;97(2):233-43.
14. Dietz T, Ostrom E, Stern PC. The struggle to govern the commons. Science. 2003;302(5652):1907-12.
15. Geels FW. Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: A multi-level perspective and a case-study. Res Policy. 2002;31(8-9):1257-74.
16. Geels FW. From sectoral systems of innovation to socio-technical systems: Insights about dynamics and change from sociology and institutional theory. Res Policy. 2004;33(6-7):897-920.
17. Schot J, Geels FW. Strategic niche management and sustainable innovation journeys: Theory, findings, research agenda, and policy. Technol Anal Strateg Manag. 2008;20(5):537-54.
18. Rogers EM. Diffusion of innovations. 5th ed. New York: Free Press; 2003.
19. MacVaugh J, Schiavone F. Limits to the diffusion of innovation: A literature review and integrative model. Eur J Innov Manag. 2010;13(2):197-221.
20. Rogge KS, Reichardt K. Policy mixes for sustainability transitions: An extended concept and framework for analysis. Res Policy. 2016;45(8):1620-35.
21. Mazzucato M. Mission-oriented innovation policy: Challenges and opportunities. London: UCL Institute for Innovation and Public Purpose; 2017.
22. Reason P, Bradbury H, editors. The SAGE handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE; 2008.
23. Israel BA, Eng E, Schulz AJ, Parker EA, editors. Methods for community-based participatory research for health. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2013.
24. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. Designing and conducting mixed methods research. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE; 2017.
25. Morgan DL. Pragmatism as a paradigm for social research. Qual Inq. 2014;20(8):1045-53.
26. Ragin CC. The comparative method: Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies. Berkeley: University of California Press; 1987.
27. Mignolo WD. The darker side of Western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options. Durham: Duke University Press; 2011.
28. Berkes F. Sacred ecology. 4th ed. London: Routledge; 2018.
29. Thaler RH, Sunstein CR. Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness. New Haven: Yale University Press; 2008.
30. Hulme M. Why we disagree about climate change: Understanding controversy, inaction and opportunity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2009.
31. Hajer MA. The politics of environmental discourse: Ecological modernization and the policy process. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1995.
32. Young OR. The institutional dimensions of environmental change: Fit, interplay, and scale. Cambridge: MIT Press; 2002.
33. Lawrence TB, Suddaby R, Leca B, editors. Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2009.
34. Throsby D. Cultural sustainability. In: Towse R, editor. A handbook of cultural economics. 2nd ed. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar; 2011. p. 156-61.
35. Pendlebury J, Wang YW, Law A. Re-using 'uncomfortable heritage': The case of the 1933 building, Shanghai. Int J Herit Stud. 2018;24(3):211-29.
36. Evans G. Creative cities, creative spaces and urban policy. Urban Stud. 2009;46(5-6):1003-40.
37. Cornwall A. Unpacking 'participation': Models, meanings and practices. Community Dev J. 2008;43(3):269-83.
38. Kretzmann JP, McKnight JL. Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets. Chicago: ACTA Publications; 1993.
39. Tummers L. The re-emergence of self-managed co-housing in Europe: A critical review of co-housing research. Urban Stud. 2016;53(10):2023-40.

40. Wals AEJ. Mirroring, gestalts switching and transformative social learning: Stepping stones for developing sustainability competence. Int J Sustain High Educ. 2010;11(4):380-90.
41. Wiek A, Withycombe L, Redman CL. Key competencies in sustainability: A reference framework for academic program development. Sustain Sci. 2011;6(2):203-18.
42. Gruenewald DA. The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. Educ Res. 2003;32(4):3-12.
43. Borgman CL. Scholarship in the digital age: Information, infrastructure, and the Internet. Cambridge: MIT Press; 2007.
44. Kitchin R. The real-time city? Big data and smart urbanism. GeoJournal. 2014;79(1):1-14.
45. Burdick A, Drucker J, Lunenfeld P, Presner T, Schnapp J. Digital_Humanities. Cambridge: MIT Press; 2012.

How to Cite This Article
Brooks JA. Exploring interdisciplinary research in humanities and sustainable innovation: theoretical models, methodological frameworks, and policy-oriented applications for societal transformation. International Journal of Humanities and Sustainable Innovation. 2026;2(2):32–39.