

Intelligence Briefing

Cite this article: Marciniak G *et al.* (2024). Leveraging capacity for transformative sustainability science: a theory of change from the Future Earth Pathways Initiative. *Global Sustainability* 7, e21, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1017/sus.2024.19>

Received: 14 July 2023
Revised: 1 April 2024
Accepted: 8 April 2024






Keywords:

adaptation and mitigation; communication and education; policies; politics; and governance; social value

Corresponding author:

Sandrine Paillard;
Email: sandrine.paillard@futureearth.org

Leveraging capacity for transformative sustainability science: a theory of change from the Future Earth Pathways Initiative

Gilles Marciniak^{1,2} , Davnah Urbach^{1,3,4}, Flurina Schneider^{1,5,6,7},
Cornelia Krug^{1,8} , Ariane de Bremond^{1,9}, Mark Stafford-Smith^{1,10} ,
Odirilwe Selomane^{1,11,12} , Rebecca Fenn², Natalie Chong^{1,2} and
Sandrine Paillard^{1,2} 

¹Future Earth Pathways Initiative steering group member; ²CNRS, Future Earth, Paris, France; ³GMBA – Global Mountain Biodiversity Assessment, University of Bern, 3013 Bern, Switzerland; ⁴CIRM – Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherche sur la Montagne, University of Lausanne, 1010 Lausanne, Switzerland; ⁵ISOE – Institute for Social-Ecological Research, 60486 Frankfurt am Main, Germany; ⁶Faculty of Biological Sciences, Goethe University Frankfurt, Frankfurt am Main, Germany; ⁷Senckenberg Biodiversity & Climate Research Centre, 60325 Frankfurt/Main, Germany; ⁸bioDISCOVERY, University of Zürich, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland; ⁹GLP – Global Land Programme, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA; ¹⁰CSIRO Land & Water, PO Box 1700, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia; ¹¹Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development, University of Pretoria, Hatfield 0028, South Africa and ¹²PECS – Programme on Ecosystem Change and Society, University of Stellenbosch, Matieland, 7602 Stellenbosch, South Africa

Abstract

Non-technical summary. To address increasingly pressing social–environmental challenges, the transformative strand of sustainability science seeks to move beyond a descriptive-analytical stance in order to explore and contribute to the implementation of radical alternatives to dominant and unsustainable paradigms, norms, and values. However, in many cases, academia is not currently structured to support and reward inter-/trans-disciplinary and transformative endeavors. This paper introduces a theory of change for the Future Earth Pathways Initiative, and similar initiatives, to help leverage the capacity of sustainability scientists to engage in transformative research.

Technical summary. The increasing body of descriptive-analytical knowledge produced by sustainability science over the last two decades has largely failed to trigger the transformation of policies, norms, and behaviors it was aiming to inform. The emergent transformative strand of sustainability science is a proactive alternative approach seeking to play an active role in processes of societal change by developing knowledge about options, solutions, and pathways, and by participating in their implementation. In principle, scientists can enhance their contribution to more sustainable futures by engaging in transformative research. However, a lack of skills and competencies, relatively unmaturing transformative methods and concepts, and an institutional landscape still geared toward disciplinary and descriptive-analytical research, still hinders the sustainability science community from engaging more widely in transformative research. In this paper, the Future Earth Pathways Initiative introduces a theory of change (ToC) for increasing the capacity of sustainability scientists to engage in this type of research. This ToC ultimately aims to build a growing community of practitioners engaged in transformative research, to advance concepts, methods, and paradigms to foster ‘fit-for-purpose transformative research’, and to shape institutions to nurture transformative research-friendly contexts.

Social media summary. What would a theory of change for leveraging the transformative capacity of sustainability science look like?

1. Introduction

Humanity is facing multiple interlinked environmental, social, and political crises, including anthropogenic climate change, biodiversity loss, continued structural injustices, geopolitical threats, armed conflicts, and the rise of populism (Balvanera *et al.*, 2019; IPCC, 2022; Lockwood, 2018; Purvis *et al.*, 2019). These crises are rooted in highly unsustainable societal relations with nature, dominant economic and political logics based on a narrow set of values that both support and arise from power asymmetry and rising inequality (Balvanera *et al.*, 2019; Brand *et al.*, 2021; IPBES, 2022; Pascual *et al.*, 2023). Attempting to resolve these complex and deeply rooted sustainability challenges require transformative changes (Brand *et al.*, 2021; Chan *et al.*, 2019), that is, ‘a fundamental, system-wide reorganization across technological, economic and social factors, including paradigms, goals and values’ (Razzaque *et al.*,

© The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.



Box 1. Definition for transformative research

What is transformative research?

In this paper, we use Stirling's (2015, p. 1) definition for transformations as 'emergent and unruly political re-alignments, involving social and technological innovations driven by diversely incommensurable knowledges, challenging incumbent structures and pursuing contending (even unknown) ends'. Acknowledging that these transformations are not inherently virtuous, transformative sustainability science refers to the normative responsibility of academia to inform and accompany transformations supporting just and fair futures for people and nature. Transformative research is defined as the ensemble of methods and concepts enabling academics to take an active role in processes of societal change by developing knowledge about options, solutions, and pathways, and by participating in their implementation.

2019, p. 889). To inform and contribute to such fundamental societal transformations, sustainability science must embark on its own transformative journey, wherein scientists reflect and deliberate on the role of science in sustainable development, re-examining and transforming their own role, while taking action to augment the capabilities of the research community to engage in transformative research (see Box 1). In this paper, we propose a theory of change (ToC) for overcoming challenges that currently hinder the sustainability science community from engaging in transformative research, with the aim to support a growing community of practitioners.

2. Transformative sustainability science

2.1 The transformative gap in sustainability science

Nearly 25 years ago, Kates et al. (2001, p. 641) stated in their seminal paper that sustainability science seeks 'to focus research attention on both the fundamental character of interactions between nature and society and on society's capacity to guide those interactions along more sustainable trajectories'. Since then, most research efforts have focused on the 'descriptive-analytical' stream of sustainability science. Yet, considerable advances of knowledge in this stream over the last few decades have not triggered the necessary transformation of policies, norms, and behaviors to achieve and sustain acceptable living conditions for humans and nature. This raises fundamental questions about the role and responsibility of sustainability science in society, the type of knowledge it produces, and how this knowledge is developed and shared with others. As a response, the 'transformational' stream of sustainability science is now a growing focus of attention (Salomaa & Juhola, 2020; Wiek & Lang, 2016).

2.2 Addressing complex problems requires integrative and holistic approaches

Sustainability challenges are commonly recognized as 'wicked problems' (Davies et al., 2015; DeFries & Nagendra, 2017; Rittel & Webber, 1973) or more broadly as 'complex problems' (Sharpe et al., 2016). The interdependence and inherent unpredictability of the dynamics of socio-environmental systems at various scales mean that individual scientific disciplines cannot address alone such high levels of uncertainty and complexity. Interdisciplinary research is necessary to understand systemic interactions within coupled social-ecological systems (Liu et al., 2007) and between sometimes conflicting sustainability objectives

(Nilsson et al., 2016; Singh et al., 2018). 'Wide' interdisciplinarity – which refers to collaborations between fields that are conceptually diverse – is crucial in this regard (Kelly, 1996). Social sciences and the humanities play a key role in shaping the goals of societal transformation processes and formulating narratives and strategies to meet them (ibid.). In addition, social sciences contribute to a better understanding of how societies and governance bodies mobilize knowledge and shape policymaking (Urai & Kelly, 2023).

Beyond academic knowledge, tackling real-world challenges also requires contextualized and experiential knowledge. Co-development of knowledge with societal actors through transdisciplinary modes of research allows for mutual learning processes between science and society to co-create, re-integrate, and apply solution-oriented knowledge (Lang et al., 2012). Moreover, the diversity of sustainability objectives implies that different groups of actors have different visions of what a more desirable future should look like, depending on their socio-ecological context, culture, and values. Researchers must engage with relevant actors to allow for a plurality of perspectives and iteratively elicit the diversity of values and interests that frame the problem and possible solutions (Leach et al., 2010; Schneider et al., 2019c), while communicating openly on uncertainties and unknowns (Fjelland, 2016).

Finally, working across knowledge systems is required to enact change. Engaging with art, for example, can not only provide powerful ways to convey novel and complex issues to a broad audience, but also invite different ways of apprehending and interpreting complex problems. Through embodied cognition (mobilizing senses, emotions, and intuition), art-based research opens up 'constellations of possible meanings, allowing a large freedom of "lateral", associative thinking' contributing to richer forms of knowledge production (Heinrichs & Kagan, 2019, p. 435). Furthermore, collaborative efforts with societal actors to address concrete problems allow for increasing accountability, legitimacy, and ownership of solutions, enhancing agency by improving actors' capacities to cope with high uncertainty and complexity (Scoones et al., 2020; Turnheim et al., 2015).

3. Where to increase capacity

Scientists can enhance their contribution to more sustainable futures by engaging in transformative research, advancing knowledge on processes and practices of change, and implementing approaches that better link knowledge and action (O'Brien, 2012, 2013).

However, three fundamental challenges remain: (1) researchers often lack the necessary skills and competencies; (2) transformative research is highly context-dependent, which limits the transferability of approaches and ability to anticipate their transformative effects; and (3) across multiple levels, institutional support for conducting such research is insufficient.

3.1 Researchers' skills and competencies

Transformative research methods and concepts are still not adequately recognized as such in academic curricula (Barth et al., 2020; Schneider et al., 2019a). Accordingly, many academic actors do not yet feel at ease employing a scientific approach that deviates from traditional approaches to conducting research and producing knowledge. Even for researchers who consider transformative research critical for addressing sustainability challenges,

designing transformative projects and engaging in processes of co-design with societal actors often falls outside their skillset. Without adequate training and capacity-building opportunities, many researchers, even with years of experience, can be challenged to handle the complex dynamics inherent to processes of co-design, co-production, and co-implementation with actors holding multiple, different or divergent opinions.

3.2 Transformative methods and concepts

Transformative research aims to bridge the gap between informed analyses of complex social–environmental issues and the development and implementation of alternative narratives and trajectories toward just and more desirable futures. Because of its focus on social dynamics and power relations, transformative research is highly context-dependent and approaches must therefore be adapted to specific cases through iterative and reflexive processes (Lam et al., 2021; Wittmayer et al., 2021). The exploratory and experimental qualities of these processes mean that several concepts, tools, and methods are often combined (Midgley, 2011). In turn, the hybridization and adaptation of existing concepts and methods, paired with the specificities of each project, make transformative approaches difficult to generalize or transfer (Bennett et al., 2021; Nagy et al., 2020). Additionally, there is a lack of understanding on the extent and the mechanisms through which different approaches contribute to social transformations (Lam et al., 2021; Schneider et al., 2019b).

3.3 Institutional support

The ‘academic productivist regime’, epitomized by the relentless pressure to publish and the increasing importance of metrics ‘through which research is assessed and academics can establish their reputation, advance their career, and obtain funding’ has entrenched the predominance of disciplinary approaches and reduced opportunities to explore more collaborative, holistic, and innovative ways of doing research (Lorenz-Meyer, 2018, p. 152; Paasche & Österblom, 2019). Transformative research still remains a niche field in the broader scientific landscape. Science efforts in support of sustainable development (e.g. to contribute to addressing the sustainable development goals in an integrated fashion) are insufficient, owing in part to constraints in research funding as well as fragmentation, misalignment, misplaced priorities (e.g. national research over international collaboration to achieve global societal and environmental benefits for the common good), and large disparities, between the Global North and Global South, in the capacity to produce knowledge (Chankseliani, 2023; Irwin et al., 2018; Reidpath & Allotey, 2019; Sabzalieva et al., 2020).

4. The Future Earth Pathways Initiative’s ToC

The Future Earth Pathways Initiative aims to increase the capacity of research to contribute to societal transformation by strengthening capabilities for transformative sustainability science. Anchored in the Future Earth network, an international and interdisciplinary community of scientists and societal actors, the Pathways Initiative is ideally positioned to support researchers wanting to engage in transdisciplinary processes of adaptive learning.

4.1 ToC of the Pathways Initiative

To achieve the aims of the Initiative, the steering committee of the Pathways Initiative created a ToC, outlining our working hypotheses about how and why the Initiative’s activities might contribute to desired changes in research and education. The hypotheses link activities, which directly stem from the Initiative, to desired changes, through plausible pathways of outcomes and impacts. Acknowledging that societal transformations rarely unfold in linear ways, these initial hypotheses will be continuously refined in future through cycles of action and reflection (Dhillon & Vaca, 2018; Schneider et al., 2019b).

To construct the ToC of the Future Earth Pathways Initiative, in a series of workshops, we jointly reflected about plausible pathways for the Initiative; iteratively reflecting on the initiative’s capabilities, required changes, possible outcomes of various actions as well as pathways to impact. We considered what could be defined in a transformative context as meaningful goals, and assessed external developments and actual and possible power relations. The frameworks and insights of Belcher and Hughes (2021), O’Brien (2018), Schneider et al. (2021), and Schneider et al. (2019b) served as prompts for the reflection process. Table 1 summarizes how each of these informed the development of our ToC.

In line with the challenges identified in the previous section and the initiative’s goal of strengthening capabilities for transformative sustainability science, we identified three foci of action where the Pathways Initiative can provide relevant and effective support: scientists, scientific methods, and concepts, as well as in the functioning of institutions in charge of formulating scientific agendas and of providing funding vehicles. In our ToC, these three focus points correspond to three pathways along which efforts are required. Because science, scientists, and scientific institutions are intrinsically linked, these three pathways are closely intertwined and specific outputs and outcomes achieved along each of them individually are assumed to be essential for progressing along the other ones (Figure 1). We outline and describe the individual pathways, and discuss linkages, feedback, and interactions between these.

Supporting newcomers to build a growing community of practitioners engaged in transformative research (Figure 1, middle row): Sustainability science needs committed and competent scientists, who can legitimately claim expertise in transdisciplinarity and pursue a career as transformative researchers (Hoffmann et al., 2022). This legitimacy, along with a strong sense of belonging to a community of like-minded individuals, empowers them as credible change agents (Barth et al., 2020). The Initiative aims to enable and support such a *growing community of practitioners engaged in transformative research*. We therefore adopt a path that starts with the education and training of newcomers (i.e. researchers who seek to adopt transformative approaches in their work), and are looking for opportunities to engage in knowledge exchange with other researchers.

Through activities such as summer schools or workshops developed with different academic and institutional partners, our aim is to contribute to equipping scientists with strong transformative skills and competencies. We further aim to spark enthusiasm to take on the challenges of co-producing transformative and sometimes contested knowledge with a diversity of actors, implementing novel transformative research approaches, and catalyzing sustainable change on the ground. Ultimately, these trained researchers will form a community of practitioners engaged in transformative research that earns visibility and

Table 1. Influential frameworks

Framework/insights	Key takeaways from framework/insights	Influence on Pathways ToC
Understanding and evaluating the impact of integrated problem-oriented research programs (Belcher & Hughes, 2021)	<p>‘Appropriate evaluation approaches are needed to evidence research impact and generate learning for continual improvement’.</p> <p>‘Nested project- and program-scale theories of change; research quality assessment; theory-based outcome evaluations to empirically test ToCs and assess policy, institutional, and practice influence’ are part of a holistic, multi-method, and integrated approach to evaluate transdisciplinary programs.</p>	The need to evaluate the effectiveness of transformative approaches influenced the evaluation feedback loops featured in our <i>evolving science</i> (top) pathway.
The three spheres of transformation (O’Brien, 2018)	<p>The three spheres is a heuristic highlighting the interdependent dynamics between behaviors, systems, culture in transformation processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘<i>Practical sphere</i> is at the core of the figure, and it represents specific actions, interventions, strategies, and behaviors that directly contribute to a desired outcome. • <i>Political sphere</i> represents the systems and structures that facilitate or constrain practical responses to climate change. • <i>Personal sphere</i> of transformation represents the subjective beliefs, values, worldviews, and paradigms that influence how people perceive, define, or constitute systems and structures, as well as their behaviors and practices’. 	The interplay between subjective values, practical capabilities, and supporting/constraining structures was a key influence in the design of the Pathways ToC, and is evident through the way our three pathways are interconnected.
The network compass (Schneider et al., 2021)	<p>Four generic fields of action through which networks seek to foster co-production:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) ‘Connecting actors and scales to enable co-production. (2) Supporting the network community in co-production. (3) Fostering co-production to leverage the network community’s transformative power. (4) Innovating the network to strengthen co-production’. 	This framework was useful to reflect on the capacity of the Pathways Initiative’s activities to support the four different fields of action, and how these fields of action relate to the end-goals of our ToC pathways.
Three generic mechanisms of impact generation (Schneider et al., 2019c)	<p>Three generic mechanisms through which transdisciplinary co-production of knowledge is expected to lead to sustainability transformations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Knowledge promotion</i>: promoting systems, target, and transformation knowledge for more informed and equitable decision-making. • <i>Social learning</i>: fostering social learning for collective action. • <i>Competence building</i>: enhancing competences for reflective leadership’. 	Acknowledging that these mechanisms are not mutually exclusive, and are most effective when combined, our ToC tried to adopt a mixed approach (through three pathways) using elements of all three mechanisms to reach our overall objective of increasing capacity for transformative research.

recognition, thereby deconstructing existing stereotypes and shifting scientific norms. Such a shift, in turn, implies that transformative approaches to research are fully integrated across scientific disciplines and promoted equally to others through training and education, academic positions, as well as funding schemes.

Evolving the science by advancing concepts, methods, and paradigms to foster ‘fit-for-purpose transformative research’ (Figure 1, top row): Increasing researchers’ skills and competencies to overcome the barriers of classical, disciplinary science inevitably needs to be paired with advancing the specific scientific concepts, methods, and paradigms that underpin transformative research. While individual scientists of certain scientific fields have started to develop novel approaches, these must be further developed and adapted according to the needs of different disciplines, scientific communities, impact goals, and contexts. The Pathways Initiative aims to enable and support reflexivity and learning processes among scientists of different disciplines and scientific communities, within Future Earth and beyond, to catalyze the development of *fit-for-purpose transformative-science*. To achieve

this aim, our pathway to impact starts with the creation of reflective spaces in which sustainability science practitioners (scientists, stakeholders, etc.) come together in mutual learning environments. Such environments serve to share experiences, exchange ideas, question and refine existing practices and methodologies, experiment, and co-create new methods and approaches best suited to address current challenges at local to regional scales. Our Initiative fosters these spaces in different ways: via the exchange of experience, insights, and reflections that happen as part of our webinars, summer schools, and workshops. Spaces for discussion, knowledge exchange, and experimentation enable the emergence of critical reflections on the norms and values of transformative research as a way to reappraise conventional narratives and develop new ones (Kläy et al., 2015; Singer-Brodowski et al., 2018; Vogt & Weber, 2020). The advanced concepts and methods co-produced (*sensu* Norström et al., 2020) within these incubators are intended to overcome the limitations of disciplinary science and of sectoral governance. These advances are also meant to acknowledge that different ways

can make to society as we collectively work to tread a path toward more desirable futures. We look forward to the journey ahead together with all of the motivated and daring scholars who constitute the fundamental drivers of change for a transformative sustainability science.

Acknowledgments. The authors acknowledge Ria Lambino, Kelebogile Pule, and Judit Ungvari for their contributions to early iterations of the Pathways Initiative's theory of change.

Author contributions. All the authors listed have contributed to the writing of this paper and to the development of the theory of change.

Funding statement. This work received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests. None.

References

- Balvanera, P., Pfaff, A., Viña, A., García-Frapolli, E., Merino, L., Minang, P. A., Nagabhatla, N., Hussain, S. A., & Sidorovich, A. A. (2019). Chapter 2.1. Status and trends – Drivers of change. In E. S. Brondizio, J. Settele, S. Díaz, & H. T. Ngo (Eds.), *The global assessment report of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services*. IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany, 1148 pp.
- Bammer, G., O'Rourke, M., O'Connell, D., Neuhauser, L., Midgley, G., Klein, J. T., Grigg, N. J., Gadlin, H., Elsum, I. R., Burszty, M., Fulton, E. A., Pohl, C., Smithson, M., Vilsmaier, U., Bergmann, M., Jaeger, J., Merckx, F., Vienni Baptista, B., Burgman, M. A., ... Richardson, G. P. (2020). Expertise in research integration and implementation for tackling complex problems: When is it needed, where can it be found and how can it be strengthened? *Palgrave Communications*, 6(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0380-0>
- Barth, M., Bruhn, A., Lam, D. P. M., Bergmann, M., & Lang, D. J. (2020). Capacity building for transformational leadership and transdisciplinarity. *GAIA – Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society*, 29(3), 195–197. <https://doi.org/10.14512/GAIA.29.3.12>
- Belcher, B. M., & Hughes, K. (2021). Understanding and evaluating the impact of integrated problem-oriented research programmes: Concepts and considerations. *Research Evaluation*, 30(2), 154–168. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvaa024>
- Bennett, E. M., Biggs, R., Peterson, G. D., & Gordon, L. J. (2021). Patchwork Earth: Navigating pathways to just, thriving, and sustainable futures. *One Earth*, 4(2), 172–176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2021.01.004>
- Brand, U., Muraca, B., Pineault, É., Sahakian, M., Schaffartzik, A., Novy, A., Streissler, C., Haberl, H., Asara, V., Dietz, K., Lang, M., Kothari, A., Smith, T., Spash, C., Brad, A., Pichler, M., Plank, C., Velegrakis, G., Jahn, T., ... Görg, C. (2021). From planetary to societal boundaries: An argument for collectively defined self-limitation. *Sustainability: Science, Practice, and Policy*, 17(1), 265–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2021.1940754>
- Chan, K., Agard, J., Liu, J., Aguiar, A. P. D., Armenteras, D., Boedhihartono, A. K., Cheung, W. W. L., Hashimoto, S., Hernández-Pedraza, G. C., Hickler, T., Jetzkowitz, J., Kok, M., Murray-Hudson, M., O'Farrell, P., Satterfield, T., Saisel, A. K., Seppelt, R., Strassburg, B., Xue, D., ... Mohamed, A. A. (2019). Chapter 5. Pathways towards a sustainable future. In E. S. Brondizio, J. Settele, S. Díaz, & H. T. Ngo (Eds.), *The global assessment report of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services*. IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany, 1148 pp. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3832099>
- Chankseliani, M. (2023). Who funds the production of globally visible research in the global south? *Scientometrics*, 128(1), 783–801. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04583-4>
- Davies, K. K., Fisher, K. T., Dickson, M. E., Thrush, S. F., & Le Heron, R. (2015). Improving ecosystem service frameworks to address wicked problems. *Ecology and Society*, 20(2), 37. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-07581-200237>
- DeFries, R., & Nagendra, H. (2017). Ecosystem management as a wicked problem. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 356(6335), 265–270. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aal1950>
- Dhillon, L., & Vaca, S. (2018). Refining theories of change. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, 14(30), 64–87. http://journals.sfu.ca/jmde/index.php/jmde_1/article/view/496
- Fjelland, R. (2016). When laypeople are right and experts are wrong: Lessons from love canal. *Hyle*, 22(1), 105–125.
- Gordon, I. J., Bawa, K., Bammer, G., Boone, C., Dunne, J., Hart, D., Hellmann, J., Miller, A., New, M., Ometto, J., Pickett, S., Wendorf, G., Agrawal, A., Bertsch, P., Campbell, C. D., Dodd, P., Janetos, A., Mallee, H., & Taylor, K. (2019). Forging future organizational leaders for sustainability science. *Nature Sustainability*, 2(8), 647–649. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0357-4>
- Haider, L. J., Hentati-Sundberg, J., Giusti, M., Goodness, J., Hamann, M., Masterson, V. A., Meacham, M., Merrie, A., Ospina, D., Schill, C., & Sinare, H. (2018). The undisciplined journey: Early-career perspectives in sustainability science. *Sustainability Science*, 13(1), 191–204. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-017-0445-1>
- Heinrichs, H., & Kagan, S. (2019). Artful and sensory sustainability science: Exploring novel methodological perspectives. *Journal of Environmental Management and Sustainability*, 8(3), 431–442. <https://doi.org/10.5585/GEAS.V8I3.15734>
- Hoffmann, S., Deutsch, L., Klein, J. T., & O'Rourke, M. (2022). Integrate the integrators! A call for establishing academic careers for integration experts. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 9(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01138-z>
- IPBES. (2022). Summary for policymakers of the methodological assessment report on the diverse values and valuation of nature of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. U. Pascual, P. Balvanera, M. Christie, B. Baptiste, D. González-Jiménez, C. B. Anderson, S. Athayde, D. N. Barton, R. Chaplin-Kramer, S. Jacobs, E. Kelemen, R. Kumar, E. Lazos, A. Martin, T. H. Mwampamba, B. Nakangu, P. O'Farrell, C. M. Raymond, S. M. Subramanian, M. Termansen, M. Van Noordwijk, and A. Vatn (Eds.). IPBES Secretariat, Bonn, Germany. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6522392>
- IPCC. (2022). Summary for policymakers In H.-O. Pörtner, D. C. Roberts, M. Tignor, E. S. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, A. Alegría, M. Craig, S. Langsdorf, S. Lösckke, V. Möller, A. Okem, B. Rama (Eds.), *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability* (pp. 3–33). Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009325844.001>
- Irwin, E. G., Culligan, P. J., Fischer-Kowalski, M., Law, K. L., Murtugudde, R., & Pfirman, S. (2018). Bridging barriers to advance global sustainability. *Nature Sustainability*, 1(7), 324–326. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0085-1>
- Kates, R. W., Clark, W. C., Corell, R., Hall, J. M., Jaeger, C. C., Lowe, I., McCarth, J. J., Schellnhuber, H. J., Bolin, B., Dickson, N. M., Faucheux, S., Gallopin, G. C., Grübler, A., Huntley, B., Jäger, J., Jodha, N. S., Kaspersen, R. E., Mabogunje, A., Matson, P., ... Svedin, U. (2001). Environment and development: Sustainability science. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 292(5517), 641–642. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1059386>
- Kelly, J. S. (1996). Wide and narrow interdisciplinarity. *The Journal of General Education*, 45(2), 95–113. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27797294>
- Kläy, A., Zimmermann, A. B., & Schneider, F. (2015). Rethinking science for sustainable development: Reflexive interaction for a paradigm transformation. *Futures*, 65, 72–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2014.10.012>
- Lam, D. P. M., Freund, M. E., Kny, J., Marg, O., Brohmann, B., Lang, D. J., Schäfer, M., Mbah, M., Theiler, L., & Bergmann, M. (2021). Transdisciplinary research: Towards an integrative perspective. *GAIA – Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society*, 30(4), 243–249.
- Lang, D. J., Wiek, A., Bergmann, M., Stauffacher, M., Martens, P., Moll, P., Swilling, M., & Thomas, C. J. (2012). Transdisciplinary research in sustainability science: Practice, principles, and challenges. *Sustainability Science*, 7(S1), 25–43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-011-0149-x>
- Leach, M., Scoones, I., & Stirling, A. (2010). *Dynamic sustainabilities: Technology, environment, social justice* (pp. 1–206). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781849775069>

- Liu, J., Dietz, T., Carpenter, S. R., Alberti, M., Folke, C., Moran, E., Pell, A. N., Deadman, P., Kratz, T., Lubchenco, J., Ostrom, E., Ouyang, Z., Provencher, W., Redman, C. L., Schneider, S. H., & Taylor, W. W. (2007). Complexity of coupled human and natural systems. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 317(September), 1513–1517.
- Lockwood, M. (2018). Right-wing populism and the climate change agenda: Exploring the linkages. *Environmental Politics*, 27(4), 712–732. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2018.1458411>
- Loorbach, D. A., & Wittmayer, J. (2024). Transforming universities. *Sustainability Science*, 19, 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-023-01335-y>
- Lorenz-Meyer, D. (2018). The academic productivist regime: Affective dynamics in the moral-political economy of publishing. *Science as Culture*, 27(2), 151–174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09505431.2018.1455821>
- Lotz-Sisitka, H., Wals, A. E. J., Kronlid, D., & McGarry, D. (2015). Transformative, transgressive social learning: Rethinking higher education pedagogy in times of systemic global dysfunction. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 16, 73–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2015.07.018>
- Lyall, C. (2019). *Being an interdisciplinary academic: How institutions shape university careers*. Palgrave Pivot. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-18659-3>
- Midgley, G. (2011). Theoretical pluralism in systemic action research. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 24, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11213-010-9176-2>
- Nagy, E., Ransiek, A., Schäfer, M., Lux, A., Bergmann, M., Jahn, T., Marg, O., & Theiler, L. (2020). Transfer as a reciprocal process: How to foster receptivity to results of transdisciplinary research. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 104 (November 2019), 148–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2019.11.007>
- Nilsson, M., Griggs, D., & Visbeck, M. (2016). Policy: Map the interactions between sustainable development goals. *Nature*, 534(7607), 320–322. <https://doi.org/10.1038/534320a>
- Norström, A. V., Cvitanovic, C., Löf, M. F., West, S., Wyborn, C., Balvanera, P., Bednarek, A. T., Bennett, E. M., Biggs, R., de Bremond, A., Campbell, B. M., Canadell, J. G., Carpenter, S. R., Folke, C., Fulton, E. A., Gaffney, O., Gelcich, S., Jouffray, J. B., Leach, M., ... Österblom, H. (2020). Principles for knowledge co-production in sustainability research. *Nature Sustainability*, 3(3), 182–190. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0448-2>
- O'Brien, K. (2012). Global environmental change II: From adaptation to deliberate transformation. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(5), 667–676. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132511425767>
- O'Brien, K. (2013). Global environmental change III: Closing the gap between knowledge and action. *Progress in Human Geography*, 37(4), 587–596. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132512469589>
- O'Brien, K. (2018). Is the 1.5°C target possible? Exploring the three spheres of transformation. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 31, 153–160.
- Paasche, Ø., & Österblom, H. (2019). Unsustainable science. *One Earth*, 1(1), 39–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2019.08.011>
- Pascual, U., Balvanera, P., Anderson, C. B., Chaplin-Kramer, R., Christie, M., González-Jiménez, D., Martin, A., Raymond, C. M., Termansen, M., Vatn, A., Athayde, S., Baptiste, B., Barton, D. N., Jacobs, S., Kelemen, E., Kumar, R., Lazos, E., Mwampamba, T. H., Nakangu, B., ... Zent, E. (2023). Diverse values of nature for sustainability. *Nature*, 620, 813–823. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06406-9>
- Purvis, A., Molnár, Z., Obura, D., Ichii, K., Willis, K., Chettri, N., Dulloo, M., Hendry, A., Gabrielyan, B., Gutt, J., Jacob, U., Keskin, E., Niamir, A., Öztürk, B., Salimov, R., & Jaureguiberry, P. (2019). Chapter 2.2. Status and trends – Nature. In *Global assessment report of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5517457>
- Razzaque, J., Visseren-Hamakers, I., Gautam, A. P., Gerber, L. R., Islar, M., Karim, M. S., Kelemen, E., Liu, J., Lui, G., Mcelwee, P., Mohammed, A. J., Mungatana, E. D., Muradian, R., Rusch, G. M., Turnhout, E., Williams, M., Chan, I., Fernandez-Llamazares, A., & Lim, M. (2019). Chapter 6. Options for decision makers. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5041300>
- Reidpath, D. D., & Allotey, P. (2019). The problem of 'trickle-down science' from the Global North to the Global South. *BMJ Global Health*, 4, 2–4. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001719>
- Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2), 155–169. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01405730>
- Sabzalieva, E., Martinez, M., & Sá, C. (2020). Moving beyond 'North' and 'South': Global perspectives on international research collaborations. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 24(1), 3–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315319889882>
- Salomaa, A., & Juhola, S. (2020). How to assess sustainability transformations: A review. *Global Sustainability*, 3, e24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/sus.2020.17>
- Schneider, F., Buser, T., Keller, R., Tribaldos, T., & Rist, S. (2019a). Research funding programmes aiming for societal transformations: Ten key stages. *Science and Public Policy*, 46(3), 463–478. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scy074>
- Schneider, F., Giger, M., Harari, N., Moser, S., Oberlack, C., Providoli, I., Schmid, L., Tribaldos, T., & Zimmermann, A. (2019b). Transdisciplinary co-production of knowledge and sustainability transformations: Three generic mechanisms of impact generation. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 102(July), 26–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2019.08.017>
- Schneider, F., Kläy, A., Zimmermann, A. B., Buser, T., Ingalls, M., & Messerli, P. (2019c). How can science support the 2030 agenda for sustainable development? Four tasks to tackle the normative dimension of sustainability. *Sustainability Science*, 14(6), 1593–1604. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-019-00675-y>
- Schneider, F., Tribaldos, T., Adler, C., Biggs, R. O., De Bremond, A., Buser, T., Krug, C., Loutre, M., Paulavets, K., Moore, S., Norstro, A. V., Urbach, D., Spehn, E., & Wu, G. (2021). *Co-production of knowledge and sustainability transformations: A strategic compass for global research networks* (pp. 127–142). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2021.04.007>
- Scoones, I., Stirling, A., Abrol, D., Atela, J., Charli-joseph, L., Eakin, H., Ely, A., Olsson, P., Pereira, L., Priya, R., & Van Zwanenberg, P. (2020). Transformations to sustainability: Combining structural, systemic and enabling approaches. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 42, 65–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.12.004>
- Sharpe, B., Hodgson, A., Leicester, G., Lyon, A., & Fazey, I. (2016). Three horizons: A pathways practice for transformation. *Ecology and Society*, 21(2), 47. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-08388-210247>
- Singer-Brodowski, M., Beecroft, R., & Parodi, O. (2018). Learning in real-world laboratories: A systematic impulse for discussion. *GAIA – Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society*, 27(January), 23–27. <https://doi.org/10.14512/gaia.27.s1.7>
- Singh, G. G., Cisneros-Montemayor, A. M., Swartz, W., Cheung, W., Guy, J. A., Kenny, T. A., McOwen, C. J., Asch, R., Geffert, J. L., Wabnitz, C. C. C., Sumaila, R., Hanich, Q., & Ota, Y. (2018). A rapid assessment of co-benefits and trade-offs among sustainable development goals. *Marine Policy*, 93 (March 2017), 223–231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.05.030>
- Stirling, A. (2015) Emancipation transformations: From controlling 'The transition' to culturing plural radical progress. In I. Scoones, M. Leach, & P. Newell (Eds.), *The politics of green transformations* (pp. 54–67). Routledge.
- Turnheim, B., Berkhout, F., Geels, F. W., Hof, A., Mcmeekin, A., Nykvist, B., & Van Vuuren, D. P. (2015). Evaluating sustainability transitions pathways: Bridging analytical approaches to address governance challenges. *Global Environmental Change*, 35(2015), 239–253.
- Urai, A. E., & Kelly, C. (2023). Rethinking academia in a time of climate crisis. *eLife*, 12, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.84991>
- Vogt, M., & Weber, C. (2020). The role of universities in a sustainable society. Why value-free research is neither possible nor desirable. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(7), 2811. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12072811>
- Wiek, A., & Lang, D. J. (2016). Transformational sustainability research methodology. In H. Heinrichs, P. Martens, G. Michelsen, & A. Wiek (Eds.), *Sustainability science: An introduction* (pp. 31–41). Springer, ISBN 978-9-401-77241-9.
- Wittmayer, J. M., Loorbach, D., Bogner, K., Hendlin, Y., Hölscher, K., Lavanga, M., Vasques, A., von Wirth, T., & de Wal, M. (2021). Transformative research: Knowledge and action for just sustainable transitions (Issue DIT Working Paper #1). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28485.99047>