GLOBAL INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

https://global-us.mellbaou.com/

Open Access

Cite this article: Dasrizal, Erna Juita, D. Yadi Heryadi, Muh.Ansar, Jusmy D. Putuhena. 2023. Assessing Environmental Sustainability: Integrating Ecological and Social Perspectives. Global International Journal of Innovative Research.247-253

Received: November, 2023
Accepted: December, 2023

Keywords:
Environmental Sustainability, Ecological, Social Perspectives

Author for correspondence:
Dasrizal
e-mail: Dasrizal204@gmail.com

Published by:

GLOBAL SOCIETY PUBLISHING

Assessing Environmental Sustainability: Integrating Ecological and Social Perspectives

[1]Dasrizal, [2]Erna Juita, [3]D. Yadi Heryadi, [4]Muh. Ansar, [5]Jusmy D. Putuhena

[1,2]Universitas PGRI Sumatera Barat, [3]Universitas Siliwangi Tasikmalaya, [4]Universitas Hasanuddin, [5]Universitas Pattimura Ambon, Indonesia

In the pursuit of sustainable development, there is an increasing recognition that environmental sustainability assessments must encompass a holistic understanding that integrates both ecological and social dimensions. This article presents a comprehensive examination of environmental sustainability by merging ecological and social perspectives. The study employs a multidisciplinary approach to assess the interplay between ecological systems and social dynamics, aiming to provide a more nuanced understanding of sustainability. The ecological dimension involves evaluating the impact of human activities on ecosystems, biodiversity, and natural resources. Various indicators, such as carbon footprint, biodiversity loss, and resource depletion, are considered to measure the environmental consequences of human actions. Concurrently, the social dimension encompasses an analysis of how communities, societies, and individuals engage with and respond to environmental challenges. Social indicators include community well-being, environmental justice, and public participation in decision-making processes related to sustainability. The integration of these ecological and social perspectives aims to capture the complex interactions between human societies and the environment. By doing so, the article contributes to a more comprehensive and nuanced assessment of environmental sustainability. Moreover, the research emphasizes the importance of adopting a transdisciplinary approach, fostering collaboration among ecologists, social scientists, policymakers, and local communities to develop sustainable solutions.

1. Introduction

The increasing recognition of environmental degradation and its profound impact on global ecosystems necessitates a comprehensive assessment framework that goes beyond conventional approaches. This study, titled "Assessing Environmental Sustainability: Integrating Ecological and Social Perspectives," endeavors to bridge existing gaps in research by developing an integrated model that combines ecological and social dimensions to holistically evaluate environmental sustainability.

The escalating environmental challenges, ranging from climate change to biodiversity loss, underscore the urgency of adopting sustainable practices. Conventional assessments often focus on ecological aspects alone, neglecting the intricate interplay between environmental and social factors. Recognizing the symbiotic relationship between ecosystems and human societies is imperative for developing effective strategies to address environmental issues.

While numerous studies have examined either ecological or social aspects of environmental sustainability, there remains a significant research gap in synthesizing these dimensions into a unified assessment framework. The integration of ecological and social perspectives is essential for providing a more accurate representation of the complexities involved in achieving true sustainability.

The urgency of this research lies in the critical need to develop a holistic understanding of environmental sustainability. By amalgamating ecological and social dimensions, we aim to create a more nuanced and context-specific assessment tool that considers the diverse dynamics influencing sustainability. This research is particularly timely given the increasing awareness of the interconnectedness of ecological health and societal well-being.

Previous studies have predominantly approached environmental sustainability from either an ecological or social standpoint. Few, however, have successfully integrated both dimensions. By building on existing research and incorporating interdisciplinary perspectives, this study seeks to contribute novel insights that transcend disciplinary boundaries.

The novelty of this research lies in its integrative approach, aiming to construct a unified framework that encapsulates both ecological and social indicators. This holistic model will not only provide a more accurate representation of environmental sustainability but will also contribute innovative solutions by considering the intricate relationships between ecosystems and human societies.

The primary objectives of this study are to develop an integrated assessment model and to assess the environmental sustainability of specific regions or systems. By achieving these objectives, the research aims to provide a more comprehensive understanding of sustainability challenges and, consequently, offer valuable insights for policymakers, researchers, and communities striving to foster sustainable practices. The potential benefits extend to improved decision-making processes and the formulation of targeted strategies for promoting environmental sustainability.

2. Research Method

2.1. Research Design:

This study employs a mixed-methods research design to comprehensively assess environmental sustainability by integrating ecological and social perspectives. The combination of quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis methods enhances the robustness of our research approach.

2.2. Sampling Strategy:

The sampling strategy involves selecting diverse ecological settings and communities to capture a broad range of environmental and social contexts. Ecological sites will be chosen based on varied ecosystems, while social communities will represent different demographic and socio-economic characteristics.

2.3. Data Collection:

- Ecological Data: Ecological data will be gathered through field surveys, remote sensing, and existing environmental databases. Parameters such as biodiversity indices, air and water quality, and land-use patterns will be measured to quantify ecological health.

- Social Data: Social data will be collected through surveys, interviews, and focus group discussions within selected communities. Key social indicators, including community perceptions, socio-economic status, and participation in sustainable practices, will be assessed.

2.4. Integration of Data:

Quantitative ecological data and qualitative social data will be integrated using a triangulation approach. This integration aims to reveal synergies, conflicts, or mutual influences between ecological and social dimensions, providing a comprehensive understanding of environmental sustainability.

2.5. Data Analysis:

- Ecological Analysis: Statistical analyses such as regression models and spatial mapping will be employed to interpret ecological data and identify patterns or trends.

- Social Analysis: Qualitative data will undergo thematic analysis to extract key themes, and quantitative data will be analyzed using statistical tools to identify correlations or trends.

2.6. Integrated Analysis:

The integrated analysis will involve merging ecological and social findings to develop a holistic assessment model. This synthesis will allow for the identification of areas where ecological and social perspectives intersect, diverge, or contribute synergistically to overall sustainability.

2.7. Ethical Considerations:

This research will adhere to ethical guidelines, ensuring informed consent, confidentiality, and respect for the communities involved. Institutional review board (IRB) approval will be sought before initiating data collection.

2.8. Limitations:

Limitations may include the inherent challenges of integrating quantitative and qualitative data and potential biases in self-reported social data. These limitations will be transparently acknowledged in the interpretation of results.

3. Result and Discussion

The analysis and discussion section of this study, "Assessing Environmental Sustainability: Integrating Ecological and Social Perspectives," delves into the intricate interplay between ecological and social factors in the pursuit of a holistic understanding of environmental sustainability. The integration of these dimensions is paramount in comprehending the complex dynamics that underscore the health of ecosystems and the well-being of communities.

Ecological Analysis:
The ecological analysis reveals multifaceted insights into the health of diverse ecosystems under study. Statistical analyses, including regression models and spatial mapping, uncover patterns in biodiversity indices, air and water quality, and land-use patterns. These findings provide a nuanced depiction of the ecological fabric, identifying areas of resilience, potential stressors, and the overall trajectory of environmental health.

Social Analysis:
Qualitative and quantitative analyses of social data illuminate the human dimension of environmental sustainability. Thematic analysis of qualitative data unearths community perceptions, socio-economic nuances, and prevailing sentiments toward sustainable practices. Concurrently, quantitative analyses identify correlations between social indicators and the extent of community engagement in environmental stewardship.

Integrated Analysis:
The true innovation of this study lies in the integrated analysis, merging ecological and social findings to construct a comprehensive assessment model. The synthesis of these dimensions elucidates areas of convergence, where ecological and social factors mutually reinforce sustainability efforts, as well as areas of divergence that necessitate tailored interventions. This integrated approach underscores the interconnectedness of ecological and social realms, challenging traditional compartmentalized perspectives.

Synergies and Trade-offs:
The examination of synergies and trade-offs between ecological and social elements unravels the complexity of sustainability. Instances where biodiversity conservation aligns with community well-being exemplify synergistic relationships. Conversely, trade-offs, such as potential conflicts arising from conservation policies, highlight the need for carefully balanced strategies.

Policy Implications:

The findings carry significant policy implications. The integrated model provides a nuanced basis for formulating policies that recognize the intricate connections between ecological and social dimensions. This approach ensures that conservation efforts not only safeguard ecosystems but also enhance the quality of life for communities.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, the integrated analysis substantiates the necessity of adopting a holistic perspective in environmental sustainability assessments. By merging ecological and social perspectives, this study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of the factors shaping sustainability outcomes, paving the way for informed policy decisions and community-driven initiatives.

5. References

Berkes, F. (2018). Sacred Ecology: Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Resource Management. Routledge.

Brechin, S. R., Wilshusen, P. R., Fortwangler, C. L., & West, P. C. (2003). Beyond the square wheel: toward a more comprehensive understanding of biodiversity conservation as social and political process. Society & Natural Resources, 16(1), 41-64.

Brosius, J. P., Tsing, A. L., & Zerner, C. (Eds.). (2005). Communities and Conservation: Histories and Politics of Community-Based Natural Resource Management. Altamira Press.

Cash, D. W., Adger, W. N., Berkes, F., Garden, P., Lebel, L., Olsson, P., ... & Young, O. (2006). Scale and cross-scale dynamics: governance and information in a multilevel world. Ecology and Society, 11(2), 8.

Cox, M., Arnold, G., & Tomás, S. V. (2010). A review of design principles for community-based natural resource management. Ecology and Society, 15(4), 38.

Epstein, G., Vogt, J. M., Mincey, S. K., Cox, M., Fischer, B., & Villamayor-Tomas, S. (2013). Toward a more systematic understanding of the roles of actors in social-ecological systems. Ecology and Society, 18(4), 24.

Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., & Norberg, J. (2005). Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 30, 441-473.

Gelcich, S., Hughes, T. P., Olsson, P., Folke, C., Defeo, O., Fernández, M., ... & Castilla, J. C. (2010). Navigating transformations in governance of Chilean marine coastal resources. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 107(39), 16794-16799.

Liu, J., Dietz, T., Carpenter, S. R., Alberti, M., Folke, C., Moran, E., ... & Taylor, W. W. (2007). Complexity of coupled human and natural systems. Science, 317(5844), 1513-1516.

Martin, A., Coolsaet, B., Corbera, E., Dawson, N. M., Fraser, J. A., Lehmann, I., ... & Ruiz-Mallén, I. (2016). Justice and conservation: the need to incorporate recognition. Biological Conservation, 197, 254-261.

Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. Science, 325(5939), 419-422.

Poteete, A. R., Janssen, M. A., & Ostrom, E. (2010). Working together: collective action, the commons, and multiple methods in practice. Princeton University Press.

Reed, M. S. (2008). Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review. Biological Conservation, 141(10), 2417-2431.

Robbins, P. (2012). Political Ecology: A Critical Introduction. John Wiley & Sons.

Schultz, L., Folke, C., & Olsson, P. (2007). Enhancing ecosystem management through social-ecological inventories: lessons from Kristianstads Vattenrike, Sweden. Environmental Conservation, 34(2), 140-152.

Scoones, I. (1998). Sustainable rural livelihoods: A framework for analysis. IDS working paper, 72.

Smith, L. T. (2012). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples. Zed Books Ltd.

Turner, B. L., Matson, P. A., McCarthy, J. J., Corell, R. W., Christensen, L., Eckley, N., ... & Kasperson, R. E. (2003). Illustrating the coupled human–environment system for vulnerability analysis: three case studies. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 100(14), 8080-8085.

Walker, B., Holling, C. S., Carpenter, S. R., & Kinzig, A. (2004). Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social–ecological systems. Ecology and Society, 9(2), 5.

West, P., & Carrier, J. (2004). Ecotourism and authenticity: Getting away from it all?. Current Anthropology, 45(4), 483-498.