International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
Volume 4, Issue 4
Jul-Aug 2026, PP 1-11

An Integrated Four-Domain Research Framework for Environmental Sustainability: Energy, Water, Recycling, and Waste Management

Dr. Kanchan Kumari four-domain
Assistant Professor, Gitarattan International Business School, Affiliated to Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi, India.
prof.kanchan30@gmail.com

Abstract- Purpose – This paper develops and presents an integrated multi-domain research framework for investigating four critical pillars of environmental sustainability — energy systems, water resource management, material recycling, and waste governance. The framework addresses the fragmented state of sustainability research by proposing a unified six-phase mixed-methods model applicable across disciplines, geographies, and institutional contexts. Design/methodology/approach – The framework adopts a mixed-methods design integrating quantitative data analysis, field-based measurement, systems modelling, and qualitative policy evaluation. An 18-month phased timeline is proposed, structured across problem identification, literature synthesis, methodology design, primary data collection, analysis, and policy output generation. Findings – Cross-domain analysis reveals five high-priority research gaps, including grid-scale storage viability, groundwater depletion in arid urban zones, methane capture efficiency in informal landfills, and the systemic nexus interactions between energy, water, and waste. The framework demonstrates that treating these domains in isolation systematically underestimates interdependencies and leads to suboptimal policy design. Research limitations/implications – The framework is conceptual and requires empirical validation across diverse national contexts. Data availability constraints in low-income countries may limit certain quantitative methods.

Practical implications – The framework provides researchers, policymakers, and sustainability practitioners with a structured, replicable approach to cross-domain environmental investigation. It directly supports SDG 6 (Clean Water), SDG 7 (Clean Energy), SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities), and SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption). Originality/value – This paper makes an original contribution by synthesising four sustainability domains into a single integrated research model, moving beyond siloed inquiry to capture systemic interdependencies.

Keywords- Kerala Renaissance, English Education, Anti-Caste Consciousness, Enlightenment, Malayalam Literature, Subaltern Emancipation, Modernity.

I. Introduction

Environmental sustainability has emerged as the defining challenge of the twenty-first century. The accelerating pace of climate change, compounded by resource depletion, population growth, and rapid urbanisation, has placed unprecedented pressure on four interconnected systems: energy infrastructure, freshwater supply, material recycling capacity, and waste management governance. While each domain has generated

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
Volume 4, Issue 4
Jul-Aug 2026, PP 1-11

substantial independent scholarship, the systemic interdependencies between them remain poorly understood and inadequately researched (Mohtar and Daher, 2016; Kaddoura and El Khatib, 2017).

Energy systems are undergoing fundamental transformation as nations transition from fossil fuel dependency toward renewable sources. Yet energy transitions are inseparable from water — thermoelectric power generation accounts for approximately 41 per cent of total freshwater withdrawals in the United States (Meldrum et al., 2013). Similarly, waste management and recycling systems determine not only material resource flows but also greenhouse gas emission trajectories, with the waste sector contributing approximately five per cent of global anthropogenic emissions (IPCC, 2022).

Despite these evident interconnections, sustainability research has historically proceeded in disciplinary silos. Energy researchers rarely engage with waste governance literature; water scientists seldom incorporate circular economy principles into their models. This fragmentation produces research that captures domain-specific dynamics while missing the systemic interactions that most powerfully shape sustainability outcomes (Bazilian et al., 2011).

This paper responds to that gap by developing an integrated four-domain research framework encompassing energy, water, recycling, and waste management. The framework proposes a unified six-phase mixed-methods methodology, a structured 18-month research timeline, domain-specific research questions and measurable variables, and a cross-domain research gap analysis. The model is designed to be applicable across institutional, geographic, and disciplinary contexts.

II. Theoretical Background and Literature Review

Environmental Sustainability Frameworks

The concept of sustainable development, articulated in the Brundtland Commission report as development that 'meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' (WCED, 1987, p. 43), has provided the foundational normative orientation for sustainability research. The subsequent formulation of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015 operationalised this concept across 17 goals and 169 targets, with four goals — SDG 6, SDG 7, SDG 11, and SDG 12 — directly mapping onto the four domains examined in this study (United Nations, 2015).

Systems thinking has emerged as a critical lens for understanding sustainability challenges (Meadows, 2008). Complex adaptive systems theory recognises that sustainability outcomes emerge from dynamic interactions between biophysical, economic, institutional, and social subsystems (Ostrom, 2009). This perspective underpins the integrative logic of the framework proposed in this paper.

Energy Systems Research

Energy systems research has been substantially reshaped by the imperative of decarbonization. The International Energy Agency (IEA, 2023) reports that renewable energy sources accounted for 82 per cent of new electricity capacity additions globally in 2023. Nevertheless, 733 million people remain without reliable electricity access (World Bank, 2023), underscoring persistent energy justice dimensions. Key theoretical contributions include the Multi-Level Perspective on sociotechnical transitions (Geels, 2002), and Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) as the standard methodology for evaluating environmental burdens of energy technologies (Hertwich et al., 2015).

Water Resource Management

Water resource management scholarship has been organised around the concept of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM), defined by the Global Water Partnership (2000, p. 22) as 'a process which promotes the co-ordinated development and management of water, land and related resources.' Current estimates indicate that four billion people experience severe water scarcity for at least one month per year (Mekonnen and Hoekstra, 2016), and 2.2 billion lack safely managed drinking water (WHO/UNICEF, 2023).

Recycling and Circular Economy

Circular economy (CE) scholarship has developed rapidly since the Ellen MacArthur Foundation's (2013) influential report positioning CE as a systemic alternative to the linear 'take-make-dispose' economic model. Material Flow Analysis (MFA) provides the methodological foundation for quantifying material flows through national and regional economies (Brunner and Rechberger, 2004). Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) has emerged as the dominant policy instrument for internalizing end-of-life costs into producer decision-making (Kaffine and Brandt, 2013).

Waste Management

Municipal solid waste management literature spans technical, governance, and social dimensions. The waste hierarchy — Reduce, Reuse, Recycle, Recover, Dispose — provides the normative ordering of waste management options (European Parliament, 2008). Informal waste sector research has documented significant material recovery contributions of informal waste pickers across developing country contexts (Scheinberg et al., 2010). Globally, 40 per cent of waste is openly dumped or burned without environmental controls (World Bank, 2022), and the sector contributes approximately five per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions (IPCC, 2022).

III. The Integrated Research Framework

Framework Design Philosophy

The integrated framework is grounded in three design principles. First, multi-domain integration: the framework treats energy, water, recycling, and waste as subsystems within a single environmental sustainability system. Second, methodological pluralism: the framework adopts a mixed-methods approach recognizing that complexity cannot be adequately captured by quantitative or qualitative methods alone. Third, policy relevance: each research phase is oriented toward actionable policy outputs rather than purely academic contributions.

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
Volume 4, Issue 4
Jul-Aug 2026, PP 1-11

The Six-Phase Research Process Model

The framework operationalises research across six sequential phases:

- **Phase 1 —** Problem Identification: Define research gaps, articulate scope, establish societal urgency, and map the stakeholder landscape across all four domains.
- **Phase 2 —** Literature Review: Conduct systematic reviews of peer-reviewed literature, policy documents, grey literature, and data repositories. Apply PRISMA standards where applicable.
- **Phase 3 —** Methodology Design: Select and justify specific methods for each domain, ensuring cross-domain comparability where relevant. Design data collection instruments.
- **Phase 4 —** Data Collection: Gather primary data through field surveys, sensor networks, official statistics, and industry reporting. Apply quality assurance protocols.
- **Phase 5 —** Analysis and Synthesis: Apply statistical modelling, systems dynamics, policy mapping, and cross-domain integration to derive findings.
- **Phase 6** — Policy Outputs: Translate findings into evidence-based policy recommendations, technology roadmaps, implementation guidelines, and peer-reviewed publications.

Cross-Domain Research Gap Analysis

Table 1. Cross-Domain Research Gap Analysis

Domain	Primary Research Gap	Proposed Approach	Priority
Energy	Grid-scale storage viability in developing economies	Techno-economic modelling + comparative case analysis	High
Water	Long-term groundwater depletion in arid urban zones	GIS hydrological sensing + MODFLOW modelling	High
Recycling	Behavioural drivers of sorting contamination	RCTs + behavioural economics analysis	Medium
Waste Management	Methane capture efficiency in informal landfills	Emission field measurement + systems modelling	High
Cross-Domain	Nexus trade-offs between all four domains	Systems dynamics + stakeholder workshops	Medium

IV. Domain 1: Energy Systems

Research Rationale

Energy system research within this framework focuses on the transition from fossil fuel-dependent to renewable-dominated energy infrastructure, examined simultaneously at the technical, economic, equity, and governance levels. The coexistence of rapid renewable capacity expansion and persistent energy poverty — 733 million unelectrified people globally (World Bank, 2023) — creates a dual research imperative that cannot be addressed by techno-economic analysis alone.

Core Research Questions

- **RQ1(E):** What technical and economic barriers impede full renewable energy adoption in developing nations, and what financing mechanisms most effectively overcome them?
- **RQ2(E):** How do energy access disparities manifest across urban-rural and socioeconomic divides, and which interventions produce equitable outcomes?
- **RQ3(E):** What smart grid architectures best support the integration of intermittent renewable energy at national scale?
- **RQ4(E):** Which policy instruments — carbon pricing, subsidies, or technology mandates — most cost-effectively accelerate decarbonization trajectories?

Methodology

Energy domain research employs Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) to evaluate the environmental burden of renewable technology deployment, following ISO 14040/14044 standards. Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) modelling captures macroeconomic policy impacts. Household energy consumption surveys are administered in peri-urban and rural zones using stratified random sampling. Grid simulation employs HOMER Pro software for techno-economic optimisation.

Key Measurable Variables

Primary variables include: renewable energy share of total electricity mix (%), Levelized Cost of Energy (LCOE, USD/kWh), energy intensity (MJ per USD of GDP), carbon price (USD per tonne CO_2e), energy poverty index (composite), and grid reliability measured by System Average Interruption Duration Index (SAIDI).

V. Domain 2: Water Resource Management

Research Rationale

Freshwater scarcity represents one of the most acute sustainability challenges globally. An estimated 2.2 billion people lack access to safely managed drinking water services (WHO/UNICEF, 2023), while agricultural demand accounts for approximately 70 per cent of all freshwater withdrawals (FAO, 2020). Research addresses the intertwined challenges of physical scarcity, governance failure, infrastructure gaps, and ecosystem degradation — treating water simultaneously as a human right, economic input, and ecological foundation.

Core Research Questions

- **RQ1(W):** Which regions face imminent physical water scarcity versus economic scarcity driven by governance or infrastructure failure?
- **RQ2(W):** What is the state of drinking water treatment infrastructure across low- and middle-income countries, and what investment gaps persist?
- **RQ3(W):** How can precision irrigation and crop diversification reduce agricultural water consumption without compromising yield?

- **RQ4(W):** What institutional arrangements best protect watershed integrity and ensure equitable community water access?

Methodology

Water domain research integrates remote sensing and GIS-based hydrological mapping to characterise spatial patterns of scarcity and stress. Groundwater dynamics are modelled using MODFLOW. Water quality assessment follows WHO drinking water quality guidelines (2022), incorporating physicochemical and microbiological parameters. Governance analysis applies Ostrom's (1990) eight design principles for robust common-pool resource institutions.

VI. Domain 3: Recycling and Circular Economy

Research Rationale

Despite widespread recycling programs, global material recovery rates remain far below technical potential. Only nine per cent of all plastic ever produced has been recycled (Geyer et al., 2017). Aluminium demonstrates what is achievable — with a global recycling rate of approximately 72 per cent — but this represents the exception rather than the rule (International Aluminium Institute, 2021). The research challenge is to understand why such performance gaps persist.

Core Research Questions

- **RQ1(R):** What drives divergence in material recovery rates by material type and across regions with similar regulatory frameworks?
- **RQ2(R):** Which circular economy business models demonstrate the strongest economic and environmental returns at scale?
- **RQ3(R):** How do infrastructure design, product labelling, and public education shape household sorting behaviour and contamination rates?
- **RQ4(R):** Does Extended Producer Responsibility meaningfully shift packaging design decisions and product take-back rates?

Methodology

Recycling domain research applies Material Flow Analysis (MFA) to quantify material inputs, stocks, and outputs across industrial supply chains. Physical waste composition audits provide empirical contamination rate data. Behavioural interventions are evaluated using Randomised Controlled Trials (RCTs), consistent with best practice in behavioural public policy (Thaler and Sunstein, 2008). EPR policy impacts are assessed using difference-in-differences econometric designs.

VII. Domain 4: Waste Management

Research Rationale

Municipal solid waste management is a critical yet chronically underfunded sustainability domain. Globally, 2.3 billion tonnes of solid waste are generated annually, with 40 per cent openly dumped or burned without environmental controls (World Bank, 2022). The waste sector contributes approximately five per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions (IPCC, 2022). Research must bridge technical engineering dimensions with social and governance challenges including informal sector integration and community health impacts.

Core Research Questions

- RQ1(WM): What metrics and benchmarks best capture municipal solid waste system performance across diverse national contexts?
- RQ2(WM): How can informal waste pickers be meaningfully integrated into formal waste systems without displacing established livelihoods?
- RQ3(WM): What are the health exposure pathways in communities living adjacent to hazardous waste disposal facilities?
- RQ4(WM): Under what conditions does waste-to-energy represent a net environmental benefit versus a structural obstacle to zero-waste objectives?

Methodology

Waste domain research employs waste generation and composition surveys following World Bank GWMD protocols. Health Impact Assessments (HIAs) are conducted near disposal and treatment sites (WHO, 2014). Greenhouse gas accounting follows IPCC Tier 2 methodologies. Ethnographic research with informal waste worker communities employs participant observation and semi-structured interviews following International Sociological Association ethical guidelines.

VIII. Integrated Research Design and Nexus Analysis

18-Month Phased Research Timeline

Table 2. Domain-Specific Research Activities by Phase

Domain	Phase 1 (Mths 1–3)	Phase 2 (Mths 4–8)	Phase 3 (Mths 9–14)	Phase 4 (Mths 15–18)
Energy	Baseline assessment, audit protocols, stakeholder mapping	Field surveys, smart meter data, expert interviews	Scenario modelling, CGE analysis, and regional comparison	Policy briefs, peer-reviewed papers, roadmaps
Water	Watershed delineation, usage data, stakeholder ID	Water quality sampling, groundwater monitoring	Demand forecasting, infrastructure gap analysis	IWRM frameworks, investment roadmaps
Recycling	Waste stream audit, program inventory, policy review	Household surveys, focus groups, and field experiments	Value chain mapping, EPR case studies	Intervention toolkits, legislative proposals

Waste Mgmt	Collection analysis, facility inventory, regulatory review	Site inspections, worker interviews, health surveys	Emission modelling, cost-benefit analysis	City strategies, financing models, and capacity building

Key Variables and Data Sources

Table 3. Key Variables, Measurement Units, and Primary Data Sources

Domain	Key Variable	Measurement Unit	Data Source
Energy	Renewable energy share; LCOE; Energy poverty index	%; USD/kWh; composite index	IEA, World Bank, national energy ministries
Water	Freshwater withdrawal; WHO quality index; groundwater depth	% of renewable resource; index score; meters	FAO AQUASTAT, WHO/UNICEF JMP, USGS
Recycling	Material recovery rate, contamination rate; EPR compliance	%; %; % of producers	Eurostat, OECD, national EPR registries
Waste Mgmt	Waste per capita; landfill diversion rate; methane capture	kg/person/year; %; %	World Bank GWMD, IPCC, municipal records

The Energy–Water–Waste–Recycling Nexus

The most distinctive feature of the integrated framework is its explicit attention to cross-domain nexus interactions. Research has established several critical linkages that single-domain studies routinely overlook:

Energy–Water Nexus: Thermoelectric power generation is the largest industrial consumer of freshwater globally. Desalination — increasingly deployed in response to water scarcity — is highly energy-intensive, creating a feedback loop between energy availability and water access (IEA, 2016).

Water–Waste Nexus: Inadequately managed landfills generate leachate that contaminates groundwater and surface water resources. In regions where groundwater is a primary drinking water source, landfill siting decisions carry direct public health consequences.

Waste–Energy Nexus: Waste-to-energy facilities generate electricity from residual waste while diverting material from landfill. However, the climate benefits are contested and depend critically on the carbon intensity of the displaced electricity.

Recycling–Energy Nexus: Aluminium recycling consumes approximately 95 per cent less energy than primary aluminium production from bauxite (IAI, 2021). These savings have direct implications for energy demand projections in climate models that fail to incorporate circular economy assumptions.

IX. Discussion

Theoretical Contributions

This framework makes three principal theoretical contributions. First, it advances integrated sustainability research by providing a structured operational model that treats four environmental domains as a coherent system rather than independent variables. This responds to calls in the literature for nexus thinking to move from metaphor to methodology (Hoff, 2011). Second, it operationalises the SDG framework in a research design context, demonstrating how SDG targets can be translated into measurable variables and empirical research questions. Third, it bridges the methodological traditions of natural science, social science, and policy analysis within a single coherent design.

Practical Implications

For research institutions and funding bodies, the framework provides a template for commissioning integrated sustainability research that avoids the inefficiencies of parallel domain-specific studies. For policymakers, it generates outputs — policy briefs, investment roadmaps, and implementation guidelines — directly applicable to national sustainability planning. For practitioners in energy utilities, water authorities, waste management companies, and recycling operators, the framework generates comparative benchmarks and evidence-based standards against which to assess performance.

Limitations

Several limitations require acknowledgment. First, the framework is conceptual and has not been empirically validated; its practical utility will be established through applied studies that adopt and test its components. Second, data availability constraints in low-income countries may limit the application of certain quantitative methods. Third, the 18-month timeline assumes continuous research activity and institutional support that may not be available in all contexts.

X. Conclusion

This paper has presented an integrated four-domain research framework for environmental sustainability, encompassing energy systems, water resource management, material recycling, and waste governance. Through a six-phase mixed-methods design operationalized across an 18-month timeline, the framework provides researchers and practitioners with a structured, replicable, and policy-relevant approach to cross-domain sustainability investigation.

The critical contribution of this work lies in its integrative logic: by designing research that simultaneously addresses energy, water, recycling, and waste — and explicitly maps the nexus interactions between them — the framework captures systemic dynamics that domain-specific research systematically misses. Future research should empirically apply the framework across multiple national and regional contexts, validating its phased methodology, testing its cross-domain hypotheses, and refining its variable set in response to data availability and institutional realities.

International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities
Volume 4, Issue 4
Jul-Aug 2026, PP 1-11

References

1. Bazilian, M., Rogner, H., Howells, M., Hermann, S., Arent, D., Gielen, D., Steduto, P., Mueller, A., Komor, P., Tol, R.S.J. and Yumkella, K.K. (2011), 'Considering the energy, water and food nexus: towards an integrated modelling approach', Energy Policy, Vol. 39 No. 12, pp. 7896–7906.
2. Brunner, P.H. and Rechberger, H. (2004), Practical Handbook of Material Flow Analysis, Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, FL.
3. Ellen MacArthur Foundation (2013), Towards the Circular Economy: Economic and Business Rationale for an Accelerated Transition, Ellen MacArthur Foundation, Cowes.
4. European Parliament (2008), Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on Waste, Official Journal of the European Union, Brussels.
5. FAO (2020), The State of Food and Agriculture 2020, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.
6. Geels, F.W. (2002), 'Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: a multi-level perspective and a case-study', Research Policy, Vol. 31 Nos 8/9, pp. 1257–1274.
7. Geyer, R., Jambeck, J.R. and Law, K.L. (2017), 'Production, use, and fate of all plastics ever made', Science Advances, Vol. 3 No. 7, p. e1700782.
8. Global Water Partnership (2000), Integrated Water Resources Management, TAC Background Papers No. 4, GWP, Stockholm.
9. Hoff, H. (2011), Understanding the Nexus, Background Paper for the Bonn 2011 Nexus Conference, Stockholm Environment Institute, Stockholm.
10. IEA (2016), Water Energy Nexus — Excerpt from the World Energy Outlook 2016, International Energy Agency, Paris.
11. IEA (2023), Renewables 2023, International Energy Agency, Paris.
12. International Aluminium Institute (IAI) (2021), Global Aluminium Cycle 2020, IAI, London.
13. IPCC (2022), Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
14. Kaddoura, S. and El Khatib, S. (2017), 'Review of water-energy-food nexus tools', Environmental Science and Policy, Vol. 77, pp. 114–121.
15. Kaffine, D.T. and Brandt, A.R. (2013), 'Rigorous scrutiny of extended producer responsibility', Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 236–253.
16. Meadows, D.H. (2008), Thinking in Systems: A Primer, Chelsea Green Publishing, White River Junction, VT.
17. Mekonnen, M.M. and Hoekstra, A.Y. (2016), 'Four billion people facing severe water scarcity', Science Advances, Vol. 2 No. 2, p. e1500323.
18. Meldrum, J., Nettles-Anderson, S., Heath, G. and Macknick, J. (2013), 'Life cycle water use for electricity generation', Environmental Research Letters, Vol. 8 No. 1, p. 015031.
19. Mohtar, R.H. and Daher, B. (2016), 'Water-energy-food nexus framework for facilitating multi-stakeholder dialogue', Water International, Vol. 41 No. 5, pp. 655–661.

20. Ostrom, E. (1990), Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
21. Ostrom, E. (2009), 'A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems', Science, Vol. 325 No. 5939, pp. 419–422.
22. Scheinberg, A., Wilson, D.C. and Rodic, L. (2010), Solid Waste Management in the World's Cities, UN-Habitat/IWA Publishing, London.
23. Thaler, R.H. and Sunstein, C.R. (2008), Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
24. United Nations (2015), Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, A/RES/70/1, United Nations, New York, NY.
25. WCED (1987), Our Common Future, World Commission on Environment and Development, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
26. WHO (2014), Health Impact Assessment: The Determinants of Health, World Health Organization, Geneva.
27. WHO/UNICEF (2023), Progress on Household Drinking Water, Sanitation and Hygiene 2000–2022, World Health Organization, Geneva.
28. World Bank (2022), What a Waste 2.0: A Global Snapshot of Solid Waste Management to 2050, World Bank Group, Washington, DC.
29. World Bank (2023), Tracking SDG 7: The Energy Progress Report 2023, World Bank, Washington, DC.