



Transformations to Sustainability

Ian Scoones, Andy Stirling, Dinesh Abrol,
Joanes Atela, Lakshmi Charli-Joseph, Hallie Eakin,
Adrian Ely, Per Olsson, Laura Pereira, Ritu Priya,
Patrick van Zwanenberg, Lichao Yang



About the STEPS Centre

The ESRC STEPS (Social, Technological and Environmental Pathways to Sustainability) Centre carries out interdisciplinary global research uniting development studies with science and technology studies.

Our pathways approach links theory, research methods and practice to highlight and open up the politics of sustainability. We focus on complex challenges like climate change, food systems, urbanisation and technology in which society and ecologies are entangled. Our work explores how to better understand these challenges and appreciate the range of potential responses to them.

The STEPS Centre is hosted in the UK by the Institute of Development Studies and the Science Policy Research Unit (SPRU) at the University of Sussex. Our main funding is from the UK's Economic and Social Research Council.

We work as part of a Global Consortium with hubs in Africa, China, Europe, Latin America, North America and South Asia. Our research projects, in many countries, engage with local problems and link them to wider concerns.

Website: steps-centre.org

Twitter: [@stepscentre](https://twitter.com/stepscentre)

For more STEPS publications visit:
steps-centre.org/publications

This is one of a series of Working Papers from the STEPS Centre

ISBN: 978-1-78118-476-9 © STEPS 2018



Transformations to Sustainability

Ian Scoones, Andrew Stirling, Dinesh Abrol, Joanes Atela, Lakshmi Charli-Joseph, Hallie Eakin, Adrian Ely, Per Olsson, Laura Pereira, Ritu Priya, Patrick van Zwaneberg, Lichao Yang

STEPS Working Paper 104

Correct citation: Scoones, I., Stirling, A., Abrol, D., Atela, J., Charli-Joseph, L., Eakin, H., Ely, A., Olsson, P., Pereira, L., Priya, R., van Zwanenberg, P. and Yang, L. (2018) *Transformations to Sustainability*, STEPS Working Paper 104, Brighton: STEPS Centre

© STEPS 2018

Some rights reserved – see copyright license for details

ISBN: 978-1-78118-476-9

Acknowledgements:

This working paper is partly based on the research supported by the Transformations to Sustainability programme, which is coordinated by the International Science Council and funded by the Swedish Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), and implemented in partnership with the National Research Foundation of South Africa. The Transformations to Sustainability Programme represents a contribution to Future Earth. The working paper is also partly funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) – grant number ES/R008884/1.

For further information please contact: STEPS Centre, University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9RE

Tel: +44 (0) 1273915673; Email: steps-centre@ids.ac.uk; web: www.steps-centre.org

STEPS Centre publications are published under a Creative Commons Attribution – Non-Commercial – No Derivative Works 3.0 UK: England & Wales Licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/legalcode>)

Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor.

Non-commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

No Derivative Works: You may not alter, transfer, or build on this work.

Users are welcome to copy, distribute, display, translate or perform this work without written permission subject to the conditions set out in the Creative Commons licence. For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the licence terms of this work. If you use the work, we ask that you reference the STEPS Centre website (www.steps-centre.org) and send a copy of the work or a link to its use online to the following address for our archive: STEPS Centre, University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9RE, UK (steps-centre@ids.ac.uk).



Contents

Abstract	iv
1 What is Transformation?	5
1.1 Structural Approaches.....	5
1.2 Systemic Approaches.....	5
1.3 Enabling Approaches.....	6
2 Complementary Lenses	8
3 Practical, Methodological Responses	10
4 Towards Emancipatory Transformations to Sustainability.....	12
References.....	13

Abstract

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) highlight how transformations to sustainable economies and societies are a major global challenge. This Working Paper offers a brief overview of different conceptual approaches to transformation, and outlines a set of practical principles for effective research and action towards sustainability. We review three approaches to transformation, labelled: 'structural', 'systemic' and 'enabling'. We show how different ways of understanding what we mean by transformations can affect what actions follow. But these approaches are not mutually exclusive. We use global examples on low-carbon economy transformations, seed systems, wetland conservation and peri-urban development to show how they can be complementary and reinforcing. We describe three cross-cutting practical challenges and responses that must be taken seriously for effective transformations to sustainability: diverse knowledges, plural actors and the political nature of transformation. Realising the ambitions of the SDGs, we conclude, requires being clear about what we mean by transformation, and recognising these basic methodological principles for action.

1 What is Transformation?

In response to the challenge of achieving the SDGs, a wide literature is currently arguing for transformations to sustainability. But what is meant by 'transformation'? The term seems to be everywhere, but it is often not clear what is being transformed, by and for whom, and through what processes.

Reflecting a critical stance concerning the current economic interests and practices producing unsustainable outcomes, some authors point to a need for fundamental structural changes to production and consumption (Scoones *et al.* 2015; Foster *et al.* 2010; D'Alisa *et al.* 2015). Others advocate acceleration of more incremental approaches for managing social, technological and ecological transitions, driven by combinations of technological innovations and progressive policy (O'Brien 2011; Grin *et al.* 2010). Still others argue that change must emerge from below through networks of civic movements and grassroots activity that together, in often unruly ways, construct wider change (Stirling 2015). How do we make sense of these different ways of understanding and enacting transformation? We suggest that contemporary debates about sustainability should draw on deeper, contrasting political traditions, reflecting distinct but overlapping understandings of social processes that generate transformative change (Scoones 2016).

1.1 Structural Approaches

Structural approaches focus on changes in perceived underlying foundations of politics, economy and society. Examples include classical political economists like Marx, who argued that revolutionary change was possible at historical moments when relations of labour and capital do not match existing capabilities, techniques and technologies (Marx 1976). Drawing on Marx, Lenin focused on the class tensions wrought by processes of social differentiation in society (Lenin 2008), while Gramsci envisaged changes overturning generally accepted social values and understandings resulting in revolutionary transformation (Gramsci and Smith 1971).

Historical analyses, in turn, reveal how, for example, making the world 'cheap and safe' for capitalism creates nature-society relations that destroy the environment (Patel and Moore 2017), suggesting that major transformations in mass production and systems of consumption are required (O'Connor 1999). Or alternatively, histories highlight how key moments, or conjunctures, are important in generating transformations, as the relationships between economies and societies shift; generating crises and tensions, but also new inspirations and movements for change (Polanyi 2001). Such movements emerging across civil society – for example focusing on environment, gender rights, race – may also, some argue, come together to create a new politics for transformative structural change (Fraser 2013).

Such historical analyses of transformations have a common concern with wider structural change, occurring through radical, sometimes revolutionary, shifts in power and control at key moments. Yet many are rather generic and sweeping. Some emphasise material forces and downplay roles for deliberate human will, while others imply mechanical causal processes. The importance of localised activity, cultural practices or incremental policy action are frequently side-lined by a focus on deeper structural dynamics, driven by historical processes and shifting interests.

1.2 Systemic Approaches

Systemic approaches, by contrast, identify particular features of 'systems' (like 'levels' or 'actors') as targets for focused instrumental change, usually initiated by policy. For example, perspectives from social-ecological systems thinking (developed from ecology) (Holling 1973), highlight complex systems properties like resilience (Folke *et al.* 2010), and the potential for dynamic change across scales (Berks

et al. 2003). Socio-technical systems approaches emphasise 'transitions', involving interlinked processes at levels of the 'niche' (localised settings where novelties emerge), the 'regime' (the rules and institutions ordering wider practice) and 'the landscape' (the deeper patterns shaping social and technological change) (Rip and Kemp 1998).

Over the past few decades, the social-ecological systems approach has taken many forms, with attention recently moving towards politics, institutions, social dimensions and local contexts (Brown 2013; Westley *et al.* 2011). Many sophisticated case studies have followed with major implications for understanding system sustainability and transformative change (Olsson *et al.* 2014). These follow broadly similar patterns, in which multiple biophysical and social features are defined for a notionally bounded social-ecological system, with strategic interventions then designed to improve system resilience: the ability to bounce back to a new state following various kinds of perturbation (Folke 2006). Building on this tradition, the concept of 'planetary boundaries' defines global sustainability in relation to nine thresholds (Steffen *et al.* 2015; Rockström *et al.* 2009). Extending this, Raworth introduces a complementary 'social floor', with sustainability seen as the challenge of navigating between planetary boundaries and basic social and economic needs (Raworth 2017).

Socio-technical systems thinking has many similarities, with 'niche' innovations able to reform wider 'regimes', so generating socio-technical transitions (Geels 2005). Knowledge about system properties is seen to offer chances for transitions to be managed in ways directed by policy (Loorbach and Rotmans 2010). Examples include transformations of transport systems, renewable energy innovations and agricultural practices. Over time, this approach has been extended to focus more on the social and political dimensions of change (Keen 2013; Geels 2014), as well as tackling how change is resisted. Explorations of 'niches' as sites for innovation have also been extended beyond technology to social and cultural innovations, and how these combine in movements (Seyfang 2008; Keen 2013). But a focus on particular system categories – like 'actors' and 'levels' – is retained, as is a commitment to policy change through incentives, investments and policy initiatives, usually led by the state, but often in alliance with others, across the private sector and civic groups (Schmitz 2015).

1.3 Enabling Approaches

Enabling approaches draw on both these traditions to highlight the agency and uncertainties inherent in choosing aims and directions for transformative change (O'Brien 2015). By 'agency', we refer to the deliberate exercise of individual or collective will, with enabling approaches focusing especially on the most excluded interests. For example, there are many forms of low-carbon transition proposed, each entailing different values, interests and actions. So how can a policymaker decide, in merely technical ways, which policy is appropriate? Resilience is similarly contested, with system change following shocks and stress affecting different people in different ways, and marginalised groups are typically most vulnerable (Leach *et al.* 2010).

Enabling approaches take a more optimistic and activist stance than some structural or systems approaches, focusing on processes and capacities rather than just outcomes. Beyond major, historically driven structural reconfigurations or system changes, opportunities for transformation are seen in 'murmurations', in ostensibly smaller actions (Stirling 2015). Placing less emphasis on grand theoretical frameworks or pre-decided categories of phenomena, enabling approaches focus on the values, agency, relations and processes that underlie both structures and systems (Hulme 2009). Multiple forms of power are exercised, with power emerging both in structural forces and in collective action (Stirling 2014). Focusing on the scope for political mobilisation and cultural change, an enabling approach envisions a more hopeful, caring, emancipatory stance on transformation; one that is less controlling, violent or fearful. Enabling change will inevitably take different forms in different settings, and requires a wider, unruly and often adversarial politics of citizen mobilisation at its heart (Mouffe 1993; Fraser 2014); a process that is less open to manipulation or management by privileged interests.

A number of perspectives are central to an enabling approach. Network understandings may help address more messy power dynamics, linking emerging new actors, structures and processes that challenge incumbent positions and cultivate new pathways to sustainability. A focus on practice and agency affords more scope for action by citizens, enabling more emancipatory change, whatever the direction (Arora 2017). The politics of knowledge is also stressed, including how future transformations are imagined.

2 Complementary Lenses

These are not mutually exclusive approaches: each can offer complementary lenses on transformative change. Two illustrations show how transformations may emerge in different ways.

First, there are *transformations to low-carbon energy systems* that are essential for tackling climate change. These are recognised across many governments, businesses and civil-society organisations across the world. With such transformations central to a number of SDGs, most recognise that climate change requires deep structural shifts away from fossil fuels (Mitchell 2011). A structural approach argues for the reconfiguring of global markets and infrastructures, radically shifting forms of production (Bulkeley *et al.* 2012). Requiring support for alternatives, this fundamentally challenges incumbent interests. Across Europe, structural transformations have emerged through radical shifts in economic conditions, such as dramatic reductions in costs of renewable energy, shifting options in the energy sector. Or, change may result from new political and institutional commitments, with structural shifts away from conventional energy infrastructures, such as is currently being pursued in Germany (Kuzemko *et al.* 2017).

A socio-technical systems approach, by contrast, examines how an incumbent fossil fuel 'regime' can be transformed through substitution by new low-carbon innovations emerging in 'niches' (like wind and solar power), and how these can be nurtured and protected (Smith and Raven 2012). This approach, now evident in many European countries, advocates incremental responses to adapt to changes in an existing energy regime, including shifts in production patterns, consumption behaviour and motivating expectations that allow new, more resilient systems to develop (Folke *et al.* 2005).

An enabling approach to low-carbon transformation, by contrast, focuses on supporting novel pathways for more emergent social, political and cultural changes, often involving the mobilising of grassroots movements and alliances driven by a new ethics of sustainability (Smith *et al.* 2016). Examples can be found in many contributions made by civil society in areas like community-owned wind power, socially useful production or ecological agricultural practices (Smith and Stirling 2018). Here, directions of transformation are deliberated upon more politically, articulating diverse definitions of sustainability and wider social priorities (STEPS Centre 2010).

More control-oriented approaches, aiming at structural and systemic changes, may not engage in this broad politics of deliberation. 'Eco-modernist' visions, for example, highlight rapid technological 'solutions' for climate change, including focusing on nuclear or geo-engineering technologies (Asafu-Adjaye *et al.* 2015). But this technical, control focus can neglect wider implications around uncertainty, justice or cultural fit. By contrast, an enabling approach highlights complementarities between social and environmental aims, with an openness to contestation, dissent and deliberation. This helps to shape actively sustainability transformations that advance social justice as well as ecological integrity.

A second example highlights the importance of *open-source approaches to sustainable food and farming systems*. Transformations in food and farming systems away from input-intensive polluting industrial farming towards more diverse sustainable systems are immensely challenging. This is especially so in settings like Argentina where monolithic systems of intensive commodity crop and animal production are expanding rapidly, destroying existing agricultural system diversity. A pre-condition for agricultural transformation is to protect what remains of agricultural diversity and expand it further, to retain a range of alternative working practices that experiment with less input-intensive and more socially inclusive and productive agricultural systems. Here enabling approaches, such as shifts towards open-source legal rules for seed innovation, or co-operative business models and fair trade regulations, provide ways to protect and foster agricultural diversity. This is because they help open up space for emergent opportunities, enabling new actors to engage and novel practices to develop.

For example, institutional innovations like open-source seed licenses can help to reconfigure the wider political economic structures of food and farming that drive unsustainability. Such licenses are more accessible to economically marginal interests and avoid the exclusions of patent-based rules for governing seed innovation. In Argentina, such new institutional arrangements have helped form bridges between those concerned with adverse effects of strict intellectual property on domestic industries and technological capabilities and those committed to changing seed systems in favour of more marginalised producers (van Zwanenberg forthcoming 2018). In turn, through involving new people, ideas and practices, such change builds awareness of the constraints and opportunities imposed by wider political-economic structures, and makes possible a novel politics of transformation around seed production and associated farming systems.

Structural, systemic and enabling approaches are, thus, complementary. Instrumental systemic change in policies and institutions can be enabling of social movements and novel alliances seeking to address sustainability challenges in diverse ways, and at the same time lay the ground for a reconfiguration of broader structures.

3 Practical, Methodological Responses

These examples highlight how transformations to sustainability may draw on complementary approaches – but must be embedded in an open, plural, democratic politics, with central roles not just for policy, but also for mobilisation, critique and political challenge. How, then, to respond practically? What methodologies can help facilitate transformative change? What principles can best realise the complementarities? We suggest three.

The first is '*taking diverse knowledges seriously*'. Different perspectives compete in processes of transformation, rooted in different worldviews, positions and knowledges. It is crucial to appreciate this diversity and not homogenise it into a singular view of progress driven by circumscribed, expert sustainability science. This is not just about respecting 'indigenous' or 'lay' knowledges, but exploring how new hybrid knowledge systems – combining diverse sources of knowledge – can emerge through productive interactions in which research priorities, problem definitions and options are negotiated (Vogel *et al.* 2007).

This is the essence of transdisciplinarity, where multiple forms of expertise co-construct new knowledges that are both broader in what they consider and more open in their implications for change (Marshall 2016). Such processes of co-construction are intensely political, as new ways of thinking about problems and solutions are created together with new ways of tackling problems and acting on the world (Jasanoff 2004). This is more than 'getting people around a table' and engineering consensus in managerial forms of participation. Required, instead, are more equal processes of collaboration and exchange, exploring diverse visions from different standpoints (Pereira *et al.* 2015).

For example, 'transformation-labs' have been used as spaces for dialogue around transformation (Westley *et al.* 2015). These processes help mobilise people and action around a problem, giving opportunities for learning and reflexivity in exploring divergent values and interests (Ely and Marin 2016; Sharpe *et al.* 2016). In addressing the sustainability challenges of the Xochimilco wetland in Mexico City, for instance, a culture of exchange was created that enabled participants to reframe basic challenges. Through participatory activities, the transformation lab embraced an enabling approach, building space for participants to step back from the contentious land use and water quality issues that divided the community, to focus on the values and meanings they collectively wanted to conserve (Charli-Joseph forthcoming 2018). Rather than an exhausting task of fighting forces that the participants felt were beyond participants' control, the problem was recast as one of maintaining the identity and meanings they attached to 'Xochimilco'. By focusing on capacities and agency, both of individual people and different social groups, the process illuminated where power is held and how it can be mobilised to achieve more just and sustainable development pathways.

Beyond appreciation of diverse knowledges, there is a need to '*take plural pathways seriously*'. Different ideas and values of sustainability imply multiple (very material) institutional and infrastructural transformations. No matter how specific the context, there is never only one relevant, viable path. The many indicators and targets of the SDGs usefully delimit a target space. But how to realise the plurality of ways to get there? This will require demanding new forms of deliberation among contending actors. Especially crucial is engagement not just with diverse ideas, but also with the contrasting norms, interests and practices of different actors. In areas like agricultural strategies, energy policy or public health, approaches like multi-criteria mapping and participatory scenario workshops can help collaborative efforts to navigate the implications of different pathways and the contrasting ways to develop any one (Eames and McDowall 2010).

For example, progress in addressing the sustainability challenges of Xochimilco has been stymied by disagreement over the best strategies to pursue. Those who consider themselves native to the

communities that have practised agriculture within this wetland argue that the persistent degradation and urbanisation of this environment, and the decline of traditional farming techniques, the commodification of the ecosystem, suits the interests of the urban elite. They are suspicious of formal development plans and interventions by the city, and advocate local sovereignty and control in the face of external power: in other words, a structural transformation. Alternatively, some focus on technological interventions, arguing that transformation is needed in the ways people live within the system, rather than with the system itself. Thus, they demand institutional and policy support for eco-friendly sanitation technologies and rainwater harvesting, as mechanisms through which the human relationship to the ecosystem can be fundamentally changed. The transformation lab created a space to confront and discuss assumptions about which pathway – of many possibilities – will be most successful for whom, and why.

Our third principle is *'taking politics seriously'*, and builds directly on the previous two. It reminds us that, however well assisted by technical expertise, engaging with a diversity of contexts or a plurality of perspectives is always deeply political. Negotiations among contending knowledges and divergent interests across multiple actors inevitably involves politics: confronting disparate views, interests and forms of incumbent power. Wider political institutions, economic systems and technical infrastructures inevitably shape what happens and what might be possible. But taking an enabling approach means a focus on agency and the capacities of actors to open up opportunities, often in surprising alliances.

In the Xochimilco wetland, different perspectives on sustainability again play a key role. Local farmers see degradation of the wetland ecosystem as a result of decline in traditional systems of land use and commodification of the area by urban elites. For them, transformation is about resistance in the face of the power of development plans and elite control. However, an expected change in political leadership and new opportunities presented by Mexico City's embrace of planning for resilience are now providing new platforms for action. The case underscores not only the interlinked nature of sustainability goals, but also that the pathways to these goals will require negotiation, contestation and alliance-building. Taking diverse knowledges – including values and moral positions – seriously helps reframe dominant policy narratives in formal political arenas. This broadens out what is taken into account and opens up possibilities for change: challenging discursive closures that exclude alternative pathways.

Likewise in peri-urban Delhi, India, alliances of citizen environmentalists are addressing toxic pollution using a range of strategies from legal activism to citizen-science monitoring (Priya *et al.* 2017). Strategic alignments between activist interventions and some within the state or business are challenging established pathways and opening up opportunities for change (Marshall *et al.* forthcoming). A focus on social innovation helps move the emphasis away from technological fixes or instrumental policy intervention and towards the realising of entirely new possibilities. This requires thinking deliberately about where the chinks lie in the armour of power, and what the opportunities might be for tactical alliances. It means looking for political openings, in who has the capacity to act and what mobilisations are required to challenge incumbent interests and constraining structures. Alongside more conventional 'academic rigour', then, taking politics seriously also emphasises 'activist rigour', where diverse people and knowledges challenge prevailing power in collective political interventions. Many examples can be found in environmental justice struggles around the world; for instance in the hundreds of cases documented in the global *'EJ-Atlas'* or Latin American *'Grupo Confluencias'* initiatives (Temper *et al.* 2018).

4 Towards Emancipatory Transformations to Sustainability

Achieving the SDGs by 2030 will require massive transformations in economies, societies and politics. If such transformations are to be not only ecologically beneficial, but emancipatory of the most marginalised people, then approaches are required that are at once structural, systemic and enabling. This requires embedding our three principles within SDG implementation, taking seriously diverse knowledges, plural actors and the inherently political nature of transformations. This Working Paper offers some pointers for thinking more deeply about these challenges, and for translating results into action-oriented practice, as illustrated by the examples discussed. Combining recognition for deep structural realities as well as vibrant social possibilities, these three principles help open up space for new social and technical innovations, as well as deliberation, contest and democratic debate: all of which are essential for achieving sustainability, and so the wider ambitions of the SDGs, both individually and together.

References

Arora, S. (2017) *Defying Control: Aspects of caring engagement between divergent knowledge practices*, STEPS Working Paper 90, Brighton: STEPS Centre

Asafu-Adjaye, J., Blomquist, L., Brand, S., Brook, B. W., Defries, R., Ellis, E., Foreman, C., Keith, D., Lewis, M., Lynas, M., Nordhaus, T., Pielke, R., Pritzker, R., Roy, J., Sagoff, M., Shellenberger, M., Stone, R. and Teague, P. (2015) *An Ecomodernist Manifesto*, Oakland CA: Breakrough Institute, <http://www.ecomodernism.org/> (16 August 2018)

Berkes, F., Colding, J. and Folke, C. (eds) (2003) *Navigating Social-Ecological Systems: building resilience for complexity and change*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Brown, K. (2013) 'Global environmental change I: A social turn for resilience?', *Progress in Human Geography* 38.1: 107–117, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0309132513498837> 16 August 2018)

Bulkeley, H., Andonova, L., Bäckstrand, K., Betsill, M., Compagnon, D., Duffy, R., Kolk A., Hoffmann, M., Levy, D., Newell, P., Milledge, T., Paterson, M., Pattberg, P. and van Deveer, S. (2012) 'Governing climate change transnationally: assessing the evidence from a database of sixty initiatives', *Environment and Planning C* 30. 4: 591–612

Charli-Joseph, L., Siqueiros-Garcia, J., Eakin, H., Manuel-Navarete, D. and Shelton, R. (forthcoming 2018) 'Promoting agency for social-ecological transformation: The Transformation-lab in Xochimilco social-ecological system', *Ecology and Society* 23.2: 46

D'Alisa, G., Demaria, F. and Kallis, G. (eds) (2015) *Degrowth: a vocabulary for a new era*, London: Routledge

Eames, M. and McDowall, W. (2010) 'Sustainability, foresight and contested futures: exploring visions and pathways in the transition to a hydrogen economy', *Technology. Analysis and Strategic Management* 22: 671–692

Ely, A. and Marin, A. (2016) *Learning about 'engaged excellence' across a Transformative Knowledge Network*, IDS Bulletin 47, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Folke, C. (2006) 'Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses', *Global Environmental. Change* 16: 253–267

Folke, C., Carpenter, S.R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T. and Rockström, J. (2010) 'Resilience thinking: integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability' *Ecology and Society* 15.4: article 20

Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P. and Norberg, J. (2005) 'Adaptive Governance of Social-Ecological Systems', *Annual Revue of Environment Resources* 30: 441–473

Foster, J. B., Clark, B. and York, R. (2010) *The Ecological Rift: Capitalism's War on the Earth*, New York NY: Monthly Review Press

Fraser, N. (2014) 'Can society be commodities all the way down? Polanyian reflections on capitalist crisis', *Economy and Society* 43.4: 541–558

Fraser, N. (2013) 'A Triple Movement?', *New Left Review* 81: 119–132

- Geels, F. W. (2014) 'Regime resistance against low carbon transitions: introducing politics and power into the multi-level perspective', *Theory, Culture and Society* 31: 21–40
- Geels, F. (2005) *Technological Transitions and System Innovations: a co-evolutionary and socio-technical analysis*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Gramsci, A. Hoare, Q. and Smith, G. N. (eds) (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, New York NY: International Publishers
- Grin, J., Rotmans, J., Schot, J., Geels, F. and Loorbach, D. (2010) *Transitions to Sustainable Development: new directions in the study of long term transformative change*, London: Routledge
- Holling, C. S. (1973) 'Resilience and stability of ecological systems', *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 4: 1–23
- Hulme, M. (2009) *Why We Disagree About Climate Change*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Jasanoff, S. (ed.) (2004) *States of Knowledge: the co-production of science and social order*, London: Routledge
- Kern, F. (2013) 'Energy transitions and deliberate transition management: implementing the green economy', *Ökologisches Wirtschaften* 3: 20–23
- Kuzemko, C., Mitchell, C., Lockwood, M. and Hoggett, R. (2017) 'Policies, politics and demand side innovations: The untold story of Germany's energy transition', *Energy Research and Social Science* 28: 58–67
- Leach, M., Scoones, I. and Stirling, A. (2010) *Dynamic Sustainabilities: Technology, Environment, Social Justice*, London: Earthscan
- Lenin, V. I. (2008) *Revolution, Democracy, Socialism*, London: Pluto Press
- Loorbach, D. and Rotmans, J. (2010) 'The practice of transition management: examples and lessons from four distinct cases', *Futures* 42: 237–246
- Marshall, F. (2016) 'Recognising Sustainability Frontiers in the Peri-Urban', *South Asian Water Studies* 5: 98–102
- Marshall, F., Dolley, J. and Priya, R. (forthcoming 2018) 'Transdisciplinary research as transformative space making for sustainability: enhancing pro-poor transformative agency in peri-urban contexts', *Ecology and Society*
- Marx, K. (1976) *Capital: A critique of political economy - Volume 1*, London: Penguin
- Mitchell, T. (2011) *Carbon Democracy: political power in the age of oil*, London: Verso
- Mouffe, C. (1993) *The Return of the Political*, London: Verso
- O' Brien, K. (2015) 'Political agency: the key to tackling climate change', *Science* 350.6265: 1170–1171
- O'Brien, K. (2011) 'Global environmental change II: From adaptation to deliberate transformation', *Progress in Human Geography* 36: 667–676
- O'Connor, J. (1999) *Natural Causes: essays on ecological Marxism*, New York NY: Guilford Press

Olsson, P., Galaz, V. and Boonstra, W. J. (2014) 'Sustainability transformations: a resilience perspective', *Ecology and Society* 19.4:1

Patel, R. and Moore, J.W. (2017) *A History of the World in Seven Cheap Things: A guide to capitalism, nature and the future of the planet*, Berkeley: University of California Press

Pereira, L., Karpouzoglou, T., Doshi, S. and Frantzeskaki, N. (2015) 'Organising a Safe Space for Navigating Social-Ecological Transformations to Sustainability', *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 12: 6027–6044

Polanyi, K. (2001) *The Great Transformation: The political and economic origins of our time*, Boston MA: Beacon Press

Priya, R., Bisht, R., Randhawa, P., Arora, M., Dolley, J., McGranahan, G., Marshall, F. (2017), *Local Environmentalism in Peri-Urban Spaces in India: Emergent Ecological Democracy?*, STEPS Working Paper 96, Brighton, STEPS Centre

Raworth, K. (2017) *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st Century Economist*, London: Penguin Random House

Rip, A. and Kemp, R. (1998) 'Technological Change' pp. 327–399 in S. Rayner and E. L. Malone (eds) *Human Choice and Climate Change: an international assessment Volume 2*, Columbus OH: Batelle Press

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., None, K. Persson, A., Stuart Chapin III, F., Lambin E. F., Lenton, T. M., Scheffer, M., Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H. J., Nykvist, B., de Wit, C. A., Hughes, T., van der Leeuw, S., Rodhe, H., Sörlin, S., Snyder, P. K., Costanza, R., Svedin, U., Falkenmark, M., Karlbert, L., Corell, R. W., Fabry, V. J., Hansen, J., Walker, B., Liverman, D., Richardson, K., Crutzen, P. and Foley, J. A. (2009) 'A safe operating space for humanity', *Nature* 461: 472–475

Schmitz, H. (2015) 'Green Transformation: is there a fast track?' in I. Scoones, M. Leach and P. Newell (eds) *The Politics of Green Transformations*, London: Routledge

Scoones, I. (2016) 'The politics of sustainability and development', *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 41: 293-319

Scoones, I., Newell, P. and Leach, M.(eds) (2015) *The Politics of Green Transformations*, London: Routledge

Seyfang, G. (2008) *The New Economics of Sustainable Consumption: seeds of change*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, <https://www.palgrave.com/gb/book/9780230525337> (16 August 2018)

Sharpe, B., Hodgson, A., Leicester, G., Lyon, A. and Fazey, I. (2016) 'Three horizons: a pathways practice for transformation', *Ecology and Society* 21: 47

Smith, A. and Raven, R. (2012) 'What is protective space? Reconsidering niches in transitions to sustainability', *Research Policy* 41: 1025–1036

Smith, A. and Stirling, A. (2018) 'Innovation, sustainability and democracy: an analysis of grassroots contributions', *Journal of Self-Governance and Management Economics* 6: 64–97

Smith, A., Fressoli, M., Abrol, D., Around, E. and Ely, A. (2016) *Grassroots Innovation Movements*, London: Routledge

Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S. E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E. M., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S. R., de Vries, W., de Wit, C. A., Folke, C., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Mace, G. M., Persson, L. M., Ramanathan, V., Reyers, B., Sörlin, S. (2015) 'Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet', *Science* 347

STEPS Centre (2010) *Innovation, sustainability, development: a new manifesto*, Brighton: STEPS Centre

Stirling, A. (2015) 'Emancipation transformations: from controlling 'the transition' to culturing plural radical progress', pp. 54–67 in I. Scoones, M. Leach and P. Newell (eds) *The Politics of Green Transformations*, London: Routledge

Stirling, A. (2014) 'Transforming power: social science and the politics of energy choices', *Energy Research and Social Science* 1: 83–95

Temper, L., Walter, M., Rodriguez, I., Kothari, A. and Turhan, E. (2018) 'A perspective on radical transformations to sustainability: resistances, movements and alternatives', *Sustainability Science* 13.3: 747–764

van Zwanenberg, P., Cremaschi, A., Obaya, M., Marin, A. and Lowenstein, V. (forthcoming 2018) 'Seeking unconventional alliances and bridging innovations in spaces for transformative change: the seed sector and agricultural sustainability in Argentina', *Ecology and Society* 23.3: 11

Vogel, C., Moser, S. C., Kasperson, R. E. and Dabelko, G. D. (2007) 'Linking vulnerability, adaptation, and resilience science to practice: Pathways, players, and partnerships', *Global Environmental Change* 17: 349–364

Westley, F., Laban, S., Rose, C., McGowan, K., Robinson, K., Tjornbo, O. and Tovey, M. (2015) *Social Innovation Lab Guide*, Waterloo ON: University of Waterloo

Westley, F., Olsson, P., Folke, C., Homer-Dixon, T., Vredenburg, H., Looibach, D., Thompson, J., Nilsson, M., Lambin, E., Sendzimir, J., Banerjee, B., Galaz, V. and van der Leeuw, S. (2011) 'Tipping toward sustainability: Emerging pathways of transformation', *Ambio* 40: 762–780

About the authors

Ian Scoones is Co-director of the STEPS Centre and Professorial Fellow at IDS.

Andy Stirling is Co-director of the STEPS Centre and Professor of Science & Technology Policy at SPRU.

Dinesh Abrol is Coordinator of the STEPS South Asia Sustainability Hub, Member of the Transdisciplinary Research Cluster on Sustainability Studies (TRCSS), Jawaharlal Nehru University, and Chief Scientist (Retd.), Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, NISTADS.

Joanes Atela is Senior Research Fellow, Head of Climate Resilient Economies Programme and Coordinator of the STEPS Africa Hub.

Lakshmi Charli-Joseph is the Academic Technician and PhD candidate in the National Laboratory of Sustainability Sciences, Institute of Ecology, National Autonomous University of Mexico.

Hallie Eakin is Professor in the School of Sustainability, Arizona State University, and Co-ordinator of the STEPS North America Hub.

Adrian Ely is Deputy Director and Head of Impact and Engagement for the STEPS Centre, and Senior Lecturer at the Science Policy Research Unit (SPRU), University of Sussex.

Per Olsson is Researcher at the Stockholm Resilience Centre and STEPS Europe Hub co-ordinator.

Laura Pereira is Researcher at the Centre for Food Policy, City University of London.

Ritu Priya is Project Director of the STEPS South Asia Sustainability Hub, Professor at the Centre of Social Medicine and Community Health (CSMCH) and Principal Coordinator of the Transdisciplinary Research Cluster on Sustainability Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University.

Patrick van Zwanenberg is Researcher at Fundación CENIT in Buenos Aires and Co-Director of STEPS América Latina.

Lichao Yang is Associate Professor at the School of Social Development and Public Policy (SSDPP), Beijing Normal University (BNU), Coordinator of the STEPS China hub, and the lead researcher for China on the ISSC-funded Transformative Pathways to Sustainability project.

Transformations to Sustainability

STEPS Working Paper 104

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) highlight how transformations to sustainable economies and societies are a major global challenge. This Working Paper offers a brief overview of different conceptual approaches to transformation, and outlines a set of practical principles for effective research and action towards sustainability. We review three approaches to transformation, labelled: 'structural', 'systemic' and 'enabling'. We show how different ways of understanding what we mean by transformations can affect what actions follow. But these approaches are not mutually exclusive. We use global examples on low-carbon economy transformations, seed systems, wetland conservation and peri-urban development to show how they can be complementary and reinforcing. We describe three cross-cutting practical challenges and responses that must be taken seriously for effective transformations to sustainability: diverse knowledges, plural actors and the political nature of transformation. Realising the ambitions of the SDGs, we conclude, requires being clear about what we mean by transformation, and recognising these basic methodological principles for action.

