**International Journal of Management and Commerce**
**www.managementjournal.in**
**Online ISSN: 2664-6854**
**Received: 30-11-2025, Accepted: 29-12-2025, Published: 13-01-2026**
**Volume 8, Issue 1, 2026, Page No. 1-6**

# Interdisciplinary research as a tool for solving complex global challenges: A critical sociology of knowledge integration, power, and impact

**Mohammed Ali**
Swiss International University SIU, Dubai, United Arab Emirates
**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.66856/ijmc.2026.8.1.8001

**Abstract**
Interdisciplinary research is widely advocated as an essential response to intricate global challenges, including climate instability, public health threats, energy insecurity, digital transformation, and escalating inequality. But there is no guarantee that interdisciplinarity will work. A lot of "interdisciplinary" projects end up with outputs that are broken up, symbolic collaboration, or solutions that are scientifically sound but socially weak. This article formulates a journal-level, critical sociology perspective on interdisciplinary research as a contentious social practice influenced by power, prestige, resources, and institutional incentives. Utilising Bourdieu's notions of field, habitus, and capital; the core–periphery dynamics of world-systems theory; and the concept of institutional isomorphism to elucidate organisational convergence, the article articulates the challenges of knowledge integration and the tendency for interdisciplinary collaboration to devolve into legitimacy performance rather than effective problem-solving.
The article suggests a practical framework for interdisciplinary impact that is based on sociology. It moves from "topic-based interdisciplinarity" to "decision-centered interdisciplinarity." It provides operational mechanisms for integration (epistemic translation, boundary objects, triangulation protocols, and governance design), evaluation metrics beyond publication counts (integration quality, implementability, equity, and learning capacity), and ethical safeguards to prevent exploitative collaborations. The analysis consistently underscores authentic organisational conditions, including career incentives, funding competition, metric pressure, data politics, and inequitable global infrastructures. The article concludes that interdisciplinary research only becomes a real way to solve global problems when institutions treat it like a skill with clear rules, resources, and responsibility, not just a slogan.

**Keywords:** Interdisciplinary research, sociology of knowledge, Bourdieu, World-Systems Theory, institutional isomorphism, sustainability, governance, evidence integration, global challenges

## Introduction

### Why Interdisciplinarity Is No Longer Optional

Problems in today's world don't care about disciplinary lines. Heatwaves are not only weather events; they are also public health emergencies, failures of infrastructure, shocks to worker productivity, and tests of political legitimacy. Artificial intelligence is a technical system, but it is also changing the job market, creating problems for regulators, and causing cultural fights over trust and authority. While tourism growth can be good for the economy, it can also make housing more expensive, make water less available, and hurt the environment. These problems are not different from each other. They are pressures that work together like a system.
Interdisciplinary research is often proposed as the solution: convene experts, amalgamate knowledge, and generate solutions commensurate with the intricacies of reality. This story has a good point: approaches that only focus on one area often have trouble with cross-domain causal chains and limits on how they can be used. But the story can also hide a second truth: interdisciplinary work is itself a social field of struggle. Prestige hierarchies, different definitions of "rigour," competition for resources, and institutional incentives that often punish integration while rewarding narrow productivity all play a role in shaping it.
This article takes interdisciplinarity seriously as both a method and a social practice. It asks a critical sociology question: Under what conditions does interdisciplinary research actually produce usable knowledge for solving complex global challenges, and under what conditions does it become symbolic collaboration?
To answer, the article uses three theoretical lenses

1. **Bourdieu:** to understand disciplinary power, prestige, and the hidden economy of academic capital.

2. **World-systems theory:** to explain global inequalities in knowledge production and the risk of "core-designed, periphery-applied" solutions.

3. **Institutional isomorphism:** to interpret why organisations copy "interdisciplinary" structures without building interdisciplinary capability.

The article also aims to be practical. It provides an actionable framework for designing interdisciplinary projects that deliver impact, not just integration claims. This combination—critical theory plus operational design—is essential because global challenges demand both sociological realism and organisational competence.

### Defining Interdisciplinary Research: Beyond Labels and Toward Capability

1. **Multidisciplinary, Interdisciplinary, Transdisciplinary**

A frequent source of confusion is that institutions label many different practices as "interdisciplinary":

- **Multidisciplinary:** disciplines work side-by-side, producing separate outputs that are later assembled.

- **Interdisciplinary:** methods and concepts are integrated into a shared analytic or intervention model.
- **Transdisciplinary:** integration extends beyond academia to include practitioner and community knowledge in co-design and implementation.

For global challenges, the most valuable work often becomes transdisciplinary, because implementation depends on legitimacy, feasibility, and local knowledge. Yet many organisations stop at multidisciplinary work while claiming interdisciplinarity for legitimacy.

## 2. A Decision-Centred Definition

**For complex challenges, a useful definition must emphasise actionability:**

Interdisciplinary research is a structured process that integrates theories, methods, and evidence from multiple knowledge domains to support decisions, designs, or interventions under real-world constraints.

This definition implies that interdisciplinarity is not merely about diversity of expertise; it is about integration discipline: the rules and workflows that convert plural knowledge into coherent outputs.

## 3. Why "Complex Global Challenges" Require Integration

**Complex problems tend to have five characteristics:**

1. Multiple interacting causes rather than a single driver.
2. Feedback loops (policy affects behaviour; behaviour affects outcomes; outcomes affect policy).
3. Uncertainty (data gaps, changing conditions, imperfect models).
4. Contested values (trade-offs between growth, equity, safety, and freedom).
5. Implementation dependence (solutions work only if institutions and communities can apply them).

These characteristics mean that knowledge must be both technically credible and socially viable. Interdisciplinary research becomes crucial precisely because it can combine causal understanding with governance and behavioural realism—if done well.

## The Sociology of Interdisciplinarity: Why Integration Is Difficult

### 1. Bourdieu: Disciplines as Fields, and Interdisciplinarity as Struggle

**Bourdieu's theory of fields treats academic disciplines as semi-autonomous worlds with their own:**

- Rules of evaluation (what counts as "good science" or "good scholarship")
- Forms of capital (prestige, citations, grants, institutional reputation)
- Habitus (embodied dispositions: how scholars speak, argue, and judge)

From this view, interdisciplinarity is not a neutral meeting of minds; it is often a confrontation between fields. Each discipline protects its autonomy and status by defending its standards of rigour. A field that controls powerful methods (for example, advanced quantitative modelling) may claim methodological superiority, while a field grounded in interpretive analysis may claim superior understanding of meaning and social context.

**Key point:** when disciplines meet, they do not only exchange ideas; they negotiate hierarchy.

### 1.1 Forms of Capital in Interdisciplinary Work

**Bourdieu helps us identify why scholars may resist interdisciplinarity:**

- **Cultural capital:** deep disciplinary expertise, canonical theory, specialised methods.
- **Social capital:** networks, collaborations, "who knows whom," gatekeepers.
- **Symbolic capital:** prestige and recognition; what counts as "excellent."
- **Economic capital:** funding, paid time, infrastructure, salaries, grants.

Interdisciplinary work can threaten symbolic capital because it may be evaluated by multiple audiences, none of which fully recognise the work. A scholar can lose status if their output is judged "not rigorous enough" by one discipline and "not meaningful enough" by another. The risk is not merely intellectual; it is career risk.

### 1.2 Habitus and Communication Conflict

Interdisciplinary teams often struggle because members carry different academic habitus:

- Some prefer formal proof and models.
- Some prioritise thick description and context.
- Some seek causal inference; others seek explanation of meaning.
- Some use "neutral" technical language; others foreground power and inequality.

These differences can generate misunderstanding: not because people are irrational, but because they operate with different assumptions about what knowledge is for.

**Sociological insight:** integration requires more than translation of terms; it requires negotiation of epistemic authority.

### 2. World-Systems Theory: Global Inequalities in Knowledge Production

World-systems theory explains how global capitalism is structured around core, semi-periphery, and periphery relations. In knowledge production, this often translates into:

- Concentrated funding and infrastructure in the core
- Gatekeeping through high-prestige journals and rankings
- English language dominance and citation inequalities
- Data extraction from less-resourced settings without equal benefits

Interdisciplinary research on global challenges can either reduce or reproduce these inequalities.

### 2.1. The "Core-Designed, Periphery-Applied" Problem

A common pattern is that conceptual models and "best practices" are developed in well-resourced contexts and applied elsewhere with minimal adaptation. This creates failures when:

- Institutional capacity differs
- Informal economies shape behaviour
- Cultural norms affect adoption

- Basic infrastructure (data systems, governance, logistics) is missing

Interdisciplinary research becomes meaningful when it integrates local knowledge and implementation realities, not only as data inputs but as agenda-setting power.

### 2.2. Epistemic Justice and Collaboration Ethics

**Global interdisciplinary work needs epistemic justice:**

- Who defines the research question?
- Who controls the dataset?
- Who becomes first author, and who becomes "field assistant"?
- Who benefits from the intervention?

Without equity, interdisciplinary research risks becoming extractive, reinforcing periphery dependency rather than building capacity.

### 3. Institutional Isomorphism: Why Interdisciplinarity Becomes a Fashion

**Institutional isomorphism explains why organisations converge in structure:**

- **Coercive isomorphism:** funders and regulators requires interdisciplinary outputs.
- **Normative isomorphism:** professional norms promote interdisciplinarity as "modern.
- **Mimetic isomorphism:** uncertain organisations copy prestigious peers.

This creates a familiar phenomenon: universities and agencies build interdisciplinary centres because it looks correct. But they may not change incentives or evaluation systems. Interdisciplinarity then becomes an institutional performance: an attractive label with limited transformation.

### 3.1. The Gap Between Structure and Capability

Organisations can create an interdisciplinary unit without addressing

- Career evaluation criteria (still discipline-based)
- Workload recognition (integration time is invisible)
- Shared data infrastructure
- Leadership accountability for outcomes

When these conditions are missing, interdisciplinary projects become short-term, symbolic, and fragile.

### From "Topic Interdisciplinarity" to "Decision Interdisciplinarity"

### 1. The Limits of Topic-Based Collaboration

Many projects begin with a large theme: "AI and society," "climate resilience," "health equity," or "sustainable tourism." Themes are useful for communication, but weak for action. They do not specify:

- What decision must be made
- Which outcomes define success
- What constraints matter
- Which trade-offs are acceptable

As a result, outputs become general recommendations, not decision tools.

### 2. Decision-Centred Research Questions

Decision-centred interdisciplinarity begins with a precise question:

- Who is deciding? (city government, hospital board, ministry, industry coalition)
- What must be decided? (policy choice, investment plan, protocol)
- When? (6 months, 2 years, 10 years)
- Constraints? (budget, law, political feasibility, staff capacity)
- Equity and ethics? (who bears costs and risks)

This approach increases the chance that integrated knowledge becomes usable.

### Mechanisms of Integration: How Interdisciplinary Knowledge Is Actually Built

### 1. Boundary Objects: Shared Tools That Allow Different Meanings

A boundary object is something that different disciplines can use while interpreting it differently—such as:

- A system maps
- A shared dataset with metadata
- A risk registers
- A scenario models
- A common framework of indicators

Boundary objects do not eliminate differences; they provide a stable platform for coordination.

### 2. Epistemic Translation: Turning One Discipline's Output into Another's Input

Integration often fails because outputs are not "convertible." For example:

- Qualitative insights are not translated into measurable variables.
- Statistical findings ignore institutional feasibility.
- Technical designs ignore behavioural adoption.

**Epistemic translation requires explicit work:** defining how each discipline's evidence will be used by others.

### 3. Triangulation Protocols: Managing Contradictory Evidence

Interdisciplinary work frequently produces conflicting findings:

- A model predicts high impact; field interviews suggest low trust and low adoption.
- Economic analysis recommends efficiency; ethics analysis highlights unacceptable inequity.

**Instead of forcing artificial consensus, teams should adopt protocols:**

- Identify why evidence conflicts (measurement, assumptions, context)
- Conduct sensitivity analysis (what changes outcomes?)
- Use deliberative methods for value trade-offs
- Document uncertainty rather than hiding it

True integration is often a disciplined way of handling disagreement.

### 4. Integration Governance: Who Decides What Counts as "Rigour"?

Because interdisciplinarity is a struggle over authority, governance matters. Practical governance includes

- A shared definition of quality (multiple standards of rigour)
- Rotating facilitation to reduce dominance
- Explicit decision rights for integration choices
- Conflict resolution pathways
- Recognition systems for integration labour (often invisible work)

Without governance, interdisciplinarity becomes either chaos or domination by the most prestigious method.

**Case Vignettes: Where Interdisciplinary Research Adds Real Value**

These vignettes are illustrative and represent common real-world patterns.

**1. Climate–Health Resilience in Cities**

A city faces rising heat-related illness. A purely environmental solution may focus on temperature mapping; a purely medical approach may focus on hospital preparedness. Interdisciplinary research integrates:

- Climate science (heat patterns)
- Urban planning (housing and shade)
- Public health (risk populations)
- Behavioural science (risk communication)
- Governance (emergency protocols, budgeting)

**The integrated output is not a report alone, but a decision package:** priority neighbourhoods, cooling infrastructure plan, communication strategy, and monitoring indicators.

**2. AI Adoption in Public Services**

Governments adopt AI to improve efficiency. Technical teams build predictive systems; social research reveals mistrust, bias fears, and institutional misuse risks. Interdisciplinary research integrates:

- Computer science (model performance)
- Law and ethics (rights, accountability)
- Sociology (trust, power, bureaucratic incentives)
- Public administration (implementation feasibility)

The output becomes a governance model: audit protocols, human oversight design, complaint mechanisms, and transparent risk criteria.

**3. Sustainable Tourism Under Resource Pressure**

A destination depends on tourism income but faces water scarcity and community resistance. Interdisciplinary research integrates:

- Economics (income and jobs)
- Environmental science (water and ecological limits)
- Anthropology/sociology (community identity and conflict)
- Operations management (visitor flow and infrastructure)
- Policy (regulation and enforcement)

The output becomes a balanced plan: capacity limits, pricing strategies, community benefit-sharing, and ecological monitoring.

**Evaluation: What Counts as Success in Interdisciplinary Research?**

**1. Why Publication Metrics Are Insufficient**

Publication counts and journal rankings are discipline-specific forms of symbolic capital. They do not measure

- Integration quality
- Implementation usability
- Ethical fairness
- Learning and adaptation

A sociological view recognises that evaluation shapes behaviour. If institutions evaluate interdisciplinarity using disciplinary metrics, they produce symbolic interdisciplinarity.

**2. A Multi-Dimensional Evaluation Model**

**A robust evaluation approach should include:**

**a. Integration quality**

- Existence of a shared model or synthesis framework
- Evidence that one discipline's findings changed another's approach
- Documented handling of contradictions and uncertainty

**b. Decision usability**

- Clear decision options with trade-offs
- Feasibility analysis (capacity, law, budget, politics)
- Stakeholder validation and implementation plan

**c. Equity and ethics**

- Fair agenda-setting and benefit-sharing
- Data governance and privacy safeguards
- Bias and harm assessment (especially in AI systems)

**d. Learning capacity**

- Monitoring indicators
- Iteration plan
- Feedback loops and institutional memory

This evaluation model treats interdisciplinary work as a problem-solving capability rather than a branding exercise.

**The Political Economy of Interdisciplinarity: Funding, Prestige, and Time**

**1. Funding as a Structuring Force**

Funding systems shape research behaviour. Short-term grants encourage quick deliverables, not deep integration. Competitive funding encourages risk avoidance and safe narratives. Interdisciplinary integration, however, requires time

- Building shared language
- Harmonising data
- Negotiating governance
- Testing interventions

If funders want interdisciplinary impact, they must fund integration labour explicitly.

**2. Prestige Hierarchies and Method Power**

Certain methods carry higher symbolic capital in many institutions. When interdisciplinary teams form, the methods with higher prestige may dominate, pushing others into "support roles." This leads to:

- Narrow problem definitions (what fits the dominant method)
- Reduction of context (what cannot be quantified is ignored)
- Lower legitimacy among communities and implementers.

Bourdieu's concept of symbolic power explains why teams may accept this hierarchy even when it undermines impact. People internalise what counts as "serious science."

### 3. The Hidden Labour of Integration

**Integration produces invisible labour:**

- Facilitation and translation
- Negotiating definitions
- Documenting assumptions
- Aligning timelines and workflows
- Ethical review and stakeholder engagement

Institutions often do not reward this labour. Yet without it, interdisciplinary projects fail. Therefore, success requires creating formal recognition for integration work (workload models, promotion criteria, and leadership roles).

### Ethics and Responsibility: When Integrated Knowledge Can Harm

Interdisciplinary research can unintentionally increase harm if it produces powerful interventions without adequate ethics:

- Predictive systems can intensify discrimination
- Environmental policies can displace vulnerable communities
- Health interventions can fail without cultural trust
- Tourism strategies can commodify identity and deepen inequality

**Responsibility requires**

- Transparency about uncertainty
- Participatory governance in affected communities
- Clear accountability lines
- Bias and fairness auditing (where relevant)
- Minimising extractive data practices

From a world-systems perspective, ethical responsibility also includes resisting periphery extraction and building local capacity.

### A Practical Blueprint: Building Interdisciplinary Capability in Institutions

Below is a blueprint that converts theory into practice.

1. **Step 1: Define the Decision and Outcomes**
   - Identify decision-makers and timeline
   - Define success metrics (including equity metrics)
   - Map constraints (budget, law, capacity)

2. **Step 2: Build a System Map and Identify Leverage Points**
   - Model feedback loops
   - Identify where small changes create big effects
   - Identify unintended consequences early

3. **Step 3: Create Boundary Objects**
   - Shared glossary
   - Shared dataset and metadata
   - Shared risk register
   - Shared scenario framework

4. **Step 4: Write an Integration Plan**
   - How evidence types will combine
   - How conflicts will be handled
   - What counts as sufficient certainty for action
   - How ethical risks will be managed

5. **Step 5: Build Governance**
   - Define roles and decision rights
   - Create conflict resolution pathways
   - Prevent method domination through structured deliberation

6. **Step 6: Implement, Monitor, Learn**
   - Pilot interventions
   - Monitor outcomes and side effects
   - Iterate models and policies

This blueprint prevents interdisciplinarity from being a label and turns it into a repeatable capability.

### Discussion: Interdisciplinarity as a Social Technology

A useful way to think about interdisciplinarity is to treat it as a social technology—a designed set of rules and practices for producing integrated knowledge. Like any technology, it has requirements:

- Infrastructure (data systems, documentation)
- Skilled operators (integration-trained researchers and facilitators)
- Governance (accountability and ethics)
- Maintenance (learning loops and iteration)

Without these, interdisciplinarity produces unpredictable outcomes and easily becomes symbolic.

From a Bourdieusian view, interdisciplinarity also reconfigures capital. It can create new forms of symbolic capital (impact prestige, policy relevance, cross-sector recognition). But for this to happen, institutions must legitimise those forms of capital in promotion systems and evaluation criteria.

From a world-systems view, interdisciplinarity can either reproduce inequality or become a mechanism for epistemic justice. That depends on who controls the agenda, resources, and authorship.

From an isomorphism view, interdisciplinarity's popularity risks producing superficial imitation. Real capability requires deeper institutional change.

### Conclusion: When Interdisciplinarity Becomes a Real Tool for Global Solutions

Interdisciplinary research is crucial for addressing intricate global issues, as these issues are systemic in nature: interconnected, uncertain, value-laden, and reliant on implementation. However, interdisciplinarity is not intrinsically effective. It is a social practice that is debated and shaped by power, status, and inequality around the world.

A critical sociology perspective elucidates the challenges of integration: disciplines safeguard their capital, organisations replicate trendy structures, and global knowledge systems favour the core over the periphery. A practical approach demonstrates that integration can still be successful through decision-centered problem framing, boundary objects, explicit triangulation protocols, integration governance, equity safeguards, and learning loops.

The main point is simple: interdisciplinary research works when institutions treat it as a skill with clear rules, resources, and accountability, not just as a catchphrase. Interdisciplinary research becomes more than just a trend when that happens. It becomes a long-lasting tool for creating useful knowledge, ethical actions, and strong solutions for a world that is changing quickly.

**Hashtags (7)**

#InterdisciplinaryResearch
#CriticalSociology
#GlobalChallenges
#SystemsThinking
#EvidenceBasedPolicy
#SustainabilityInnovation
#KnowledgeGovernance

**References**


1. Arrighi G. The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times. London: Verso, 1994.
2. Bourdieu P. Outline of a Theory of Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511812507
3. Bourdieu P. *Homo Academicus*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988.
4. Bourdieu P. The Logic of Practice. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990.
5. Carr G, Loucks DP, Blöschl G. Gaining insight into interdisciplinary research and education programmes: A framework for evaluation. Research Policy,2018:47(1):35–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2017.09.010
6. DiMaggio PJ, Powell WW. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review,1983:48(2):147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101
7. Jasanoff S. The Fifth Branch: Science Advisers as Policymakers. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990.
8. Klein JT, Interdisciplinarity: History, Theory, and Practice. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1991.
9. Kwon S, Youtie J, Porter AL. Interdisciplinary knowledge combinations and emerging technological topics: Implications for reducing uncertainties in research evaluation. Research Evaluation,2021:30(1): 127–140. https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvaa029
10. Latour B. Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
11. Lõhmus A, Kiisel M, Lõhkivi E. Interdisciplinary collaboration for sustainability science: The training challenge. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 2025, 12(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-06221-9
12. Newman J. Promoting interdisciplinary research collaboration: A systematic review, a critical literature review and a pathway forward. Studies in Higher Education, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2023.2172694
13. Nowotny H, Scott P, Gibbons M. Re-Thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.
14. OECD. OECD Science, Technology and Innovation Outlook 2025: Driving Change in a Shifting Landscape. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1787/5fe57b90-en
15. Ostrom E. Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
16. Star SL, Griesemer JR. Institutional ecology, "translations" and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–1939. Social Studies of Science,1989:19(3):387–420. https://doi.org/10.1177/030631289019003001
17. Star SL. This is not a boundary object: Reflections on the origin of a concept. Science, Technology, & Human Values,2010:35(5):601–617.
18. Trompette P, Vinck D. Revisiting the notion of boundary object. Revue d'anthropologie des connaissances,2009:3(1):3–25.
19. Wallerstein I. World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.
20. Xiang S, Romero DM, Teplitskiy M. Evaluating interdisciplinary research: Disparate outcomes for topic and knowledge base. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,2025:122(16):e2409752122. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2409752122