Chapter 13
Societal Sustainability: The Innovative Practices of the 21st Century

Nayan Deep S. Kanwal
University Putra, Malaysia

Tapaswini Panda
Model Degree College, Rayagada, India

Udaya Sankar Patro
https://orcid.org/0009-0009-9198-3578
Rayagada Autonomous College, Rayagada, India

Saumendra Das
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4956-4352
GIET University, Gunupur, India

ABSTRACT

Research on the sustainability of society, both theoretically and practically, is lacking. Research indicates that discussions on environmentally friendly growth did not fully incorporate the "societal" aspect until much later. To close this hole, the present research suggests a novel conceptualization of the sustainability of society. Researchers argue that danger is a fundamental component of environmental sustainability and that modern human societies and their living environments face grave interpersonal, geographical, fundamental, and physical hazards as a consequence of the uncertainty surrounding warming temperatures. The authors suggest that a sustainable society works to face risk while addressing social issues in the context of sustainability. As a result, they offer a thorough conceptual framework of social sustainability that consists of four interconnected conceptions of environmentally conscious practises—every one of them integrates important societal components and serves a specific purpose within the overall structure.

DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-2181-2.ch013

1. INTRODUCTION

The "societal" was brought up later in discussions about advancing sustainable. Throughout the field of social science, psychology has not been visible in professional circles, with popular or policy debates centred around environment and the environment *(Tercy, 2008; Grundmann & Stehr, 2010).* On the other hand, anthropological research, geographical location, and urban studies and planning have all become more active. The debate's very short history indicates that the main argument first focused on protecting uncommon creatures and distinctive ecological systems which led to a severe criticism of how people handle the natural world. As technology-driven perspectives on sustainability gained traction, the conversation's focus widened to encompass neighbourhoods in addition to natural ecosystems. Theoretical and practical approaches focused on technical advancements to counteract global warming and safeguard the environment from excessive usage, while doing so permitting uninterrupted utilisation of these assets.

The discussion only began on the path towards recognising that the majority of people is susceptible when it comes to environmental externalities, natural disasters, and warming temperatures with the increasing impact of the social-ecological structure, which was strengthened by ecofeminist, Eco socialist, and native motion hypotheses. Furthermore, as it was clear that environmental externalities are unevenly and disproportionately dispersed, in terms of location and across sections, the concept of sustainable discussion was connected to the inequality's narrative *(Vinthagen, 2013).* Nowadays biggest problems are socially contextualised and defined by increasing degrees of danger and susceptibility brought on by social polarisation, expanding inequality in cities, urban conflict and violence, terrorism, natural catastrophes, and warming temperatures *(Jabareen, 2015).* Such problems have an impact on planned and practises, thus in order to address this grave socioeconomic condition, present procedures for planning must be reconsidered and revised *(Eizenberg & Shilon 2016).*

It is acknowledged that developing strategies for environmentally friendly growth requires an all-encompassing paradigm in which the ecological is intertwined with both the social and economic *(Hopwood et al., 2005; Featherstone, 2013).* The development of each component separately has led to a significant evolution of this three-pillar model of sustainability. But as Litig and Kreissler point out, no comprehensive theory explaining the connection of the triad's components or how to quantify and assess them has been developed *(Littig & Griesler 2005).*

Even while this knowledge has fundamentally changed the conversation around "sustainability," there is still a need for a straightforward explanation of one concept in particular—social viability. *(Ahman, 2013)* Researchers in the social sciences are often blamed for the shortcomings since they are viewed as cognitively ambiguous *(Axelesson et al., 2013)* & incompatible, *(Vallance et al., 2011)* leading to the creation of many conceptions. Moreover, they discovered that a fundamental grasp of legitimacy and ongoing legislative objectives often informs the selection of social sustainability measures, rather than theoretical foundations *(Grieller and Littig, 2004).*

Bostrom *(2012)* and Davidson *(2009)* suggest a more deeply, philosophical qualification to the goal of overcoming the convulsive and feinted discourse on social viability. They argue that any attempt to create professionally environmentally friendly neighbourhoods must initially establish the "a little bit about society... we as a species want to sustain". We are hoping to make a few strides by putting out both of the following claims, considering that expressing the parameters of a just society is far too dedicated and outside the purview of this piece of work. Firstly, the primary issue with the current fragmented guidelines doesn't lie in that it seeks to define environmental sustainability in terms of a community of individuals, but rather that it approaches environmental responsibility by means of multiple perspectives.