Nomico Journal
E-ISSN : 3046-6318
https://nawalaeducation.com/index.php/NJ/index
Vol.2.No.12 January 2026

Economic and Ecological Sustainability in Sustainable Development Planning: An Ecological Economics Approach

Loso Judianto [1], Tharienna Dhesta Kusuma Dewi[2]
[1] IPOSS Jakarta
[2] Universitas Sains Alquran

Email: losojudiantobumn@gmail.com

Entered : 24 January 2026
Accepted: 29 January 2026
Revised : 28 January 2026
Published : 31 Jnauary 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examines the integration of economic and ecological sustainability in sustainable development planning through the lens of ecological economics. Conventional development planning has historically prioritized economic growth, often neglecting ecological limits and resulting in systemic environmental degradation. Using a qualitative conceptual–normative approach, this research analyzes theoretical foundations, normative principles, and policy implications of ecological economics as an alternative development paradigm. The study draws on an in-depth review of classical and contemporary literature on sustainable development, ecological economics, and environmental policy. The findings indicate that ecological economics provides a more comprehensive framework for development planning by recognizing the economy as a subsystem of the ecosystem, emphasizing sustainable scale, equitable distribution, and ethical governance. This approach challenges growth-centered planning models and offers normative guidance for integrating ecological constraints into policy design. The study concludes that sustainable development planning requires a paradigm shift toward ecological economics to ensure long-term economic viability, environmental integrity, and social justice.

Keywords: *ecological economics, economic sustainability, environmental sustainability, sustainable development planning*

INTRODUCTION

Modern development paradigms have historically been grounded in an economic growth–oriented logic that assumes the availability of natural resources as effectively unlimited and substitutable by capital and technology. This assumption has shaped dominant planning models in which economic expansion is treated as the primary indicator of progress, while ecological systems are positioned as external or auxiliary components of development. However, the escalating global ecological crisis, manifested in climate change, biodiversity loss, resource depletion, and ecosystem degradation, has increasingly exposed the structural limitations of development models that separate economic systems from ecological realities (Ahmed et al., 2021; Ghosh & Pearson, 2025).

The growing recognition of planetary boundaries and ecological limits has challenged the foundational premises of conventional development planning. Empirical evidence demonstrates that continuous economic growth, when decoupled from ecological constraints, generates unsustainable pressures on natural systems and undermines long-term socio-economic stability. As a result, sustainable development has emerged not merely as a policy slogan, but as a normative imperative that requires the integration of economic and ecological sustainability within a single conceptual framework (Basheer et al., 2022; D'Adamo et al., 2023).

Despite widespread adoption of sustainable development rhetoric, development planning practices often continue to privilege economic objectives over ecological considerations. Environmental factors are frequently reduced to technical variables or mitigation instruments intended to support growth, rather than being recognized as constitutive limits that define the scale and direction of development itself. Indicators of development success remain dominated by macroeconomic measures such as gross domestic product, investment growth, and productivity, while ecological integrity and environmental resilience are treated as secondary or compensatory concerns (Rotondo et al., 2022; Sunny et al., 2024).

This tension reflects a deeper conceptual conflict between economic growth imperatives and ecological carrying capacity. Planning frameworks that prioritize growth frequently assume that technological innovation and market mechanisms will resolve environmental constraints without requiring fundamental changes to development objectives. However, such assumptions have been increasingly criticized for underestimating biophysical limits and overestimating the substitutability of natural capital. As a result, the persistence of ecological degradation alongside economic expansion signals a failure of prevailing development paradigms to reconcile economic and ecological sustainability in a meaningful way (Durand, Hofferberth, & Schmelzer, 2023; Haddad & Solomon, 2024).

Within this context, ecological economics offers an alternative theoretical and normative framework for rethinking sustainable development planning. Unlike neoclassical economics, which treats the environment as an externality to be managed, ecological economics conceptualizes the economy as a subsystem embedded within the broader ecological system. This perspective emphasizes that economic activity is constrained by biophysical limits, energy flows, and ecosystem services, and that sustainability depends on maintaining economic scale within ecological boundaries while ensuring equitable distribution and efficient allocation of resources (Śleszyński, 2023; Manfredini, 2025).

Ecological economics fundamentally challenges growth-centered planning by introducing normative principles that redefine development objectives. Rather than maximizing output or consumption, ecological economics prioritizes sustainable scale, social justice, and ecological integrity. These principles shift the focus of development planning from quantitative growth toward qualitative development, emphasizing well-being, resilience, and long-term system viability. However, despite its conceptual richness, ecological economics has not been systematically integrated into mainstream development planning frameworks, which remain heavily influenced by neoclassical assumptions and growth-oriented metrics (D'Amato & Korhonen, 2021; Brenner & Hartl, 2021).

The marginal position of ecological economics within planning practice reflects a significant theoretical and normative gap. While numerous studies acknowledge the importance of environmental sustainability, few explicitly adopt ecological economics as a foundational framework for development planning. Existing research often treats ecological considerations as constraints to be balanced against economic goals, rather than as defining parameters that shape the very logic of development. This conceptual limitation results in policy approaches that seek compromise rather than transformation,

thereby limiting the potential for genuinely sustainable outcomes (Adanma & Ogunbiyi, 2024; Santos et al., 2025).

Furthermore, the lack of a normatively grounded integration between economic and ecological sustainability has important implications for policy coherence. Development policies frequently operate across fragmented institutional domains, separating economic planning from environmental governance. This institutional fragmentation reinforces conceptual separation and weakens the capacity of planning systems to address complex sustainability challenges that cut across economic, ecological, and social dimensions (Dvulit et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024).

Against this backdrop, there is a clear need for conceptual–normative analysis that repositions ecological economics as a core framework for sustainable development planning. Such an approach does not merely propose technical adjustments to existing planning tools, but calls for a paradigmatic shift in how development objectives, indicators, and policy priorities are defined. By integrating economic and ecological sustainability within a unified normative framework, ecological economics offers a more coherent basis for addressing the systemic contradictions of contemporary development planning (Zou & Punjwani, 2025; Ghosh & Pearson, 2025).

Accordingly, this study aims to analyze the relationship between economic and ecological sustainability in sustainable development planning through the lens of ecological economics. The research seeks to examine how ecological economics reconstructs the conceptual foundations of development planning and to identify its normative implications for policy formulation and implementation. By adopting a qualitative conceptual–normative approach, this study contributes to the theoretical advancement of sustainable development discourse and provides a foundational perspective for reorienting development planning toward long-term economic and ecological sustainability.

METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative research design with a conceptual–normative approach to analyze the integration of economic and ecological sustainability within sustainable development planning from the perspective of ecological economics. A qualitative approach is appropriate because the research does not aim to test hypotheses or measure empirical variables, but rather to examine theoretical concepts, normative principles, and paradigmatic assumptions underlying development planning. Conceptual–normative analysis allows for a critical interpretation of how economic and ecological dimensions are constructed, prioritized, and reconciled within sustainability discourse (Sugiyono, 2019; Creswell & Poth, 2018).

The analysis is based on secondary data sources, consisting of classical and contemporary academic literature on ecological economics, sustainable development, and environmental policy, as well as normative documents and policy frameworks related to sustainable development planning. In addition, theoretical contributions from scholars in economics, environmental studies, and public policy are examined to capture diverse perspectives on the relationship between economic systems and ecological constraints. Data were collected through an in-depth and systematic literature review, with sources selected based on their relevance, theoretical authority, and contribution to the development of ecological economics as a sustainability framework (Sugiyono, 2019).

Data analysis was conducted through three interrelated stages. First, conceptual analysis was used to identify and clarify key concepts such as economic sustainability, ecological sustainability, sustainable development, and ecological economics. Second, normative analysis was applied to assess the values, principles, and goals embedded within ecological economics, particularly in relation to development planning and policy orientation. Third, critical deductive reasoning was employed to synthesize arguments and evaluate the implications of adopting an ecological economics framework for sustainable development planning. The validity of the analysis was ensured through logical consistency across concepts, coherence of normative arguments, and traceability of theoretical sources.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Economic and Ecological Sustainability as the Conceptual Foundation of Sustainable Development

Economic and ecological sustainability constitute two interdependent dimensions that form the conceptual core of sustainable development. Conventional development paradigms have long treated economic growth and environmental protection as separable, and often competing, objectives. Within this framework, ecological systems are typically positioned as external constraints or variables to be managed after economic goals have been established. However, growing empirical and theoretical evidence demonstrates that such separation is conceptually flawed, as economic systems are fundamentally embedded within and dependent upon ecological systems that provide energy, materials, and life-supporting services (Haddad & Solomon, 2024; Manfredini, 2025).

From an ecological economics perspective, sustainability cannot be understood solely in terms of economic continuity or growth over time. Instead, economic sustainability is defined by the capacity of economic activities to operate within the biophysical limits of ecosystems while maintaining social well-being and intergenerational equity. This perspective challenges the assumption, prevalent in neoclassical economics, that natural capital can be indefinitely substituted by human-made capital. Ecological economists argue that certain ecological functions, such as climate regulation, biodiversity, and nutrient cycles, are non-substitutable and constitute critical natural capital that underpins all economic activity (Ahmed et al., 2021; Śleszyński, 2023).

The concept of ecological sustainability introduces the notion of absolute environmental limits into development planning. These limits are often articulated through frameworks such as planetary boundaries, which define thresholds beyond which ecological degradation may become irreversible. When economic activity exceeds these thresholds, it undermines the ecological foundations necessary for long-term development, leading to systemic risks that cannot be mitigated through technological or market-based solutions alone. As a result, sustainable development requires not only efficiency improvements but also constraints on the scale of economic activity relative to ecological carrying capacity (Basheer et al., 2022; Ghosh & Pearson, 2025).

Economic sustainability, when reconceptualized within ecological limits, shifts focus away from aggregate growth indicators toward qualitative dimensions of development. Rather than prioritizing increases in output or consumption, ecological economics emphasizes the maintenance of economic functions that support human well-

being without eroding ecological resilience. This includes stable livelihoods, equitable distribution of resources, and long-term economic resilience. Such a reorientation highlights the inadequacy of traditional macroeconomic indicators, such as gross domestic product, which fail to account for environmental degradation and social costs associated with economic expansion (Rotondo et al., 2022; Sunny et al., 2024).

The interdependence between economic and ecological sustainability also reveals the limitations of treating environmental protection as a compensatory or corrective policy domain. In many development planning frameworks, environmental policies are designed to mitigate the negative externalities of economic growth rather than to shape the core objectives of development. Ecological economics rejects this logic by asserting that ecological integrity is not a secondary concern but a defining condition for sustainable economic activity. Consequently, ecological sustainability must be embedded as a foundational criterion in development planning rather than appended as an afterthought (D'Adamo et al., 2023; D'Amato & Korhonen, 2021).

This reconceptualization has significant implications for how sustainability is operationalized in planning processes. If economic systems are embedded within ecological systems, then development planning must prioritize maintaining ecological functions before optimizing economic performance. This implies that trade-offs between economic growth and environmental protection cannot be resolved solely through efficiency gains or technological innovation. Instead, planning must address questions of scale, distribution, and purpose of economic activity, recognizing that some forms of growth may be incompatible with ecological sustainability (Durand, Hofferberth, & Schmelzer, 2023; Zou & Punjwani, 2025).

Furthermore, the integration of economic and ecological sustainability challenges dominant narratives that frame sustainability as a balance between competing objectives. Ecological economics proposes a hierarchical relationship in which ecological sustainability sets the boundaries within which economic sustainability must be pursued. This hierarchy does not diminish the importance of economic well-being but situates it within a broader ethical and ecological context that prioritizes long-term system viability over short-term gains (Śleszyński, 2023; Brenner & Hartl, 2021).

In this sense, economic and ecological sustainability together form a unified conceptual foundation for sustainable development. Their integration requires a shift from growth-centered planning toward a systems-based understanding of development that acknowledges biophysical limits, social equity, and intergenerational responsibility. By grounding development planning in this integrated framework, ecological economics provides a more coherent and normatively robust basis for addressing contemporary sustainability challenges.

The Ecological Economics Approach in Reconstructing Sustainable Development Planning Paradigms

The ecological economics approach offers a fundamental reconstruction of sustainable development planning by challenging the epistemological and normative foundations of conventional economic planning. Unlike neoclassical economics, which prioritizes efficiency and growth within market mechanisms, ecological economics redefines development as a process constrained by biophysical limits and guided by ethical considerations of intergenerational justice and ecological integrity. This shift is

not merely methodological but paradigmatic, as it reframes the objectives, criteria, and evaluative standards of development planning (Haddad & Solomon, 2024; Śleszyński, 2023).

At the core of ecological economics lies the principle that the economy is a subsystem of the ecosystem, not an autonomous entity. This assumption directly challenges planning models that treat environmental degradation as an externality to be corrected after economic objectives are achieved. In ecological economics, environmental limits define the feasible scale of economic activity, and planning must begin by identifying ecological thresholds before determining economic priorities. As a result, sustainable development planning becomes a process of aligning economic activities with ecological carrying capacity rather than maximizing output within assumed technological flexibility (Manfredini, 2025; Ghosh & Pearson, 2025).

A key contribution of ecological economics to development planning is its emphasis on the triad of scale, distribution, and allocation. Conventional planning typically focuses on allocation efficiency through market pricing mechanisms, assuming that optimal outcomes will emerge if resources are allocated efficiently. Ecological economics argues that efficient allocation is meaningful only after appropriate scale and just distribution have been established. Planning that ignores scale risks ecological overshoot, while neglecting distribution undermines social sustainability and political legitimacy (Durand, Hofferberth, & Schmelzer, 2023; D'Adamo et al., 2023).

This perspective necessitates a reorientation of development goals. Growth-oriented planning equates progress with increases in aggregate economic indicators, whereas ecological economics prioritizes qualitative development outcomes such as resilience, well-being, and ecological stability. In practical terms, this implies redefining success indicators in development planning to include ecosystem health, resource regeneration rates, and social equity alongside economic performance. Such a redefinition challenges entrenched institutional practices that rely heavily on macroeconomic metrics and short-term growth targets (Rotondo et al., 2022; Sunny et al., 2024).

Ecological economics also introduces a normative dimension that explicitly acknowledges value judgments in planning processes. Conventional economic planning often claims value neutrality, framing policy decisions as technical optimizations. Ecological economics rejects this stance by asserting that choices about development scale, resource use, and environmental protection are inherently ethical and political. Planning, therefore, must transparently articulate normative commitments to sustainability, justice, and long-term ecological viability rather than obscuring them behind technical models (Śleszyński, 2023; Brenner & Hartl, 2021).

The paradigmatic differences between ecological economics and conventional economic approaches can be systematically illustrated through a comparative framework. Table 1 summarizes the key distinctions relevant to sustainable development planning.

Table 1. Comparison between Neoclassical Economics and Ecological Economics in Sustainable Development Planning

Dimension	Neoclassical Economics	Ecological Economics	Implications for Development Planning
Ontological Assumption	Economy as an autonomous system	Economy as a subsystem of the ecosystem	Planning must respect ecological limits
Primary Objective	Economic growth and efficiency	Sustainable scale and well-being	Shift from growth targets to sustainability goals
Treatment of Nature	Externality or production input	Critical natural capital	Nature becomes a binding constraint
Role of Technology	Unlimited substitutability	Limited substitutability	Technology cannot fully replace ecosystems
Key Planning Criteria	Allocation efficiency	Scale, distribution, and allocation	Multi-dimensional planning priorities
Normative Orientation	Value-neutral optimization	Explicit ethical commitments	Transparency in value-based policy choices

The table demonstrates that ecological economics does not merely add environmental considerations to existing planning frameworks but restructures the logic of planning itself. By prioritizing ecological scale and social distribution before economic allocation, ecological economics transforms sustainable development planning into a normatively grounded process that explicitly addresses the limits and purposes of development.

However, integrating ecological economics into development planning faces significant institutional and political challenges. Planning systems are often embedded within bureaucratic and political structures that prioritize short-term economic performance and measurable growth outcomes. The adoption of ecological economics requires not only conceptual acceptance but also institutional reform, including changes to planning indicators, budgeting frameworks, and decision-making processes. Resistance may arise from actors whose interests are aligned with growth-centric paradigms, highlighting the inherently political nature of paradigm shifts in development planning (Adanma & Ogunbiyi, 2024; Santos et al., 2025).

In sum, the ecological economics approach reconstructs sustainable development planning by redefining its foundational assumptions, objectives, and evaluative criteria. It provides a coherent conceptual–normative framework that aligns economic activity with ecological limits and social justice. While its integration into mainstream planning remains challenging, ecological economics offers a necessary paradigm shift for addressing the systemic sustainability challenges facing contemporary development.

Normative Implications of Ecological Economics for Development Policy and Planning

The adoption of ecological economics as a foundational framework for sustainable development planning carries profound normative implications for policy formulation and institutional practice. Unlike conventional economic approaches that prioritize growth optimization, ecological economics redefines the normative objectives of development by foregrounding ecological limits, social justice, and long-term system resilience. This redefinition requires policymakers to move beyond instrumental environmental policies and toward a value-based orientation in which sustainability becomes a guiding principle rather than a secondary constraint (Śleszyński, 2023; Haddad & Solomon, 2024).

One of the most significant normative implications concerns the reorientation of development goals. In growth-centered planning, economic expansion is treated as an end in itself, with environmental protection framed as a means to sustain growth over time. Ecological economics reverses this logic by positioning ecological integrity as a prerequisite for economic activity. Consequently, development policies must be evaluated not only on their capacity to stimulate economic output, but also on their compatibility with ecological carrying capacity and long-term environmental stability. This shift challenges dominant policy narratives that equate development success with short-term economic indicators and calls for a more holistic understanding of progress (Ghosh & Pearson, 2025; Rotondo et al., 2022).

Integrating ecological economics into development planning also necessitates the incorporation of ecological constraints into policy design and implementation. This implies that planning processes should begin with the identification of environmental thresholds, resource regeneration rates, and ecosystem vulnerabilities before determining acceptable levels of economic activity. Such an approach contrasts sharply with conventional planning models, where environmental considerations are often introduced at later stages as mitigation measures. Normatively, this represents a transition from reactive environmental management toward precautionary and preventive planning grounded in ecological realism (Basheer et al., 2022; D'Adamo et al., 2023).

Another key implication lies in the treatment of equity and distribution within development policy. Ecological economics emphasizes that sustainability is inseparable from questions of social justice, as ecological degradation and resource scarcity disproportionately affect vulnerable populations. Development planning informed by ecological economics therefore requires explicit consideration of distributive outcomes, including access to resources, exposure to environmental risks, and intergenerational equity. Policies that prioritize aggregate growth without addressing distributional consequences risk exacerbating social inequalities and undermining the legitimacy of sustainability initiatives (Durand, Hofferberth, & Schmelzer, 2023; Dvulit et al., 2024).

At the institutional level, the integration of ecological economics poses challenges to existing governance structures. Planning institutions are often organized around sectoral mandates that separate economic, environmental, and social policy domains. Ecological economics calls for cross-sectoral integration and systemic coordination, which may require institutional reforms, new planning instruments, and revised evaluation criteria. The normative demand for coherence between economic objectives and ecological constraints highlights the political dimension of sustainability transitions, as institutional change inevitably involves negotiation among competing interests and power structures (Adanma & Ogunbiyi, 2024; Santos et al., 2025).

Furthermore, ecological economics underscores the normative importance of transparency and democratic deliberation in development planning. Decisions regarding acceptable scales of economic activity, resource use, and environmental trade-offs involve ethical judgments that cannot be resolved through technical analysis alone. By making value assumptions explicit, ecological economics promotes participatory planning processes that allow diverse stakeholders to engage in defining development priorities. This participatory dimension strengthens the democratic legitimacy of development policies and enhances their capacity to address complex sustainability challenges (Brenner & Hartl, 2021; Sunny et al., 2024).

Despite its normative strengths, the application of ecological economics in policy and planning faces significant political and practical barriers. Growth-oriented interests, institutional inertia, and short-term political incentives often resist constraints on economic expansion. Moreover, translating abstract normative principles into operational policy instruments remains a complex task, particularly in contexts where economic development pressures are acute. These challenges highlight the need for gradual but deliberate integration of ecological economics into planning systems, supported by institutional learning, policy experimentation, and sustained political commitment (Manfredini, 2025; Zou & Punjwani, 2025).

In summary, the ecological economics approach offers a transformative normative framework for development policy and planning by redefining objectives, constraints, and evaluative criteria. Its emphasis on ecological limits, social justice, and democratic deliberation challenges growth-centric paradigms and provides a more coherent foundation for sustainable development. While its implementation requires significant institutional and political change, ecological economics represents a critical pathway for aligning development planning with the realities of ecological sustainability.

CONCLUSIONS

This study demonstrates that economic and ecological sustainability constitute inseparable dimensions within sustainable development planning. Conventional development paradigms that prioritize economic growth while treating ecological systems as external or subordinate variables have proven insufficient in addressing contemporary environmental crises. The findings confirm that sustainable development requires a conceptual shift that recognizes economic systems as embedded within ecological limits, thereby redefining development success beyond growth-oriented indicators.

The ecological economics approach offers a coherent conceptual–normative framework for reconstructing development planning by integrating ecological boundaries, distributive justice, and long-term system resilience. By emphasizing sustainable scale, equitable distribution, and efficient allocation, ecological economics challenges the dominance of neoclassical planning models and provides a more holistic foundation for policy formulation. This framework enables development planning to move from reactive environmental mitigation toward preventive and ethically grounded sustainability governance.

From a policy perspective, the adoption of ecological economics implies the need for paradigm-level change rather than incremental technical adjustments. Policymakers are encouraged to integrate ecological limits explicitly into development planning instruments, redesign evaluation indicators beyond macroeconomic growth, and

strengthen participatory decision-making processes. Future research is recommended to extend this conceptual–normative analysis through empirical and comparative studies that examine the operationalization of ecological economics across different policy contexts and development sectors.

REFERENCE

Adanma, U., & Ogunbiyi, E. (2024). A comparative review of global environmental policies for promoting sustainable development and economic growth. International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences. https://doi.org/10.51594/ijarss.v6i5.1147.

Ahmed, Z., Ahmad, M., Rjoub, H., Kalugina, O., & Hussain, N. (2021). Economic growth, renewable energy consumption, and ecological footprint: Exploring the role of environmental regulations and democracy in sustainable development. Sustainable Development. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2251.

Basheer, M., Nechifor, V., Calzadilla, A., Ringler, C., Hulme, D., & Harou, J. (2022). Balancing national economic policy outcomes for sustainable development. Nature Communications, 13. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-32415-9.

Brenner, B., & Hartl, B. (2021). The perceived relationship between digitalization and ecological, economic, and social sustainability. Journal of Cleaner Production, 315, 128128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128128.

D'Adamo, I., Gastaldi, M., Hariram, N., Mekha, K., Suganthan, V., & Sudhakar, K. (2023). Sustainalism: An Integrated Socio-Economic-Environmental Model to Address Sustainable Development and Sustainability. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151310682.

D'Amato, D., & Korhonen, J. (2021). Integrating the green economy, circular economy and bioeconomy in a strategic sustainability framework. Ecological Economics, 188, 107143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2021.107143. D'Amato, D., & Korhonen, J. (2021). Integrating the green economy, circular economy and bioeconomy in a strategic sustainability framework. Ecological Economics, 188, 107143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2021.107143.

Durand, C., Hofferberth, E., & Schmelzer, M. (2023). Planning beyond growth: The case for economic democracy within ecological limits. Journal of Cleaner Production. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.140351.

Dvulit, Z., Maznyk, L., Horbal, N., Brych, L., Skrzypek-Ahmed, S., Szymoniuk, B., & Dluhopolska, T. (2024). Modeling the Integrated Influence of Social, Ecological, and Economic Components on Achieving Sustainable Development Goals: A Cross-Country Analysis. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16229946.

Ghosh, E., & Pearson, L. (2025). Rethinking Economic Foundations for Sustainable Development: A Comprehensive Assessment of Six Economic Paradigms Against the SDGs. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17104567.

Haddad, B., & Solomon, B. (2024). Ecological economics as the science of sustainability and transformation: Integrating entropy, sustainable scale, and justice. PLOS Sustainability and Transformation. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pstr.0000098.

Heydari, R., Fathololoumi, S., Soltanbeygi, M., & Firozjaei, M. (2025). A Sustainability-Oriented Spatial Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis Framework for Optimizing Recreational Ecological Park Development. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17020731.

Manfredini, F. (2025). Comparative analysis between environmental economics and ecological economics in the approach to ecosystem services. Brazilian Journal of Development. https://doi.org/10.34117/bjdv11n9-019.

Parween,, S., Awasthi,, N., Pandey,, A., Bhatt,, A., Adwani,, S., & Singh, V. (2025). Environmental Sustainability: Future Trends, Challenges, Approaches, Consequences, And Solutions for Sustainable Development Growth in India. International Journal of Environmental Sciences. https://doi.org/10.64252/msgwd280.

Rotondo, F., Perchinunno, P., L'Abbate, S., & Mongelli, L. (2022). Ecological transition and sustainable development: integrated statistical indicators to support public policies. Scientific Reports, 12. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-23085-0.

Saha, B. (2025). Overview of Sustainable Urban Planning with Ecologically Friendly Practices. Journal of Social Science and Humanities. https://doi.org/10.53469/jssh.2025.7(02).06.

Santos, A., Victorio, F., De Carvalho Petuco, D., Nogueira, M., De Oliveira Sathler, K., Lamberti, P., Montalvao, D., & Costa, R. (2025). Ecological-Economic Zoning: A Bibliometric Analysis. Revista de Gestão Social e Ambiental. https://doi.org/10.24857/rgsa.v19n8-059.

Śleszyński, J. (2023). Normative ecological economics as a condition for sustainable development. Ekonomia i Środowisko - Economics and Environment. https://doi.org/10.34659/eis.2022.83.4.516.

Sugiyono. 2019. Metode Penelitian & Pengembangan. Alfabeta

Sunny, F., Jeronen, E., & Lan, J. (2024). Influential Theories of Economics in Shaping Sustainable Development Concepts. Administrative Sciences. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15010006.

Wang, X., Zhao, H., Qian, J., Li, X., Cao, C., Feng, Z., & Cui, Y. (2024). Sustainable Land Use Diagnosis Based on the Perspective of Coupling Socioeconomy and Ecology in the Xiongan New Area, China. Land. https://doi.org/10.3390/land13010092.

Zou, B., & Punjwani, A. (2025). Unraveling the Dynamics of Economic Complexity, Clean Energy, Globalization, and Natural Resource Use for Sustainable Development: Insights from “Next 11” Countries. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17041717.