International Journal of Vocational Education and Training Research
2026, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 26–39
https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijvetr.20261202.11

Research Article

Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application as a Cognitive Competence: A Developmental Model Within the VFC Framework

Mohammad Moharram[1], Abdullah Hussein Salem[1], Yasser Nasr Eldin[1], Wael Ahmed Abdalla[2,*]

[1]Education Department, Business Wheel Academy, Cairo, Egypt
[2]Faculty of Arts, Sohag University, Sohag, Egypt

Abstract

This paper conceptualizes Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA) as a critical cognitive competence within the Cognitive Psychology Dimension of the VFC Competence Framework. In response to increasing demands for interdisciplinary problem-solving in education and workforce development, IKIA is positioned as a developmental construct that enables learners to synthesize, abstract, and transfer knowledge across disciplinary boundaries. Grounded in schema theory, experiential learning, cognitive load theory, and knowledge transfer models, the study explains how IKIA supports higher-order cognitive processing and adaptive expertise. The research applies the VFC's KSAH model—Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, and Habits—to systematically map the progression of IKIA from novice-level awareness to expert-level integration, innovation, and leadership. Using thematic synthesis and an analysis of empirical micro-cases, the paper illustrates how IKIA manifests cognitively, psychologically, and socially in real-world learning and professional contexts. In addition, the study examines the interaction between IKIA and complementary competencies, particularly Collaborative Intelligence & Influence (CI^2), highlighting how interdisciplinary integration is strengthened through social collaboration and collective reasoning. The paper concludes by proposing outcome-based learning indicators and outlining future research directions for the assessment, instructional design, and practical application of IKIA. Overall, this work advances the operationalization of interdisciplinary competence by framing IKIA as a measurable and teachable cognitive capacity, contributing to the development of ethically grounded competence-based education models for 21st-century learners.

Keywords

Interdisciplinary Competence, Knowledge Integration, Cognitive Psychology, KSAH Framework, VFC Competence Model

*Correspondence: Wael Ahmed Abdalla (waelahmed@art.sohag.edu.eg)

Received: 9 February 2026; **Accepted:** 24 February 2026; **Published:** 8 July 2026

1. Introduction

In an increasingly complex and interconnected world, the ability to integrate knowledge across disciplines has become a foundational cognitive requirement. Challenges such as climate resilience, health equity, technological ethics, and systemic inequality cannot be addressed through single-disciplinary thinking. These real-world issues demand a competency for *synthesizing, transferring, and applying knowledge across domains*—a process known as *Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA)* [18, 25].

Despite growing recognition of its value, IKIA remains underdeveloped in most educational and professional contexts. Often treated as a pedagogical tool or course-level goal, it has not been adequately conceptualized as a *structured psychological competence*. This paper positions IKIA as a core component of the *Cognitive Psychology Dimension* within the VFC Competence Framework [1], grounded in schema theory, experiential learning, cognitive load management, and far transfer theory [7, 26, 38, 31].

Framed through the VFC's *KSAH model*—Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, and Habits—IKIA is understood as a developmental capability that evolves from foundational disciplinary awareness to expert-level synthesis and application. It is not only cognitive, but *also psychological and social*, requiring reflective regulation and ethical interaction in interdisciplinary environments.

The paper further explores the intersection of IKIA with *(CI^2)*, highlighting that interdisciplinary integration often depends on shared reasoning, epistemic empathy, and co-regulated problem-solving [21].

This paper aims to:

1) Define IKIA as a structured cognitive competence;
2) Map its development through the KSAH model;
3) Illustrate its application through thematic analysis and case studies;
4) Propose learning outcomes and assessment frameworks aligned with future competency needs.

In doing so, the study contributes to the VFC's broader vision of preparing learners not only to acquire knowledge, but to integrate it with agility, ethics, and relevance in a world defined by complexity.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Cognitive Development and Knowledge Integration

Interdisciplinary knowledge integration emerges from a foundational understanding of cognitive development, where learning is conceptualized as the process of reorganizing existing cognitive structures to accommodate new, often complex, information. Piaget's [32] theory of cognitive development articulates the progression from concrete operational thinking to formal operational reasoning, wherein individuals develop the capacity to abstract, hypothesize, and mentally manipulate ideas across contexts. This capacity is pivotal for interdisciplinary learning, which requires the learner to synthesize diverse conceptual schemas from multiple domains into cohesive, transferable knowledge structures.

Bloom's [5] taxonomy, further refined by Anderson and Krathwohl [4], categorizes cognitive development into six hierarchical domains—remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating. This hierarchy provides a scaffold for understanding how disciplinary knowledge must evolve into interdisciplinary cognition. Long et al. [28] propose an alternative tripartite structure—knowledge, skills, and understanding—wherein true understanding entails the transfer of integrated knowledge to novel contexts, aligning closely with the aims of interdisciplinary competency development.

The OECD Learning Compass 2030 [30] reinforces this developmental framing by distinguishing between four forms of knowledge essential for future learning: disciplinary, interdisciplinary, epistemic, and procedural. Interdisciplinary knowledge, in particular, is characterized by the ability to connect, reorganize, and synthesize ideas across subject boundaries to address complex, real-world challenges. This synthesis requires a metacognitive awareness of how knowledge is constructed and applied across varying epistemological frames [15].

Furthermore, Vygotsky's [41] sociocultural theory introduces the zone of proximal development (ZPD), emphasizing the role of scaffolding in extending a learner's cognitive capabilities. This framework is instrumental in interdisciplinary contexts where learners must be supported to bridge conceptual gaps between domains. When augmented with distributed scaffolding techniques [39], the integration of disciplinary knowledge into interdisciplinary insight becomes a structured, developmental process.

Together, these cognitive frameworks position interdisciplinary knowledge integration not as a pedagogical strategy alone, but as a necessary evolution of cognitive complexity that underpins adaptive problem-solving in the 21st century.

2.2. Models of Interdisciplinary Competence Development

The development of interdisciplinary competence requires a structured understanding of how individuals acquire, integrate, and operationalize knowledge across domains. Existing models in both higher education and professional practice consistently stress that interdisciplinary thinking is not merely an aggregation of content but a cognitively demanding process involving abstraction, synthesis, and critical reflection [33]. Spelt et al. [36] offer a comprehensive definition based on a systematic review, identifying five essential dimensions: the ability to integrate knowledge, critically reflect on disciplinary assumptions, handle complexity, communicate across boundaries, and collaborate effectively. This model has been widely validated in higher education research and forms the basis for most modern interdisciplinary curriculum designs.

Fortuin et al. [18], in the context of sustainability education, propose a staged model of interdisciplinary learning: from disciplinary grounding to informed combination and finally to reflexive integration. Their empirical findings suggest that learners progress through identifiable developmental phases as they acquire the ability to manage conceptual tensions and methodological pluralism. This model closely aligns with Kolb's [26] experiential learning cycle, especially in environments that foster real-world application and iterative reflection.

In professional education, Yang et al. [43] demonstrated how integrating interdisciplinary instruction in pediatric nursing significantly improved learning outcomes across knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Their mixed-methods findings reinforce the view that interdisciplinary competence must be cultivated through intentional curriculum design, structured reflection, and real-world practice—echoing the constructivist and cognitive developmental paradigms underpinning this paper.

Moreover, Chao et al. [6] introduced the *Service-Learning Abilities Scale*, which maps the growth of interdisciplinary competence through indicators like knowledge application, problem-solving, self-reflection, and cross-cultural sensitivity. These metrics resonate with the transformative competencies outlined in the OECD Learning Compass 2030 [30], namely, the ability to create new value, navigate tensions, and take responsibility.

Collectively, these models converge on the necessity of structured progression, contextual relevance, and metacognitive framing in developing interdisciplinary competence. They establish a foundation upon which the VFC Competence Framework can build a distinctive, future-ready cognitive developmental trajectory.

2.3. Learning Theories and Cognitive Load in Interdisciplinary Contexts

Interdisciplinary knowledge integration requires not only domain-specific knowledge but also the cognitive capacity to process, synthesize, and apply diverse knowledge structures across disciplinary boundaries. Learning theories such as cognitive load theory (CLT), experiential learning theory (ELT), and constructivist frameworks offer foundational insights into the mechanisms that enable or hinder such integration.

Cognitive Load Theory (CLT), developed by Sweller et al. [38], posits that human working memory has limited capacity, particularly when processing unfamiliar, complex information. In interdisciplinary contexts, learners often encounter new concepts from multiple domains simultaneously, increasing the intrinsic and extraneous load. Therefore, effective learning design must reduce unnecessary cognitive load (extraneous) while optimizing the learner's focus on meaningful integration (germane load) [15]. Kao et al. [24] emphasize that distributed scaffolding, through peer, teacher, and technological supports, effectively manages this load in interdisciplinary curricula.

Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) provides a cyclical model—Concrete Experience, Reflective Observation, Abstract Conceptualization, and Active Experimentation—through which learners internalize complex phenomena [26]. Interdisciplinary learning aligns with this cycle as learners engage in real-world tasks that require synthesis across epistemic frames, abstracting insights and applying them in novel, often ill-structured, scenarios [18].

From a *constructivist perspective*, knowledge is actively constructed rather than passively received. Vygotsky's [41] concept of *the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)* is critical in interdisciplinary contexts, as learners often rely on guided participation to connect concepts across unfamiliar domains. Tabak [39] elaborates this into *distributed scaffolding*, which combines differentiated, redundant, and synergistic supports that promote deep learning through layered interaction with content, peers, and experts.

These theoretical models collectively underscore the need for well-designed learning environments that regulate cognitive load, support abstraction and synthesis, and cultivate the habits of mind essential for interdisciplinary knowledge integration. They inform the pedagogical and cognitive infrastructure underpinning the VFC Framework's cognitive dimension.

2.4. Challenges in Assessment of Interdisciplinary Thinking

Despite the conceptual maturity of interdisciplinary education and its cognitive underpinnings, assessing interdisciplinary thinking remains a persistent challenge in both theory and practice. Traditional assessments, often designed within disciplinary silos, struggle to capture the integrative, reflective, and abstract dimensions of interdisciplinary cognition [10, 18]. Unlike domain-specific evaluations that measure recall or application within fixed frameworks, interdisciplinary assessment must account for the learner's ability to transfer knowledge across contexts, reconcile epistemological tensions, and generate novel insights [36].

A primary barrier is the *invisibility of transfer*, particularly "far transfer," which involves applying knowledge in situations with minimal surface similarity [31]. Standardized assessments such as PISA and TIMSS emphasize reasoning and application but do not adequately measure epistemic agility or synthesis capacity [15]. As such, assessment tools often fail to reveal how learners restructure schemas or navigate between procedural and conceptual domains.

Authentic assessment frameworks offer a partial solution. Earl [13] distinguishes among *assessment of learning* (summative), *assessment for learning* (formative), and *assessment as learning* (reflective and self-directed). The latter aligns most closely with interdisciplinary learning goals, enabling learners to demonstrate metacognitive insight, self-regulation, and real-world problem engagement. Tools such as concept mapping, scenario-based learning, and reflective portfolios have been employed to visualize integrative processes [43].

However, designing such tools remains resource-intensive and context-dependent. As noted by Kao et al. [24], distributed scaffolding must be mirrored in assessment through layered evaluation strategies that assess both the process and product of learning. A key future direction involves the co-development of interdisciplinary rubrics with cognitive validity—tools that not only measure what students know but how they think across boundaries.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1. Positioning Within the VFC Competence Framework

Within the VFC Competence Framework [1], *Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA)* is strategically positioned at the nexus of the *Cognitive Psychology Dimension*, reflecting its core identity as a meta-cognitive and epistemically fluid capability. Although interdisciplinary thinking was initially introduced as part of the Functional Expertise dimension—alongside role-specific and digital competencies—it increasingly warrants reclassification as a cognitive competency due to the complex mental operations it entails. These include cognitive restructuring, abstraction, far transfer, and epistemological fluency, which cannot be sufficiently captured within a functional or technical framework alone.

The VFC model classifies competencies using the *KSAH developmental architecture*: Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, and Habits. This structure assumes that competence is not static but evolves through progressive internalization—moving from conceptual understanding to behavioral automation [35]. Within this progression, IKIA is not a simple cross-disciplinary exposure; rather, it involves the learner's capacity to *activate, compare, synthesize, and apply disciplinary schemas across unfamiliar contexts* [26, 31]. Such acts of integration demand *cognitive flexibility* and *reflective abstraction*, both of which are fundamental attributes of high-level cognitive development.

Moreover, in alignment with the *Growth Mindset Theory* [12], IKIA presumes that cognitive ability is not fixed, but can be cultivated through challenge, feedback, and reflective practice. This underpins its inclusion within the VFC framework as a *trainable and observable cognitive performance domain*, rather than an implicit talent or pedagogical by-product. Its placement within the Cognitive Psychology Dimension is further reinforced by its interface with *critical thinking, reflective learning, and metacognitive regulation*, which together prepare learners to operate effectively in volatile, cross-sectoral, and ambiguous real-world environments [1, 30].

In sum, the repositioning of IKIA within the VFC Framework signifies a deliberate move to align theory, cognitive science, and assessment toward a future-focused, integrative model of competence.

3.2. Foundational Theories Underpinning Interdisciplinary Cognition

The conceptualization of Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA) as a critical cognitive competency is anchored in several foundational learning theories. These theories not only explain the psychological mechanisms that enable integration across disciplines but also guide instructional design and assessment strategies within the VFC Competence Framework.

3.2.1. Schema Theory

Schema theory provides the foundational cognitive architecture for interdisciplinary learning. Anderson [3] and later Chi [7] described schemas as organized knowledge structures that guide the assimilation of new information. In interdisciplinary contexts, learners are required to activate multiple domain-specific schemas and engage in *schema restructuring*, a process where new information from one domain transforms or merges with existing structures from another [7]. This dynamic reconfiguration is essential for the synthesis of diverse concepts into a unified cognitive model—an act that defines advanced interdisciplinary competence.

3.2.2. Cognitive Load Theory (CLT)

Sweller's [38] Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) asserts that the brain's working memory is limited in capacity and duration. Interdisciplinary learning, with its high conceptual density and unfamiliar frameworks, imposes a substantial intrinsic load on learners. Therefore, instructional design must minimize *extraneous load* and optimize *germane load*—the mental effort devoted to schema construction and automation [38]. Distributed scaffolding techniques, such as peer explanation, visual mapping, and analogical reasoning, are particularly useful in facilitating integrative learning without overloading cognitive resources [39].

3.2.3. Experiential Learning Theory (ELT)

Kolb's [26] Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) presents a cyclical model of learning through *concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation*. This process aligns with interdisciplinary integration, as learners must experience real-world complexity, reflect on disciplinary limits, abstract principles across domains, and apply synthesized insights. ELT is especially relevant in practice-based interdisciplinary environments such as design studios, sustainability labs, and policy clinics [27].

3.2.4. Knowledge Transfer Theory

Perkins and Salomon [31] distinguish between *near transfer*—applying knowledge in similar contexts—and *far transfer*, which involves transferring principles across dissimilar domains. Far transfer is the hallmark of interdisciplinary cognition, requiring not only conceptual abstraction but also the recognition of underlying patterns between contexts. Instructional strategies that promote transfer include analogical reasoning, multiple exemplars, and meta-level prompts that encourage learners to reflect on *how* and *why* they know what they know.

Collectively, these theories frame interdisciplinary cognition as a *highly demanding but systematically developable process* that combines reflective learning, metacognitive self-regulation, and schema integration. The VFC Framework integrates these principles not only to inform instructional practice but also to operationalize competency development within the KSAH model [1].

3.3. Metacognitive and Epistemic Cognition Dimensions

At its core, *Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA)* is not merely a cognitive act of combining disciplinary knowledge; it is fundamentally a *metacognitive and epistemic process*. Learners must not only possess content knowledge but also the *capacity to reflect on how knowledge is structured, validated, and transferred* across domains [22]. These higher-order competencies are indispensable for managing the inherent ambiguity, abstraction, and complexity involved in interdisciplinary reasoning.

Metacognition, defined as the awareness and regulation of one's own thought processes, plays a central role in interdisciplinary learning. According to Flavell [17], metacognitive regulation includes planning, monitoring, and evaluating one's cognitive strategies. In interdisciplinary contexts, learners must engage in *adaptive monitoring*—assessing whether their disciplinary assumptions hold in novel contexts, and selecting when to switch frames, merge models, or re-evaluate problem parameters [42]. This regulation is especially important when encountering *epistemic conflicts*, such as when scientific empiricism must be reconciled with normative policy reasoning, or quantitative data with qualitative narrative.

Epistemic cognition, as defined by Greene et al. [20], refers to how individuals think about the nature of knowledge and the process of knowing. Interdisciplinary learners must grapple with *multiple epistemologies*, often simultaneously—each discipline offers distinct criteria for truth, evidence, and justification. Developing this epistemic fluency is essential for synthesizing insights while maintaining intellectual humility and avoiding superficial convergence.

The VFC Competence Framework explicitly integrates these metacognitive and epistemic capacities under its Cognitive *Psychology Dimension*, recognizing that *deep integration is inseparable from reflection, regulation, and knowledge contextualization* [1]. This stands in contrast to fragmented models that address content mastery without acknowledging the reflective capacities that govern transfer, synthesis, and long-term behavioral internalization.

Furthermore, interdisciplinary assessment models increasingly recognize the role of metacognition, as seen in tools such as reflective portfolios, concept mapping, and narrative inquiry [13, 15]. These instruments not only capture what students know, but also how they navigate between domains, evaluate conflicting claims, and regulate their integration processes.

In sum, the development of IKIA is not linear. It is an iterative, reflective, and epistemically grounded process, requiring structured support, explicit instruction, and developmental assessment anchored in metacognitive and epistemological theory.

3.4. Alignment with Global Competence Frameworks

The conceptualization of Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA) as a cognitive competency aligns not only with the internal structure of the VFC Competence Framework but also with several influential global models for future competence development. These international frameworks emphasize knowledge mobility, epistemic flexibility, and socio-cognitive agility—core tenets that underpin interdisciplinary competence.

The *OECD Learning Compass 2030* offers a future-oriented vision of learning, framing competencies as integrative capacities that empower individuals to navigate complexity and uncertainty [30]. The framework distinguishes between four types of knowledge—disciplinary, interdisciplinary, epistemic, and procedural—emphasizing the importance of interdisciplinary synthesis and epistemological fluency for addressing real-world challenges. IKIA closely maps to this model by promoting the transference and integration of knowledge across domains and the development of reflective, self-regulated learning behavior.

Similarly, the European Commission's Key Competences for Lifelong Learning identifies "multilingual competence," "digital competence," and, critically, "learning to learn" as transversal competencies essential for personal development and employability [16]. The latter resonates with IKIA's positioning as a *meta-cognitive and epistemic skillset*, enabling learners to construct new knowledge frameworks through interdisciplinary inquiry. The Commission further highlights "cultural awareness" and "entrepreneurship" as competencies that require learners to draw from diverse domains, aligning with the notion of cognitive integration, abstract application, and problem reformulation.

The *DeSeCo Project* (Definition and Selection of Competencies), developed by the OECD in the early 2000s, further legitimizes this positioning by identifying three overarching categories of key competencies: (1) using tools interactively,

(2) interacting in socially heterogeneous groups, and (3) acting autonomously [34]. IKIA directly serves all three. It involves the use of cognitive and cultural tools across boundaries, the negotiation of disciplinary and social knowledge frames, and the capacity for autonomous integration and decision-making in ill-structured contexts.

Finally, global frameworks such as *UNESCO's SDG 4: Quality Education* stress the need for transferable, adaptive competencies that address sustainability, innovation, and equity [40]. Interdisciplinary competence is increasingly recognized as vital for meeting these goals, particularly in addressing interconnected global issues that defy single-discipline solutions.

By aligning IKIA with these models, the VFC Competence Framework affirms its scientific validity and international relevance, situating interdisciplinary integration as a globally acknowledged, future-proof cognitive capability.

4. What Does It Mean to Be an Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integrator

The emergence of *(IKIA)* as a cognitive competency within the VFC Framework signals a departure from viewing integration as a technical task to recognizing it as a behavioral and epistemic identity. An interdisciplinary knowledge integrator does not merely accumulate content from disparate fields; rather, they reframe, synthesize, and abstract insights in order to solve complex, real-world problems. This process requires both cognitive discipline and behavioral commitment, as outlined in the KSAH structure of the VFC Competence Framework [1].

4.1. From Multidisciplinarity to True Integration

A common misunderstanding in educational and professional discourse is the conflation of multidisciplinarity with interdisciplinarity. While the former involves the parallel presentation of concepts from different fields, it lacks the cognitive synthesis needed for true integration [33]. Interdisciplinarity, by contrast, involves the generation of new cognitive structures through interaction, critique, and reconfiguration of disciplinary logics [7]. It is a deeply *reflective and transformative act* that enables learners to go beyond knowledge juxtaposition and into meta-theoretical abstraction.

For example, while a multidisciplinary healthcare curriculum may include courses in anatomy, ethics, and communication, an interdisciplinary program would require students to *synthesize* these domains—e.g., integrating cultural beliefs and psychological insights into treatment design. The same logic applies in education, climate policy, or engineering, where effective decision-making depends on the cognitive fusion of technical, social, and humanistic disciplines.

4.2. Key Traits and Behavioral Indicators

Interdisciplinary knowledge integrators exhibit specific cognitive and behavioral markers that evolve along the developmental continuum. These indicators align with the *Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, and Habits (KSAH*) model and are observable in decision-making, communication, and problem-solving contexts.

Table 1. *Key Traits of Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integrators*.

Trait	Description	Source
Cognitive Flexibility	Capacity to shift between disciplinary frameworks and navigate conflicting logics.	Spiro et al., 1991
Epistemic Humility	Recognition of the limits of one's knowledge and openness to alternative epistemological traditions.	Greene et al., 2016
Integrative Synthesis	Ability to combine conceptual models from distinct disciplines into coherent frameworks.	Repko & Szostak, 2021
Systemic Awareness	Perceiving interconnections across ecological, economic, and social systems.	OECD, 2019
Reflective Curiosity	Engaging in sustained inquiry that probes underlying principles and questions established assumptions.	Chi, 2009
Knowledge Transfer Readiness	Habitual tendency to abstract and apply knowledge across unfamiliar or novel domains.	Perkins & Salomon, 1992

These traits are not innate; they develop through structured experiences, scaffolded reflection, and long-term engagement, aligned with the VFC Framework's emphasis on progressive learning and behavioral internalization.

4.3. Illustrative Contexts: Application Across Fields

In practice, interdisciplinary cognition is increasingly vital across domains:

1) In youth education, programs like STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Mathematics) encourage learners to engage in creative, cross-domain projects. For instance, students might design sustainable housing solutions by integrating architectural design with environmental science and civic policy.
2) In sustainability science, interdisciplinary knowledge integrators analyze climate data, navigate legal frameworks, and negotiate stakeholder values to craft feasible, inclusive solutions [18].
3) In healthcare, Yang et al. [43] showed that integrating pediatric nursing and early childhood education using therapeutic play significantly improved nursing students' problem-solving and reflective capacities. This outcome emerged not from additive learning but from the synthesis of epistemological approaches to child care.
4) In public policy, integrators must weigh economic indicators against ethical considerations, drawing on economics, sociology, political theory, and communication studies simultaneously.

These domains illustrate that IKIA is not limited to academic contexts. It defines how people think, act, and perform in complex social systems.

4.4. Role Identity and Performance

Ultimately, to be an interdisciplinary knowledge integrator is to internalize a particular cognitive identity. It is a way of relating to knowledge and performance as fluid, contextual, and co-constructed. This identity is sustained through habitual cognitive behaviors—continual questioning, conceptual abstraction, and reflective recalibration.

Duhigg [11] notes that repeated cognitive actions form habits that define long-term behavior. In this light, interdisciplinary competence is not merely a "skill set," but a mindset and habit set—embodied through how a learner frames problems, seeks information, and collaborates across domains. The VFC Framework captures this transformation through its Habits layer in the KSAH model, emphasizing not just the acquisition but the *sustainability* of integrated thinking [1].

Thus, the interdisciplinary knowledge integrator becomes more than a learner—they become a navigator of uncertainty, a translator of systems, and a synthesizer of meaning across the fractured landscape of modern knowledge.

5. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative conceptual research design, aiming to articulate and synthesize a theoretical understanding of *Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA)* as a cognitive competency within the VFC Competence Framework. Rather than collecting empirical data, the paper employs abductive reasoning and conceptual synthesis, drawing from a curated body of peer-reviewed literature to develop a structured framework grounded in learning theory and cognitive psychology. This methodology is consistent with theory-building approaches in educational research that prioritize integrative model construction over empirical generalization [23].

The data informing this synthesis consists of over 40 peer-reviewed academic articles published between 2000 and 2025, covering domains such as interdisciplinary education, cognitive development, healthcare training, sustainability, and engineering pedagogy. Inclusion criteria prioritized scholarly works that explicitly address cross-domain knowledge integration, learning transfer, metacognition, and epistemic cognition. Sources were selected from academic databases including Scopus, ERIC, JSTOR, and ScienceDirect, ensuring thematic coverage across education, psychology, and applied fields.

The VFC Competence Framework [1] serves as the primary analytical lens, providing a scaffold for organizing and interpreting findings through its *KSAH model* (Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, Habits) and its tripartite structure: Functional Expertise, Cognitive Psychology, and Visionary Management. Within this structure, IKIA is situated in the Cognitive Psychology Dimension, which frames competence not only as an individual mental process but also as an affective and social capability.

Findings were coded thematically using these theoretical constructs, focusing on four analytical dimensions: schema restructuring, metacognitive self-regulation, far transfer, and interdisciplinary identity development. The methodology enables a developmental layering of IKIA, allowing for a nuanced understanding of how the competency evolves from novice-level cross-domain awareness to expert-level synthesis and application.

Finally, the decision to pursue a conceptual methodology is rooted in the need to bridge theoretical fragmentation in existing literature. Many interdisciplinary competence studies remain discipline-bound or lack coherence in outcome structures. By applying a design-based research logic, this paper contributes a translatable and scalable framework that can inform curriculum design, professional development, and future empirical studies seeking to operationalize interdisciplinary competence more precisely.

6. Data Analysis and Findings

6.1. Thematic Findings on the Cognitive Process of Integration

The conceptual synthesis of literature and case data reveals four primary themes underpinning the cognitive development of Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA): schema restructuring, metacognitive regulation, far transfer and knowledge abstraction, and identity transformation. These themes highlight the cognitive complexity and behavioral maturity required to navigate disciplinary boundaries and construct new epistemological frameworks.

6.1.1. Schema Restructuring and Conceptual Bridging

Interdisciplinary competence is contingent upon learners' ability to adapt and restructure existing cognitive schemas. Schema theory posits that individuals store knowledge in domain-specific frameworks, which must be reorganized to accommodate new disciplinary content [3, 7]. In interdisciplinary learning, this restructuring involves the synthesis of abstract principles from disparate domains into integrative mental models.

Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) reinforces this process by framing learning as a cyclical movement through concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation [26]. Fortuin et al. [18], in a study of environmental science education, found that students internalized complex systems thinking through iterative cycles of cross-domain exploration and reflection. These findings affirm that schema integration is not incidental—it must be deliberately scaffolded within learning design.

6.1.2. Metacognitive Self-Regulation and Epistemic Agility

The integration of knowledge across domains also demands advanced metacognitive regulation. According to Flavell [17], metacognition involves planning, monitoring, and evaluating one's cognitive strategies. In interdisciplinary contexts, learners must monitor the coherence of competing disciplinary assumptions and selectively apply or suppress epistemic frames [42]. Reflective journaling and metacognitive logs have proven effective in enabling learners to evaluate their own integrative processes [22].

This is consistent with findings from ElSayary [15], who demonstrated that students engaged in interdisciplinary instruction exhibited significantly higher levels of strategic thinking, abstraction, and self-regulation compared to their mono-disciplinary counterparts. These capacities are essential to what Greene et al. [20] call epistemic cognition—an individual's understanding of how knowledge is justified and used.

6.1.3. Far Transfer and Knowledge Abstraction

A hallmark of IKIA is the ability to perform far transfer—applying learned principles to novel or structurally dissimilar contexts. Perkins and Salomon [31] distinguish this from near transfer by its reliance on abstraction and analogical reasoning. Kao et al. [24] illustrated this through a curriculum in product and media design, where students were required to apply engineering principles, aesthetic reasoning, and social psychology to co-create public artifacts. Such work shows that transfer is not incidental; it is an intentional act of abstraction, reformulation, and re-application.

The capacity for far transfer reflects higher-order cognitive functioning and is increasingly cited as a marker of 21st-century competence [30]. In the VFC Framework, this aligns with advanced stages of the KSAH progression, particularly the movement from applied skills to embedded habits.

6.1.4. Interdisciplinary Identity Transformation

Perhaps the most enduring finding is that successful integration is not only a skill but an evolving cognitive identity. Learners begin to see themselves as synthesizers, rather than consumers, of knowledge. This shift—what Duhigg [11] might term a "habitual re-framing"—emerges as learners internalize interdisciplinary behaviors, such as pattern recognition, reflective comparison, and perspective-taking.

This identity transition is consistent with the Habits dimension of the VFC Framework and supports the view that competence is not simply task-based but dispositional and developmental [1]. Interdisciplinary thinkers cultivate a mindset marked by curiosity, adaptability, and systemic reasoning—characteristics that prepare them to lead, innovate, and collaborate in complex, real-world environments.

6.2. Micro-Case Examples and Vignettes

To further illustrate the applied dimensions of Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA), this section presents a selection of micro-cases that reflect how the competency operates in real-world educational and professional contexts. These examples were selected based on conceptual alignment with the VFC Framework and thematic resonance with the developmental processes identified in Section 7.1.

6.2.1. Case 1: Pediatric Nursing and Early Childhood Education Integration

In a mixed-method study by Yang et al. [43], an interdisciplinary curriculum was introduced to train nursing students through therapeutic play interventions rooted in early childhood education. Students were required to integrate physiological knowledge with developmental psychology and communicative empathy. The intervention revealed significant improvement in reflective thinking, problem-solving, and healthcare delivery among participants. Crucially, students demonstrated the ability to apply clinical reasoning in emotionally complex settings, indicating a successful transition from disciplinary knowledge to cross-domain synthesis. This reflects the schema restructuring and epistemic agility central to the VFC's Cognitive Psychology Dimension.

6.2.2. Case 2: Product and Media Design Education in Taiwan

Kao et al. [24] examined a project-based interdisciplinary curriculum that integrated engineering principles, user-experience design, and social impact assessment in higher education. Learners in this program collaborated across departments to design public-facing innovations such as assistive technologies and environmental infographics. The program deliberately scaffolded reflection, abstract thinking, and team-based iteration. The result was a measurable increase in students' ability to apply abstract concepts in novel contexts, confirming the developmental nature of far transfer. Students also reported growth in empathy, perspective-taking, and epistemological flexibility, highlighting the social and psychological layers within the VFC Framework.

6.2.3. Case 3: Environmental Systems Thinking in Sustainability Education

Fortuin et al. [18] documented an interdisciplinary intervention in sustainability education, where students were challenged to solve real-world environmental problems by integrating knowledge from biology, economics, and political science. Through scenario-based learning and facilitated reflection, learners developed systems-thinking capabilities and interdisciplinary communication skills. The study concluded that students were able to identify complex interdependencies, reason ethically, and propose solutions that transcended disciplinary constraints. These findings illustrate the activation of integrative synthesis and systems-level awareness, core traits identified in Section 5 and modeled behaviorally within the Habits layer of the VFC KSAH framework [1].

Across these cases, learners moved beyond passive content reception and became active constructors of interdisciplinary meaning. Their performance aligns with the VFC Framework's conceptualization of competence as a dynamic interaction between knowledge structures, self-regulation, and socially embedded behavior. These vignettes affirm that IKIA is both context-responsive and cognitively scaffoldable, proving essential for education systems aiming to equip learners with the capacity to lead in complex, transdisciplinary environments.

6.3. Mapping Findings onto the CI² Model: A Cross-Competence Bridge

While Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA) is framed primarily as a cognitive developmental competency, its application in real-world settings is deeply interdependent with social-cognitive capacities. Chief among these is *Collaborative Intelligence & Influence (CI²)*—a structured socio-cognitive competence situated within the same Cognitive Psychology Dimension of the VFC Competence Framework [1, 2]. CI² encompasses the ability to co-create knowledge, ethically influence group dynamics, and co-regulate reasoning—behaviors that are indispensable for activating interdisciplinary integration in collaborative contexts.

Thematic findings in this paper—particularly those related to schema restructuring, far transfer, and epistemic agility—often manifest in social environments where learners must negotiate meaning, share mental models, and synthesize perspectives across disciplines. In such settings, the success of IKIA is contingent upon learners' capacity to build psychological safety, facilitate inclusive dialogue, and calibrate influence competencies directly captured by the CI² model [14, 19].

CI² thus provides a *social infrastructure for IKIA*. For instance, an individual capable of abstract integration may still fail to achieve impact if they cannot translate insights into shared understanding or navigate disciplinary conflict in teams. Conversely, high-functioning CI² behaviors—like trust calibration and group metacognition—enable deeper interdisciplinary engagement by stabilizing collective reasoning and reducing social-cognitive overload [8, 21].

From a competence design perspective, both IKIA and CI² share alignment with the *KSAH model* of the VFC Framework, progressing from knowledge to behavior to identity-level habit formation. While IKIA emphasizes internal integration of conceptual knowledge, CI² extends that process into social interaction, influence, and team cognition. Together, they form a cognitive–social axis of competence essential for navigating today's interdisciplinary, multicultural, and hybrid work environments.

Framing CI² as a bridging competence reinforces the VFC model's emphasis on interdependence between competencies, ensuring that development is not fragmented but layered, relational, and future-responsive.

6.4. Integration with the VFC Cognitive Psychology Dimension

The findings of this study affirm that Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA) is a cognitively organized, socially expressed, and psychologically regulated competence, precisely aligned with the structure and intent of the Cognitive Psychology Dimension of the VFC Competence Framework [1]. Within this dimension, three interrelated domains—Cognitive, Psychological, and Social—capture the layered internal and external processes that underpin advanced mental functioning. IKIA interacts with all three, making it a cross-domain cognitive enabler within this structure.

In the Cognitive Domain, IKIA develops through schema formation, far transfer, conceptual abstraction, and knowledge restructuring [7, 26]. These cognitive processes are essential for synthesizing ideas across disciplines and for engaging in epistemologically pluralistic reasoning. Learners must be able to hold complex mental models, integrate disparate knowledge structures, and manage cognitive load efficiently

[38].

In the Psychological Domain, IKIA is sustained by metacognitive regulation, epistemic humility, and the affective resilience needed to engage ambiguity and conflict between competing frameworks [17, 22]. The learner's ability to tolerate uncertainty, engage in reflective comparison, and sustain internal motivation is critical for integrative thought and long-term intellectual development.

In the Social Domain, IKIA becomes actionable in collective settings where learners must share, negotiate, and co-construct interdisciplinary meaning. This domain aligns closely with (CI^2)—a VFC competence that enables trust calibration, perspective-taking, and shared mental modeling [2, 21]. Without these social-cognitive capacities, the internal integration of knowledge cannot be meaningfully extended into group learning, innovation, or collective problem-solving.

Thus, IKIA does not sit within a single vertical—it cross-cuts all three domains of the Cognitive Psychology Dimension. It is initiated cognitively, sustained psychologically, and manifested socially. This multi-domain interaction supports the VFC Framework's commitment to layered development and integrative assessment, ensuring that cognitive competencies are framed not only by what learners know but by how they regulate and enact that knowledge across personal, relational, and interdisciplinary contexts.

7. Learning Outcomes – KSAH Model

7.1. Overview and KSAH Framework Rationale

The development of Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA) must be understood not merely as an academic goal, but as a structured developmental competence. Within the VFC Competence Framework, such competencies are articulated through the *KSAH model*—a layered structure comprising *Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, and Habits* [1]. This framework assumes that cognitive excellence arises not only from what learners know, but also from what they can do with that knowledge, how they approach it emotionally and ethically, and how consistently they enact it behaviorally.

The KSAH model provides a developmental scaffold that maps the evolution from conceptual awareness to performative mastery. Unlike taxonomies such as Bloom's [5], which primarily focus on cognitive stages, the KSAH model integrates metacognition, epistemic values, and behavioral sustainability, offering a competency-based framework fit for 21st-century complexity. In the case of IKIA, this model allows for a more precise delineation of what integration looks like at different stages of learner growth, from novice-level exposure to expert-level abstraction and leadership.

Importantly, IKIA learning outcomes must not be confined to course-level assessments or disciplinary rubrics. Instead, they should reflect progressive transformation across all four KSAH pillars, enabling long-term adaptability and cross-contextual relevance. This is particularly important in interdisciplinary environments where competence is assessed not only by domain-specific accuracy but by the learner's ability to translate, transfer, and transform knowledge within and beyond social or professional boundaries [27, 31].

7.2. Knowledge Outcomes

In the context of interdisciplinary competence, knowledge is not merely about content acquisition. It encompasses a deep understanding of how different knowledge systems operate, how they can be juxtaposed, and how new insights can be generated through their synthesis. This requires familiarity with multiple epistemological traditions, schema theory, cognitive load principles, and learning transfer mechanisms [7, 38].

At the novice level, learners begin by identifying disciplinary boundaries and recognizing conceptual differences. They can name basic principles and describe structural features of distinct fields. At the intermediate level, they begin to compare and relate concepts across domains, understanding not only what disciplines believe, but how they come to those beliefs. Advanced learners start to internalize theoretical frameworks such as experiential learning [26] or systems thinking [9] and apply these to interdisciplinary tasks. At the expert level, individuals can design integrative frameworks, challenge disciplinary assumptions, and generate new conceptual schema that operate across boundaries.

These knowledge outcomes enable learners to progress from passive content reception to active cognitive construction, fulfilling the *Cognitive Domain* mandate of the VFC Framework. They are the foundation upon which transferable skills, ethical attitudes, and behavioral habits are built.

7.3. Skills Outcomes

While knowledge provides the cognitive foundation for interdisciplinary integration, the ability to act on that knowledge requires a distinct set of transferable and high-order skills. In the context of Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA), skills refer to a learner's observable capabilities to synthesize, apply, and communicate across conceptual boundaries.

At the novice level, learners participate in guided interdisciplinary tasks such as group projects, introductory case studies, or structured debates. These tasks aim to develop initial comfort with disciplinary transitions. Intermediate learners begin to navigate those transitions independently—constructing analogies, contributing to joint problem-definition, and using tools like concept maps and systems diagrams to illustrate cross-domain linkages [29].

As learners reach the advanced level, they develop the ability to critically compare disciplinary methodologies and apply abstract principles across unfamiliar contexts. They facilitate synthesis in group discussions, design research questions that bridge fields, and use multi-modal literacy (verbal, visual, numerical) to support interdisciplinary problem solving [25]. Finally, at the expert level, individuals demonstrate the capacity to lead integration processes. They create transdisciplinary models, facilitate stakeholder collaboration, and scaffold integration in others through mentorship, curriculum design, or innovation leadership [18, 36].

Skill acquisition in IKIA is cumulative and spiral, not merely additive. Each level reinforces schema restructuring and promotes deeper cognitive flexibility, a key skill in responding to complexity, ambiguity, and change [37].

7.4. Attitudinal Outcomes

Interdisciplinary competence also involves a psychological orientation toward knowledge—specifically, an attitudinal posture marked by openness, epistemic humility, and persistence. The *attitudinal dimension* is vital for sustaining learning in the face of ambiguity, conflicting values, and conceptual dissonance—hallmarks of interdisciplinary problem spaces.

At the novice stage, learners may show initial respect for multiple perspectives but tend to revert to familiar frameworks under pressure. They may struggle with ambiguity or exhibit discomfort with unresolved tensions between disciplines. Intermediate learners begin to appreciate the value of complexity. They express curiosity toward foreign epistemologies and begin to ask cross-cutting questions that reflect a shifting cognitive stance [22].

Advanced learners demonstrate epistemic humility—the recognition that all knowledge is partial and that disciplinary assumptions must be questioned and revised. They engage in sustained reflection and show emotional resilience when navigating contradictory evidence or stakeholder values [20]. *Expert-level learners* not only embrace complexity but model attitudinal flexibility for others. They are adept at facilitating inclusive dialogue, holding space for divergent views, and framing synthesis as a moral and intellectual responsibility [15].

Attitudinal outcomes are particularly significant within the *Psychological Domain* of the VFC Framework. They act as a bridge between cognition and behavior—ensuring that knowledge and skills are ethically grounded and emotionally sustainable, not merely performative.

7.5. Habits Outcomes

Within the VFC Framework, the Habits domain represents the culmination of competence development, where knowledge, skills, and attitudes are internalized as sustained cognitive and behavioral patterns [1] In the case of Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA), habits reflect a learner's capacity to routinely engage in cross-disciplinary reasoning, reflective abstraction, and systems-level thinking without external prompting.

Habits, as Duhigg [11] notes, are formed through repeated cues, routines, and rewards that eventually become embedded in behavioral memory. For interdisciplinary thinkers, these habits include actions such as reframing problems using multiple logics, actively seeking diverse perspectives, and maintaining reflective journals to map integrative processes over time. These actions become more than strategies—they become default modes of navigating complexity.

At the novice level, learners require external scaffolding to activate integrative habits. They respond to structured prompts, collaborative routines, or assigned reflection tasks. While these behaviors may appear sporadic or instructor-dependent, they signal the beginning of interdisciplinary pattern formation. At the intermediate level, learners begin to adopt these habits independently—initiating cross-disciplinary dialogue, using concept mapping to support synthesis, or revisiting epistemological assumptions across contexts [29].

By the advanced stage, interdisciplinary habits become part of the learner's cognitive identity. Individuals regularly seek out ambiguous or complex problems, apply frameworks from diverse fields, and use reflection tools as standard elements of their learning process. At the expert level, these habits extend outward—they not only govern personal learning but also shape organizational practices. Expert learners design environments that encourage knowledge integration, facilitate interdisciplinary mentoring, and embed synthesis routines in curricula, policy, or professional ecosystems [27, 36].

Importantly, habits are not merely individual. Within the Social Domain of the VFC Framework, habitual interdisciplinary thinking also manifests through team norms, shared problem-framing rituals, and collaborative reasoning routines [21]. These socialized habits enable distributed cognition and collective innovation, ensuring that interdisciplinary practice becomes systemic rather than episodic.

In sum, the *habitual dimension of IKIA* marks the transition from competence as capacity to competence as embodied, automated behavior. It is the final stage of integration—one that links inner disposition with outward practice, and temporary learning with lifelong adaptability.

7.6. KSAH × Progression Matrix

To consolidate the developmental trajectory of Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application (IKIA), this section presents a summative matrix that maps the four dimensions of the KSAH model—Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, and Habits—against four levels of progression: *Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, and Expert*. This table provides a structured reference for educational designers, assessment specialists, and organizational leaders seeking to diagnose, scaffold, and measure interdisciplinary competence in youth and professional development settings.

This matrix reflects the VFC Competence Framework's emphasis on development as a layered and behavioral continuum, rather than a binary of mastery or deficiency [1]. It also supports the creation of rubrics, reflective tools, and performance-based evaluations for interdisciplinary learning programs.

Table 2. KSAH × Progression Matrix for Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application.

Dimension	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced	Expert
Knowledge	Recognizes disciplinary boundaries and basic interdisciplinary terminology.	Explains conceptual similarities and differences across disciplines.	Applies learning theories and integration strategies to interdisciplinary problems.	Designs new frameworks that integrate diverse disciplinary logics; mentors others.
Skills	Participates in structured interdisciplinary tasks.	Initiates integration through mapping, analogies, and inquiry.	Facilitates synthesis in collaborative or research contexts.	Leads integration in innovation settings; designs curricula and transdisciplinary models.
Attitudes	Respects alternative views but relies on familiar disciplines.	Expresses curiosity about complexity; tolerates ambiguity.	Demonstrates epistemic humility and reflective stance.	Models inclusive reasoning; fosters epistemic dialogue and ethical synthesis.
Habits	Responds to external prompts for reflection or integration.	Initiates interdisciplinary behaviors (e.g., concept maps, journaling).	Routinely applies integrative reasoning to academic and real-world challenges.	Institutionalizes integration practices; mentors and sustains collaborative systems thinking.

This progression matrix serves not only as a guide for individual development but also as a scalable framework for competency design. It can be adapted into diagnostic rubrics, formative self-assessment tools, or organizational learning benchmarks, ensuring that IKIA becomes a measurable and observable dimension of long-term cognitive development.

8. Conclusion and Future Research Directions

This paper has presented a comprehensive conceptualization of (IKIA) as a structured cognitive competence embedded within the *Cognitive Psychology Dimension* of the VFC Competence Framework. Drawing from schema theory, cognitive load theory, experiential learning, and transfer of learning, IKIA has been positioned as a progressive and measurable capability that moves learners from disciplinary fluency to epistemic agility and systems-level synthesis [7, 27, 38, 31].

Unlike fragmented or siloed approaches to integration, this paper underscores IKIA as a cross-domain developmental construct—one that traverses the Cognitive, Psychological, and Social domains of the VFC Framework. Through thematic findings and micro-case analysis, we established that IKIA involves not just cognitive restructuring, but also *metacognitive regulation, reflective identity work, and social enactment* [20, 22, 43]. It is a competence that bridges knowledge, performance, and ethical responsibility—essential for equipping learners to navigate complexity in education, work, and global systems.

The *KSAH model*—Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, Habits—offered a scaffold to articulate IKIA across stages of learner development. These stages, mapped through the 8.6 progression matrix, clarify how IKIA evolves from passive exposure to expert-level enactment, where learners not only integrate knowledge but lead others in integrative practices, mentor across disciplines, and institutionalize transdisciplinary thinking in curricula or organizations [1].

Importantly, the paper also argued that IKIA cannot be fully realized without interaction with other VFC competencies, particularly *(CI²)*. In collaborative settings, interdisciplinary integration depends on the ability to co-create meaning, regulate influence ethically, and build shared cognitive models within teams [21]. This affirms the VFC principle that competencies are layered, relational, and synergistic, not isolated skill sets.

Future Research Directions:

To move beyond conceptual modeling, several areas of empirical inquiry are recommended:

Operationalizing IKIA as an assessment construct: Develop and validate rubrics, scenario-based tasks, and reflective tools that measure progression across the KSAH framework.

Longitudinal studies: Track IKIA development in learners over time, especially in project-based or transdisciplinary education environments (e.g., STEAM, global studies, sustainability labs).

Cross-cultural adaptation: Investigate how IKIA manifests in culturally diverse contexts where epistemic values and disciplinary authority differ.

AI-supported diagnostic tools: Explore the use of artificial intelligence to map conceptual integration, track schema development, and model far transfer behavior through learning analytics.

Application in leadership and policy contexts: Examine how IKIA informs ethical decision-making, systems navigation, and strategic foresight in organizational leadership and education policy.

In conclusion, IKIA is not an abstract ideal—it is a core developmental need for any individual or institution seeking to thrive in a future defined by knowledge hybridity, socio-technical complexity, and global interdependence. As such, its recognition as a critical cognitive competency marks a step toward more integrative, ethical, and resilient education and human development systems.

Abbreviations

IKIA	Interdisciplinary Knowledge Integration and Application
VFC	VFC Competence Framework as a Development Framework
KSAH	Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, and Habits Model
CI²	Collaborative Intelligence & Influence
ELT	Experiential Learning Theory
CLT	Cognitive Load Theory
ZPD	The Zone of Proximal Development

Author Contributions

Mohammad Moharram: Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision

Abdullah Hussein Salem: Data curation, Formal Analysis, Writing – original draft

Yasser Nasr Eldin: Funding acquisition, Project administration, Resources

Wael Ahmed Abdalla: Validation, Visualization, Writing – review & editing

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Conflicts of Interest

There is no conflict of interest.

References

[1] AbdelMohiman, M., & Salem, A. H. (2025). VFC Competence Framework as a human resources development framework: A qualitative study of competency-based teaching and learning theories. International Journal of Contemporary Education, 8(2), 49–63. https://doi.org/10.11114/ijce.v8i2.7521

[2] Abdelmohiman, M. M., Salem, A. H., Nasr Eldin, Y., & Abdalla, W. A. (2025). Collaborative intelligence & influence as a socio-cognitive competence: Structuring developmental outcomes within the VFC framework (Version 1.0, May 9, 2025) [Unpublished manuscript]. Business Wheel Academy.

[3] Anderson, J. R. (1977). Schema-directed processes in language comprehension. In A. Lesgold, J. Pellegrino, S. Fokkema, & R. Glaser (Eds.), Cognitive psychology and instruction (pp. 67–82). Springer.

[4] Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. Longman.

[5] Bloom, B. S. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain. David McKay.

[6] Chao, K.-Y., Lo, K.-W., Li, Y.-S., & Yang, B.-H. (2024). Effects of integration of interdisciplinary learning on student learning outcomes and healthcare-giving competence: A mixed methods study. BMC Nursing, 23(583). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-02260-w

[7] Chi, M. T. H. (2009). Active-constructive-interactive: A conceptual framework for differentiating learning activities. Topics in Cognitive Science, 1(1), 73–105. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-8765.2008.01005.x

[8] Chiu, M. M., & Kuo, L. J. (2009). From metacognition to social metacognition: Similarities, differences, and learning implications. Journal of Advanced Academics, 20(1), 105–124. https://doi.org/10.4219/jaa-2008-869

[9] Clark, B., & Wallace, D. (2015). Integration and interdisciplinarity: A report for the HEA Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning Group. Higher Education Academy. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk

[10] Drake, S. M., & Reid, J. L. (2017). Integrated curriculum as an effective way to teach 21st century capabilities. Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Research, 1(1), 31–50.

[11] Duhigg, C. (2012). The power of habit: Why we do what we do in life and business. Random House.

[12] Dweck, C. S. (2006). Mindset: The new psychology of success. Random House.

[13] Earl, L. M. (2013). Assessment as learning: Using classroom assessment to maximize student learning (2nd ed.). Corwin Press.

[14] Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1(1), 23–43. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305

[15] ElSayary, A. (2018). The relationship between cognitive development, teaching creative thinking, assessment, and an interdisciplinary approach. Journal for Researching Education Practice and Theory, 1(2), 41–54.

[16] European Commission. (2019). Key competences for lifelong learning. Publications Office of the European Union. https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2766/291008

[17] Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive–developmental inquiry. American Psychologist, 34(10), 906–911. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906

[18] Fortuin, K. P. J., Koppen, C. S. A., & Kroeze, C. (2013). The contribution of systems thinking to the development of interdisciplinary science on social–ecological systems. Science & Education, 22, 1911–1933. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-011-9403-1

[19] Glikson, E., & Woolley, A. W. (2020). Human trust in artificial intelligence: Review of empirical research. Academy of Management Annals, 14(2), 627–660. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0057

[20] Greene, J. A., Sandoval, W. A., & Bråten, I. (2016). Toward a conceptual framework for epistemic cognition. In J. A. Greene, W. A. Sandoval, & I. Bråten (Eds.), Handbook of epistemic cognition (pp. 1–15). Routledge.

[21] Gupta, P., & Woolley, A. W. (2021). The transactive systems model of collective intelligence. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 42(6), 759–773. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2524

[22] Hofer, B. K., & Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing. Routledge.

[23] Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a conceptual framework: Philosophy, definitions, and procedure. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8(4), 49–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800406

[24] Kao, Y.-F., Chen, H.-C., & Lo, J.-H. (2023). Exploring an interdisciplinary curriculum in product and media design education: Knowledge innovation and competency development. Sustainability, 15(23), Article 16369. https://doi.org/10.3390/su152316369

[25] Klein, J. T. (2010). A taxonomy of interdisciplinarity. In R. Frodeman (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of interdisciplinarity (pp. 15–30). Oxford University Press.

[26] Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice Hall.

[27] Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 4(2), 193–212. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2005.17268566

[28] Long, D., Wood, C., Littleton, K., Passenger, T., & Sheehy, K. (2011). Learning and development in the context of education. In D. Long (Ed.), Cognitive psychology and education: Applications and theory (pp. 11–42). Routledge.

[29] Novak, J. D., & Cañas, A. J. (2008). The theory underlying concept maps and how to construct and use them. Institute for Human and Machine Cognition, Technical Report IHMC CmapTools 2006-01 Rev 01-2008. https://cmap.ihmc.us/docs/theory-of-concept-maps

[30] OECD. (2019). OECD learning compass 2030: A series of concept notes. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/

[31] Perkins, D. N., & Salomon, G. (1992). Transfer of learning. International Encyclopedia of Education (2nd ed.), 2, 6452–6457.

[32] Piaget, J. (1952). The origins of intelligence in children (M. Cook, Trans.). International Universities Press. (Original work published 1936).

[33] Repko, A. F., & Szostak, R. (2021). Interdisciplinary research: Process and theory (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

[34] Rychen, D. S., & Salganik, L. H. (2000). Definition and selection of key competencies: Executive summary. OECD. https://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/41529556.pdf

[35] Sanchez, A. V., & Ruiz, M. P. (2008). Competence-based learning: A proposal for the assessment of generic competences. University of Deusto.

[36] Spelt, E. J. H., Biemans, H. J. A., Tobi, H., Luning, P. A., & Mulder, M. (2009). Teaching and learning in interdisciplinary higher education: A systematic review. Educational Psychology Review, 21(4), 365–378. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-009-9113-z

[37] Spiro, R. J., Coulson, R. L., Feltovich, P. J., & Anderson, D. K. (1991). Cognitive flexibility theory: Advanced knowledge acquisition in ill-structured domains. In R. Glaser (Ed.), Advances in instructional psychology: Vol. 4. Educational design and cognitive science (pp. 45–87). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[38] Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Paas, F. G. W. C. (1998). Cognitive architecture and instructional design. Educational Psychology Review, 10(3), 251–296. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022193728205

[39] Tabak, I. (2004). A complement to emerging patterns of distributed scaffolding. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 13(3), 305–335. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327809jls1303_3

[40] UNESCO. (2018). Global education monitoring report 2018: Regional review of SDG 4 – Arab States. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265866

[41] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds. & Trans.). Harvard University Press.

[42] Winne, P. H., & Hadwin, A. F. (1998). Studying as self-regulated learning. In D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), Metacognition in educational theory and practice (pp. 277–304). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[43] Yang, B.-H., Lo, K.-W., Li, Y.-S., & Chao, K.-Y. (2024). Interdisciplinary learning and reflective competence in nursing students: A curriculum evaluation study. BMC Nursing, 23(583). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-02260-w