**Literature Review Coding and Memoing Exercise**

**By Andrew R. Smolski**

**Instructions**

The following is a grouping of articles from Environmental Sociology. In this activity, you will go through making codes from these annotations. The goal is to conduct a round of open coding. Only code as many of the annotations as you feel necessary to get an idea of how the articles fit into a coherent narrative.

First, upload this file into your project. After, begin reading the annotations, highlighting when you want to produce a code. Remember, you can make a new code or code at an already existing code. Also, you can make sub-codes, if you think that there is a master code that is then differentiated into competing or co-occurring ideas. Once you feel you have a good set of codes with which to discuss, you can stop. Your goal with these codes is to be able to synthesize the literature into a coherent argument.

Next, you make a memo about your coding. You want to discuss what codes you developed, how you see the codes fitting together, and an overarching theme of the literature. We will use this as a way to discuss how NVivo can support us in making a literature review.

**York, Richard, and Brett Clark. 2010. "Critical Materialism: Science, Technology, and Environmental Sustainability." *Sociological Inquiry* 80:475-499**

York and Clark criticize technological optimists like (i.e. eco mod and others) for their blind faith in technology, as well as avoiding about questions of power, class, and political economy in the deployment of technology. They also criticize postmodernist positions that see science as a form of oppression and rejects scientific epistemology. This po-mo position is inherently conservative and aids those in power. They are argue for a critical (and dialectical) materialism to address environmental crisis, technology, and sustainability.

“We gain a more nuanced understanding of science and of what is necessary to bring about environmental sustainability by distinguishing between the philosophical commitments that underlie scientific epistemology and the political-economic character of the technological-scientific establishment” (2010: 476)

“However, central to the critical materialist view that we develop here is the recognition that the limitations, imperfections, and blind spots common to the scientific establishment do not undermine the importance of rational, empirical approaches to understanding nature and society. (2010: 480)

“This dialectical understanding of the relation between parts and wholes, as well as emergent properties, emphasizes the importance of contextualizing scientific analyses within a larger complex of relationships” (2010: 480)

**York, Richard, and Philip Mancus. 2009. "Critical Human Ecology: Historical Materialism and Natural Laws\*." Sociological Theory 27:122-149**Critical human ecology (CHE) breaks with idealist Western Marxism and avoids a reductionist analysis (symptomatic of human ecology tradition) in favor of a dialectical analysis. Classical Marxism is particularly useful for infusing human ecology with critical insights. Over course of 20th century, human ecology primarily focused in urban demographics and production. Why doesn’t reductionism work all the time for explaining things? Emergence and contingency, described by Gould (133). Also critiques holism for being overly idealist.  Rather, there is a dialectical relationship between nature and culture. From a materialist perspective all material factors/conditions should be on the table to help account for social life (not determine it). Critique of functionalism: not everything exists for functional reasons, some things come up due to some sort of (un)happy accident, or a non-adaptive structural side effect. We must also watch out for idealist ecologies, which idealize premodern societies as being more “in tune” with nature. In short, CHE does the following four things:   
o Grounded in materialism of biophysical human ecology, conjoined with classical Marxism   
o Embraces dialectical perspective, humans and natural environment in co-evolution process   
o Recognizes plurality of forces that influence society and nature    
 Including ahistorical and historical factors   
o Rejects functionalism in favor of a structural orientation   
    
“Marx and Engels’s materialism can be seen as an attempt to come to terms with the human   
propensity to transform the world through social labor, an activity in dialectical motion with thinking and representation” (York and Mancus 2009, 130)   
“CHE can be broadly conceived of as a materialist approach to social science that seeks to understand divergence and convergence across and within societies as well as throughout human history, to identify and analyze the impacts that human beings have on the ecosystems that sustain them, and to integrate environmental factors (e.g., climate, geography, and resource availability) into the analyses of human   
societies.” York and Mancus 2009, 124).    
There is, thus, a dance here between the ahistorical constraints of nature (e.g., solar input and its connection to net primary productivity) and the historically dynamic nature of social change. York and Mancus 2009, 137   
    
Labor became for Marx not simply the extension of human powers over inorganic nature but rather a process of the transformation of energy in which human beings were dependent on larger material and/or ecological conditions. (York and Mancus    
    
Thus, an ever-expanding sphere of production cannot accurately be called a functional adaptation, as it is not clearly functional for those whose labor is appropriated for the enjoyment of elites or those who are displaced by its predations (York and Mancus 2009, 144).

**Freudenburg, William R. 2006. “Environmental Degradation, Disproportionality, and the Double Diversion: Reaching Out, Reaching Ahead, and Reaching Beyond.” *Rural Sociology* 71(1):3-32.**

“Rather than seeking ivory‐tower isolation, members of the Rural Sociological Society have always been distinguished by a willingness to work with specialists from a broad range of disciplines, and to work on some of the world's most challenging problems. What is less commonly recognized is that the willingness to reach beyond disciplinary boundaries can contribute not just to the solution of real‐world problems, but also to the advancement of the discipline itself. This point is increasingly being illustrated in studies of environment‐society relationships. Most past discussions of humans' roles in environmental problems have focused on overall or average human impacts, but rural sociologists have played leading roles in identifying what I have come to call “the double diversion.” First, rather than being well‐represented by averages, environmental damages are often characterized by high levels of *disproportionality*, with much or most of the harm being created by the diversion of environmental rights and resources to a surprisingly small fraction of the relevant social actors. The dispropor‐tionality appears to be made possible in part through the second diversion, namely *distraction*—the diversion of attention, largely through the taken‐for‐granted but generally erroneous assumption that the environmental harm “must” be for the benefit of us all. There are good reasons why rural sociologists would have been among the first to notice both of these “diversions”— and why they will give even greater attention to both in the future.”

P. 3

In the article gets into needing to find a synthesis between eco mod and ecological Marxism (or critical structural human ecology) - gets at discussions of institutions, etc. This is an address to the discipline that happened at RSS in 2005

* + Routinization of reflexivity as a goal

**Buttel, Frederick H. 2004. “The Treadmill of Production: An Appreciation, Assessment and Agenda for Research.” *Organization & Environment.* 17(3):323-336.**

* Buttel’s analysis of TOP theory and applications
* TOP departs from mainstream soc in that the dependent variable is biophysical (enviro destruction)
* Says we can look at TOP in 4 different ways: 1) as a concept 2) as a sociological theory 3) Schnaibergs career work 4) the work of Schnaiberg and main coauthors (Pellow, Gould and Weinberg)
* In early enviro soc days the two main research traditions were The Catton-Dunlap group and the TOP folks
* TOP is anchored in a neo-Marxist political economy which includes O’Connor and the Monthly Review School
* TOP isn’t as prominent according to Buttel saying even Schnaiberg expressed disappointment that the enviro soc community had not taken this up more.
* Some problems he thinks need scrutiny and reaffirmation include: 1) People have a superficial understanding of what is actually a quite complex concept. 2) Authors have not been systematic in updating the theory causing some confusion in comprehension because they have not said enough about the rationale behind changes made to the theory sinc 1980.
* Doesn’t think TOP should be lumped in with O’Connor and metabolic rift as they are a different “species” (329)
* We see considerable changes to the theory from 1980-1990
* “The key claim remains that capital-intensive economic expansion is intrinisic to capitalist-market societies, due to the structure of the economy and the role of the state, and involves an intrinsic tendency towards environmental degradation.
* In terms of changes we see a decreased influence of the Monthly Review economists
* Research Agenda recommendations: 1) Notes that “the theoretical model of the treadmill of production has yet to be comprehensively updated at the level of detail and comprehensiveness reflected in chapter V of *The Environment”* (332)2) wants to see TOP scholars researching macrosocial dynamics once again. 3) revisit the concept of “additions and withdrawals” in the context of space, time, and history
* Says there are 5 traditions in enviro soc 1) TOP and other eco-Marxism, 2) Ecomod and enviro reform 3) cultural/enviro socs 4) neo-Malthusians and 5) the new ecological paradigm
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* Says there are 5 traditions in enviro soc 1) TOP and other eco-Marxism, 2) Ecomod and enviro reform 3) cultural/enviro socs 4) neo-Malthusians and 5) the new ecological paradigm

**Buttell, Frederick H. 2003. “Environmental Sociology and the Explanation of Environmental Reform.” *Organization & Environment.* 16(3):306-344.**

* Suggests 4 environmental reform mechanisms: enviro movements (including anti-environmental movements), state regulations, ecological modernization, and international environmental governance. Concludes that movements and activism are the most fundamental components of environmental reform.
* “U.S is among the most recalcitrant in terms of eschewing innovation and effective environmental policies and the extraordinary expansion of raw materials and energy consumption.” (308)
* There was a time when early enviro soc assumed environmental collective action was somewhat of an inevitability. However we have had to revisit and reassess our stance on environmental movements, particularly as challenges to enviro movements have increased substantially. The U.S. federal government has become more and more involved in enviro regulation in the 20th century. These responses were often inadequate and uneven.
* “The notion that government or state regulation of environmentally related private decision making, particularly by industrial corporations, would be central to a promising environmental future is an old one” (315)
* “Over the past several years, there has been an intensifying debate in the United States over whether centralized or nationalized command-and-control regulation is desirable for environmental protection..” is it a necessary piece? (320)
* Says ecomods are critical of both enviro regulation and radical environmentalism, saying that these movements have been largely unsuccessful
* “In particular, the ecological modernization image of our environmental future is based very strongly on the observation that some of the core features of a more environmentally secure tomorrow are already emerging or already in place, even though they seem less visible than radical environmentalism or government standard setting.” (323)
* Says that ecomods think environmentalists are being too confrontational and will see more success when they partner up with business, working with industry to make regulatory changes. So “a modernized government oversight and guidance process is more likely to create an atmosphere of corporate innovation and environmental citizenship than the largely adversarial relations that characterize command-and-control structures.” (324) They believe production processes can be dematerialized. This differs from TOP in that Schnaiberg saw environmental deterioration as consumption driven
* “These environmental sociological critics of the green consumerism strategy thus suggest that voluntary limitation on consumption or green consumerism would involve little more than a drop in the bucket compared to the huge flows of resources that are shaped by public policy through its effects on the transportation system, the urban infrastructure, and the character of the built environment.” (334)
* Says “Ecological modernization perspectives can be of particular help in conceptualizing the possibilities for comprehensive, effective, and socially benign systems of environmental incentives.” (337) Says this with the caveat that a supportive political climate must exist for this to happen

**Beck, Ulrich. 2015. “Emancipatory Catastrophism: What Does It Mean to Climate**

**Change and Risk Society.” *63*(1):75-88.**

* **Main Argument/Thesis**
  + Beck argues that what is missing from the contemporary discourse regarding climate change is the recognition that climate change has already completely transformed our world - he calls it a “metamorphosis of the world” - in the following ways:
    - It draws new boundaries between haves and have-nots that differ from traditional social class or nation-state lines, based on sea level (those residing at lower sea levels the ‘have-nots’).
    - Climate change cannot be adequately addressed without including in the decision-making processes those most affected.
    - It highlights what Beck calls the limitations of “‘methodological nationalism’”, or the use of the nation-state as the unit of analysis of social-environmental problems (p. 76).
    - We’re now required to distinguish between two different social groups (on a global scale) - “between those who produce the risk and those who are affected by it.” (p. 76).
  + In opposition to “methodological nationalism” Beck proposes his “cosmopolitan perspective” which acknowledges the above distinction as the primary dividing line in the world risk society, rather than class stratification that is rooted in nation-states, or a global nation-state stratification system.
* **Methods/Data**
  1. This is a Ulrich Beck piece, so of course there are no data or methodology.
* **Results**
  1. He introduces four theses:
     + There are hidden emancipatory side effects of global risk.
       - It “violates *sacred* (unwritten) norms of human existence and civilization” (p. 79).
       - This produces “anthropological shock” - cataclysmic events that transform a population’s consciousness and set into motion . . .
       - a “social catharsis” - a social reflexive process that provides insight and makes connections that were previously unseen.
     + A case study of Hurricane Katrina shows how normative horizons of global justice are being globalized.
       1. Caused anthropological shock.
       2. Social catharsis - two previously separate phenomena were linked together: history of US racism and environmental crises.
     + Global risks produce compasses for the 21st century world.
       1. Because climate change, paradigmatic of new global risks, is an existential crisis, or a qualitative rather than quantitative problem, its threat poses previously unasked questions that can serve as a “compass for the 21st century.” (p. 83).
     + Global risks enforce a categorical metamorphosis of generation.
       1. Social generations (i.e. cohorts, more or less), rather than social classes, become the primary problematic in world risk society, through a “metamorphosis of social stratification”. (p. 83).
          - The importance of temporality due to crisis of climate change.