



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 8.4
IJAR 2018; 4(12): 455-459
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 15-10-2018
Accepted: 18-11-2018

Rajeev Rai

M.Phil, Sociology, Institute of
Social Sciences, DR. Bhim Rao
Ambedkar University, Agra,
Uttar Pradesh, India

New directions and research trends in environmental sociology

Rajeev Rai

Abstract

Environmental sociology has become a mature field within the discipline of sociology. We consider a few of the key speculations that characterize the center and limits of the field, pointing out discussions and uncertain inquiries. We fight that two of the characterizing highlights of this field are (a) regard for the inseparability of human and nonhuman qualities and (b) consideration regarding the job that force and social imbalance play in molding human/nonhuman connections. These two qualities of environmental sociology likewise uncover solid connections between this field and the more extensive control, considering ongoing reevaluations of old style sociological compositions. We finish up with a thought of new bearings environmental sociologists may take toward building a considerably more vigorous, interdisciplinary, and basic territory of study.

Keywords: Environment, ecosystems, humans, nonhuman natures, power, social inequality

Introduction

Environmental sociology is typically defined as the sociological study of societal-environmental interactions, although this definition immediately presents the perhaps insolvable problem of separating human cultures from the rest of the environment. Despite the fact that the focal point of the field is the connection among society and climate as a rule, environmental sociologists commonly place extraordinary accentuation on considering the social factors that cause environmental issues, the cultural effects of those issues, and endeavors to tackle the issues. Moreover, significant consideration is paid to the social cycles by which certain environmental conditions become socially characterized as problems. Environmental sociologists have a since quite a while ago held desire to change sociology – to grow out of our sub-disciplinary specialty and rethink the standard. A significant number of us immovably accept that environmental sociology expects us to reconsider the fundamental standards of sociology and in reality the very idea of 'sociologies'. We accept such a reconsidering is basic to the progressing importance of the sociologies in a time of worldwide environmental change. Having rose during the 1970s as open familiarity with and worry for environmental issues expanded, environmental sociology's primary objective is to comprehend the interconnections between human social orders and the regular (or biophysical) climate. Environmental sociology has been portrayed as containing four significant zones of examination. To start with, environmental sociologists study the social reasons for environmental issues. Thusly, researchers have built up a variety of hypothetical structures to clarify how different social elements, including segment, social, social, political, financial, and mechanical elements, produce environmental effects and issues, and they have led numerous observational investigations on a wide scope of environmental markers to survey speculations got from these hypotheses. Second, environmental sociology is worried about how the common habitat impacts and effects society. Early environmental sociologists unequivocally underscored the reliance of human social orders on the common habitat and focused on that the field ought to consider how the climate shapes society notwithstanding how society impacts the climate. Exploration here handles issues, for example, the social outcomes of catastrophic events and the discriminatory circulation of environmental dangers along racial and financial lines. Third, environmental sociology looks at social responses and reactions to environmental dangers and issues. Examination here spotlights on getting examples and patterns in environmental mentalities and practices (e.g., reusing) just as

Corresponding Author:

Rajeev Rai

M.Phil, Sociology, Institute of
Social Sciences, DR. Bhim Rao
Ambedkar University, Agra,
Uttar Pradesh, India

different parts of the environmental development. Fourth, environmental sociologists are worried about understanding social cycles and elements that could progress environmental change and maintainability. When all is said in done, environmental sociology has would in general zero in additional on clarifying how society makes environmental issues while giving less consideration possible arrangements, however a move has occurred in late many years. The turn of events, conversation, and observational appraisal of speculations of environmental change, examinations of possible answers for environmental emergencies, and drafting of reasonable systems for maintainability have become significant foci of academic action in environmental sociology. Another significant territory of exploration, one that cuts over the first four, is the human elements of worldwide environmental change, which has gotten one of the primary considerable issues concentrated by environmental sociologists.

In spite of the fact that there was at times rancorous discussion between the constructivist and pragmatist "camps" inside environmental sociology during the 1990s, the different sides have discovered impressive shared view as both progressively acknowledge that while most environmental issues have a material reality they in any case become referred to just through human cycles, for example, logical information, activists' endeavors, and media consideration. As such, most environmental issues have a genuine ontological status notwithstanding our insight/familiarity with them originating from social cycles, measures by which different conditions are developed as issues by researchers, activists, media and other social entertainers. Correspondingly, environmental issues should all be perceived through social cycles, in spite of any material premise they may have outer to people. This intuitiveness is presently extensively acknowledged, yet numerous parts of the discussion proceed in contemporary exploration in the field.

Present day thought encompassing human-climate relations is followed back to Charles Darwin. Darwin's idea of common choice recommended that specific social qualities assumed a key part in the survivability of gatherings in the regular habitat. Albeit commonly taken at the miniature level, developmental standards, especially flexibility, fill in as a microcosm of human biology. The duality of the human condition rests with social uniqueness and developmental characteristics. From one viewpoint, people are installed in the ecosphere and coevolved close by different species. People share similar essential environmental conditions as different occupants of nature. From the other viewpoint, people are recognized from different species due to their imaginative limits, particular societies and fluctuated foundations. Human manifestations have the ability to freely control, decimate, and rise above the constraints of the indigenous habitat. During the 1970s, researchers started perceiving the constraints of what might be named the Human Exemptionalism Paradigm. Catton and Dunlap recommended another viewpoint that brought environmental factors into full record. They begat another theory, the New Ecological Paradigm, with suspicions in opposition to the HEP. The NEP perceives the inventive limit of people, yet says that people are still naturally associated likewise with different species. The NEP noticed the intensity of social and social powers yet doesn't affirm social determinism. Rather, people are affected by the reason, impact, and

criticism circles of biological systems. The earth has a limited degree of regular assets and waste archives. Subsequently, the biophysical climate can force imperatives on human action.

Backing for every point of view shifts among various networks. Scholars and environmentalists commonly put more weight on the principal point of view. Social researchers, then again, stress the subsequent viewpoint. This division has formed the establishment for the essential ideal models of environmental sociology.

Environmental sociology is a moderately new territory of request that rose to a great extent because of expanded cultural acknowledgment of the earnestness of environmental issues. Numerous zones of sociology have comparatively emerged because of cultural regard for risky conditions, including destitution and imbalance, racial and sexual orientation separation, and wrongdoing and misconduct. Environmental sociology is exceptional, nonetheless, in that sociological thoughtfulness regarding environmental issues needed to defeat solid disciplinary conventions that debilitated focusing on nonsocial conditions, for example, environmental quality. Thus, the development of sociological work on environmental issues has been joined by a study and reassessment of center sociological suppositions and practices, with the outcome that environmental sociology has a fairly conflicted position toward its parent discipline. Globalisation has additionally influenced the sociological investigation of connections among society and the climate, a field frequently approximately named environmental sociology. Nonetheless, a more intensive gander at environmental sociology under progressively globalized conditions uncovers that an astounding marvel has risen inside the field. Globalization has somewhat brought about an environmental sociology of globalization that appears as sociological investigations of how globalization has influenced the connections among society and the climate. It has not, notwithstanding, brought about what could be known as a worldwide environmental sociology, one that is bound together around the globe as far as the subjects that are contemplated and the speculations that are applied and created – to put it plainly, one having a typical epistemology and strategy. This can be seen most plainly when looking at the two areas where environmental sociology grew first and ostensibly has developed the most, the United States and Western Europe. Though a brief decade back Arthur Mol (2006) could even now recognize cheerful indications of common learning, trade, union and joining in these two fundamental areas' environmental humanistic systems, they right now appear to have floated separated regarding how they are being created, characterized, operationalized and organized. In a world portrayed by expanding interrelatedness and interconnectedness, where various societies, administration structures, metro epistemologies and logical frameworks and organizations confound and blend, the perception of a spot based difference in sociological ways to deal with (worldwide) environmental difficulties appears to be an interesting expression. Beginning from this perception, this article investigations current environmental human sciences and examines the issues, possibilities and viewpoints of a future worldwide environmental sociology. In doing as such, we intend to expand the investigation past the 'old focuses of the world'.

Trends in environmental sociology

Although there was scattered sociological attention to natural resource issues prior to the 1970s, environmental sociology developed in that decade as sociology's own response to the emergence of environmental problems. At first sociologists tended to pay more attention to societal response to environmental problems than to the problems themselves. As noted earlier, analyses of the environmental movement were popular, as were studies of public attitudes toward environmental issues. Prime topics included identifying the social sectors from which environmental activists were drawn and the social bases of pro-environmental attitudes among the general public (Dunlap and Catton 1979). Broader analyses of the ways in which "environment" was being constructed as a social problem, and the vital roles played by both activists and the media in this process, also received attention (Albrecht 1975). In addition, rural sociologists conducted a growing number of studies of natural resource agencies, while other sociologists examined environmental politics and policy making. In general, sociological work on environmental issues typically employed perspectives from the larger discipline to shed light on societal awareness of and response to environmental problems. In today's parlance, these initial efforts largely involved analyses of aspects of the "social construction of environmental problems" and represented what was termed a "sociology of environmental issues". As sociologists paid more attention to environmental issues, a few began to look beyond societal attention to environmental problems to the underlying relationships between modern, industrialized societies and the physical environments they inhabit. Concern with the causes of environmental pollution was supplemented by a focus on the social impacts of pollution and resource constraints. In some cases there was explicit attention to the reciprocal relationships between societies and their environments, or to the "ecosystem-dependence" of modern societies (Dunlap and Catton 1994). These concerns were bolstered by the 1973–1974 "energy crisis," as the interrupted flow of oil from Arab nations generated dramatic and widespread impacts and vividly demonstrated the vulnerability of modern industrial societies to an interruption of their fossil fuel supplies and—by extension—to natural resources in general (Rosa *et al.* 1988). Sociologists were quick to respond with numerous studies of the impacts, particularly the inequitable distribution of negative ones, of energy shortages.

The nascent environmental sociology of the 1970s was quickly institutionalized via formation of interest groups within the national sociological associations. These groups provided an organizational base for the emergence of environmental sociology as a thriving area of specialization and attracted scholars interested in all aspects of the physical environment—from environmental activism to energy and other natural resources, natural hazards and disasters, social impact assessment, and housing and the built environment (Dunlap and Catton 1983). The late 1970s was a vibrant era of growth for American environmental sociology, but momentum proved difficult to sustain during the 1980s, as the Reagan era was a troublesome period for the field and social science more generally. Ironically, however, sociological interest in environmental issues was beginning to spread internationally, and by the late 1980s and the 1990s environmental sociology was not only reinvigorated in the United States but was being

institutionalized in countries around the world and within the International Sociological Association (Dunlap and Catton 1994). The resurgence of environmental sociology in the United States and its emergence internationally benefited from key societal events. Publicity surrounding Love Canal and other local environmental hazards stimulated interest in the impacts of such hazards on local communities, while major accidents at Three Mile Island, Bophal (India), and Chernobyl dramatized the importance of technological hazards and helped generate sociological interest in the environmental and technological risks facing modern societies (Short 1984). More recently, growing awareness of global environmental problems such as ozone depletion, global climate change, and tropical deforestation have served to enhance sociological interest in environmental problems particularly at the global level.

Climate Change Sociology

Climate change has reached top priority on global political and research agendas, and many nation-states, environmental movements, international organisations and scientific communities are calling for immediate and concerted action. In response, various kinds of natural and environmental scientists have dramatically changed their research agendas, however whether or not our discipline has fallen short on this account remains open to debate. Lever-Tracy (2008a) and other sociologists debating climate change in a 2008 symposium in *Current Sociology* claim that, to some extent in line with discussions during the establishment of environmental sociology in the US in the mid-1970s, the sociological discipline has largely ignored climate change, despite the fact that the rate of change in natural processes will have revolutionary implications for society and social processes. For at least two reasons we believe that this symposium does not reflect a global environmental sociology. First, the symposium discussed sociological interpretations of climate change in a very restricted way, perhaps because the contributions only came from the US and Australia. A second and related reason is that while the claimed absence of sociologists in climate change research might largely be true for the US around 2008, European mainstream sociology had by then fully incorporated climate change into its research agenda.

A study of climate change according to the rules for a global environmental sociology would imply a sociological framing of the climate issue following the above rules. Here is not the place for a full-fledged systematic interpretation of climate change; instead we will indicate some possible implications of a global environmental sociology for future research. Even if the world has always been global, it has never been as globalised as today; almost all places, practices and activities are connected to others. This means that strict borders and boundaries, such as between states, cultures, markets and communities, are being eroded. Hence, climate change is a challenge that transcends existing boundaries and categories. In addition, we will stress three further implications of this for sociological analyses of climate change. The first implication is that the still dominant sociological approach of 'methodological nationalism' (where the nation-state is the primary unit of sociological investigation) needs to be replaced by a 'methodological cosmopolitanism', where analysis of society is not defined, organized and limited by the nation-state (Beck *et al.*, 2013). Instead, a global environmental

sociology stresses that even if the nation-state is a central actor in climate change negotiations and national rule-making, understanding climate change mitigation requires going outside this nation-state container. New transnational constellations of actors are arising from the challenges that climate change poses. What we have is a patchwork of partly overlapping assemblies, responding to various kinds of demands at different levels and in different sectors. Obviously, this does not preclude the study of international organisations, nation-states or local communities, but only means that these have to be studied as being co-constructed and socially embedded in wider assemblages. It is in the ties of global networks and the flows with local actors and places that climate change is to be analysed and understood. A second implication is that the border commonly drawn between society and nature needs to be transcended. In reality, there are no such things as ‘normal weather’ or ‘natural climate change’; it is impossible to find a distinct human-induced climate (Hulme, 2010). What exists is a hybrid, where human and non-human ‘agents’ (e.g. sun, volcanoes, oceans) co-produce our climate. Thus, we live in a hybrid system where the climate is co-produced by nature and society. While it is rather common to separate nature and society, resulting in, for example, claims about limits and planetary boundaries and the need for humanity to operate within them (see e.g. Rockström *et al.*, 2009), global environmental sociology argues that these boundaries need to be contextualized and historicized. For example, much research on climate change today uses linear thinking based on projected environmental and social damage caused by biophysical changes arising from greenhouse gases. By putting society at the centre instead, it can be shown that it is not increased biophysical change per se that poses a risk to local communities, but the dynamics between a changing climate and place-specific characteristics of particular communities. Thus, climate change should not be reduced to a change in nature to which society has to respond, but must instead be seen in terms of society/nature dynamics. This is a problem possessing both social and environmental characteristics, rather than an abstract scientific problem that can be disarticulated from and placed outside of social processes. Stressing the society/nature dynamics implies that sociology should not take changes in nature as the starting point for its analysis of climate change, but instead focus on how climate change is co-constituted by the dynamic interactions between social and natural processes. A third implication is that climate change challenges the borders within sociology (between different sociological theories and interpretation schemes) as well as between sociology and other disciplines. A global environmental sociology should not take a specific framing of the climate change issue for granted, such as that of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Beck *et al.*, 2014; Van der Sluijs *et al.*, 2010; Wynne, 2010). Nor should it give precedence to sociological interpretations over those of other disciplines. Other disciplinary understandings of climate change should be welcomed and allowed to enrich sociological framings, but not uncritically imported as neutral inputs to the sociological analysis. Thus, by collaborating with different contexts and interpretations (regional as well as disciplinary), a global environmental sociology should be better equipped to investigate and understand the different meanings, contestations and challenges that climate change issues imply for different

actors – be they negotiators, industrial representatives, stakeholders or citizens – but also for the discipline itself. In that sense, a global environmental sociology is reflexive but remains environmentally and socially engaged at the same time, so as not to turn into eclecticism or ivory-tower science.

New global environmental sociology

With no claim to completeness, we provide below a preliminary sketch of what we would label ‘rules for a global environmental sociology’. In the end, of course, such a list of rules can only be formulated and completed by a multitude of (environmental sociology) voices from different clusters (be they regional, theoretical or thematic). At this stage, the urgency of creating such rules is as important to us as the rules themselves. The aim of constructing and discussing an agenda for ‘rules for a global environmental sociology’ is to prevent the emergence of isolated, inward-looking, place-based environmental sociologies that condemn or neglect other environmental sociology islands. In our view, the rules for a global environmental sociology include the following:

- a) A global environmental sociology analyses local and place-based environmental issues (such as local protests, local pollution victims, local governance) while maintaining an understanding of their global embeddedness and co-construction. Similarly, a global environmental sociology will understand global environmental issues (such as global governance arrangements/regimes, global trade, global environmental movements) only by including (different and distinct) place-based and contextual specificities, practices and effects in the analysis. To use Castells’ (2009) terminology, ultimately, neither place-less nor flow-less sociological analyses work in a globalised world.
- b) A global environmental sociology is aware of and acknowledges different national/regional research traditions and approaches. However, instead of condemning, celebrating or defending them, it attempts to understand and explain their contextual emergence, reflects on whether and how these contexts influence research, and explores how these national/regional approaches can fruitfully contribute to cross-boundary sharing of and learning from findings and concepts. In doing so, global environmental sociology contributes to a cosmopolitan perspective (Beck, 2009) in general sociology.
- c) Although environmental sociology has specific objects of thought and reflection (society–environment interactions), the work of investigating and explaining these is always related to general sociology. As Redclift (2000: 161) argues, ‘the problem of globalization and the environment brings us back to the origins of social theory’. Hence, a global environmental sociology builds on, is anchored in and contributes to the wider discipline of sociology.
- d) A global environmental sociology acknowledges that studies (under conditions) of globalisation involve the blurring of disciplinary boundaries, and thus it makes use of, welcomes and profits from the mixing and in-migration of concepts and approaches from other social science disciplines. Collaboration with natural scientists may contribute to innovative conceptualization if social

- dynamics are treated as seriously as environmental dynamics. Disciplinary collaboration and the immigration of disciplines should not result in the dissolution of the sociological discipline, although it might become increasingly more difficult to distinguish sociology from some of the other social sciences.
- e) A global environmental sociology should and will have expanding global institutions: global research networks, global journals, global conferences, global platforms for debate and exchange, global signs of recognition, global funding schemes and global audiences. These expanding global research institutions should not replace their national counterparts but instead complement them, and have to be recognised by these national counterparts.
- f) Environmental sociology has always been motivated by concern for environmental problems and solidarity with victims of pollution and resource extraction, and it aims to mitigate and address these devastations. Global environmental sociology is not just a critical sociology of environmental problems, nor just a solution-oriented sociology of environmental reform. It is not just ivory-tower environmental sociology, nor just applied environmental engagement. It is not just the politically correct strategic use of scientific authority, nor is it uncommitted scientific eclecticism. A global environmental sociology is a critical-constructive public sociology (cf. Burawoy, 2009) that engages academically with different disciplines and with non-academic constituencies without abandoning its reflexive and disciplinary character.
4. Dunlap Riley E, William Michelson. (eds.) *Handbook of Environmental Sociology* (Greenwood Press, 2002. ISBN 0-313-26808-8)
 5. Freudenburg William R, Robert Gramling. *The Emergence of Environmental Sociology: Contributions of Riley E. Dunlap and William R. Catton, Jr.*, *Sociological Inquiry* 59(4):439-452.
 6. Harper Charles. *Environment and Society: Human Perspectives on Environmental Issues*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc, 2004. ISBN 0131113410
 7. Humphrey Craig R, Frederick Buttel H. *Environment, Energy, and Society*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1982. ISBN 0-534-00964-6
 8. Humphrey Craig R, Tammy Lewis L, Frederick H. Buttel. 2002. *Environment, Energy and Society: A New Synthesis*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning. ISBN 0-534-57955-8
 9. Mehta Michael, Eric Ouellet. *Environmental Sociology: Theory and Practice*, Toronto: Captus Press.
 10. Redclift, Michael, and Graham Woodgate, eds. 1997. *International Handbook of Environmental Sociology* Edgar Elgar, 1997, 1995. ISBN 1-84064-243-2

Conclusion

Sociological interest in the impacts of energy and other resource scarcities accelerated the emergence of environmental sociology as a distinct area of inquiry by heightening awareness that "environment" was more than just another social problem, and that environmental conditions could indeed have societal consequences. Studies of the societal impacts of energy shortages thus facilitated a transition from the early "sociology of environmental issues" to a self-conscious "environmental sociology" focused explicitly on societal-environmental relations. In retrospect, it is apparent that this concern also contributed to a rather one-sided view of such interactions, however, as the effects of resource constraints on society received far more emphasis than did the impacts of society on the environment (something that has been rectified in more recent research on the causes of environmental degradation).

References

1. Buttel Frederick H, Craig Humphrey R. *Sociological Theory and the Natural Environment*. In *Handbook of Environmental Sociology* edited by Riley E. Dunlap and William Michelson, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002, 33-69.
2. Diamond Jared. *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. New York: Viking, 2005. ISBN 0-670-03337-5.
3. Dunlap Riley E, Frederick Buttel H, Peter Dickens, August Gijswijt. (eds.) *Sociological Theory and the Environment: Classical Foundations, Contemporary Insights* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2002. ISBN 0-7425-0186-8).