Reconstructing the Earth's Social Ecosystem through Socio-Ecological Inquiry in the Climate Crisis Era

Rahayu Mardikaningsih

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

Email: rahayumardikaningsih@gmail.com

ABSTRACT – This study investigates the evolving structure of the Earth's social ecosystem by analyzing the intersection between sociological systems and ecological forces in the context of climate disruption. It argues that environmental transformation is not merely a natural occurrence but a socially constructed and politically mediated process. Drawing from literature in environmental sociology, political ecology, and critical theory, the study traces how governance systems, economic models, cultural narratives, and technological infrastructures reinforce environmental degradation while simultaneously shaping social inequality. The analysis highlights how fragmented institutions, market-based ecological approaches, and extractivist logics sustain the conditions that generate climate vulnerability. It also explores how climate-induced displacement, contested environmental discourses, and uneven access to green technologies contribute to the reconfiguration of identity, agency, and justice in a warming world. By integrating theoretical insights from diverse disciplines, the study develops a comprehensive framework to interpret socio-ecological transformation. It emphasizes the need to move beyond disciplinary silos to understand the dynamics that condition both crisis and response. The findings contribute to a growing body of scholarship that advocates for interdisciplinary and critical approaches to environmental inquiry and offers pathways for equitable and resilient futures.

Keywords: climate crisis, socio-ecological systems, environmental sociology, ecological degradation, governance, sustainability, planetary transformation.

A. INTRODUCTION

Human life unfolds within a web of interdependencies that bind individuals, societies, and natural systems together in subtle and often underestimated ways. For centuries, sociological inquiry has prioritized human-to-human interactions, while ecological studies have focused on biophysical patterns (Asaaga et al., 2023). Yet as the consequences of climate disruption intensify, these two domains can no longer be studied in isolation. The accelerating rate of atmospheric transformation, sea-level rise, species extinction, and environmental displacement has exposed the limitations of compartmentalized analysis. A new intellectual posture is required—one that recognizes the planet as a dynamic social ecosystem in which culture, policy, and natural systems continuously interact (Danylova, & Salata, 2018).

In recent years, scholars have begun to explore how social institutions, consumption habits, technological infrastructures, and belief systems contribute to environmental volatility. Climate change is not solely the result of physical emissions or scientific miscalculations; it is deeply embedded in social behavior, cultural values, and political economy (O'Brien, 2016). Understanding these dynamics calls for a synthesis between ecological awareness and sociological reflection. This synthesis allows us to see the planet not as a passive background to human activity, but as a co-participant in shaping the trajectory of civilization.

Interdisciplinary scholarship rooted in eco-sociological frameworks has opened new avenues for rethinking agency, resilience, and justice in an era of planetary stress (Hosseini & Gills, 2020). It invites inquiry into how communities construct meaning around nature, how inequalities are amplified by environmental degradation, and how technological advancement can either worsen or mitigate ecological harm. The biosphere becomes a stage where power, knowledge, and survival coalesce, demanding critical scrutiny and theoretical reinvention (Ruttonsha, 2018).

This study is situated at the intersection of environmental sociology and critical ecology. It aims to examine how the Earth's social ecosystem can be conceptualized as an integrated field

shaped by feedback loops between human systems and natural processes. By drawing upon established theories and emergent perspectives, this literature-based inquiry seeks to understand how social-environmental relations are being restructured amid escalating climate disruptions.

Multiple threads complicate the scientific and institutional response to climate change. First, prevailing economic models rely on resource extraction and carbon-intensive development, which reinforces unsustainable cycles (McDonnell et al., 2020). As Barry (1999) argues, environmental responsibility is often subordinated to short-term growth imperatives, leaving long-term consequences unaddressed. Second, public policy frequently reflects fragmented jurisdictional mandates, impeding cohesive climate governance. Yearley (1992) noted that environmental expertise often collides with political agendas, resulting in diluted responses that fail to align with ecological imperatives.

Third, cultural attitudes and communication frameworks can undermine collective action. Beck (1995) and Burgess, (2019) proposed the notion of a "risk society" where individuals are aware of environmental threats yet remain immobilized due to uncertainty, denial, or resignation. This paralysis is compounded by unequal exposure to environmental risks, where marginalized groups suffer disproportionate impacts despite contributing the least to ecological degradation. Catton & Dunlap (1994) emphasized the anthropocentric bias in mainstream sociology, which has historically ignored the nonhuman dimensions of societal development.

At a structural level, existing social institutions often perpetuate ecological harm through systemic inertia. Practices tied to industrial agriculture, fossil-fuel dependence, and extractive consumption persist because they are embedded in legal, cultural, and financial systems that resist transformation (Healy et al., 2019). Environmental externalities are routinely normalized, while ecological stewardship remains peripheral to dominant narratives of progress. These contradictions generate cognitive and institutional dissonance, obstructing meaningful transitions toward sustainability (Luederitz etal., 2017).

Examining this issue is essential because the survival of human and nonhuman life hinges on the recalibration of social-environmental relations. The planetary crisis is not merely a scientific emergency; it is a sociological condition that questions our moral compass, institutional competence, and cultural imagination (Plowright, 2016). Understanding these intersections helps expose the root causes of ecological vulnerability and the ideological systems that sustain them.

Observing the socio-ecological nexus invites a redefinition of what constitutes agency, responsibility, and justice in a shared biosphere. It challenges the artificial divide between society and nature, proposing instead a relational worldview grounded in mutual interdependence. By studying these entanglements through interdisciplinary literature, we gain insight into the mechanisms by which crisis is produced, distributed, and normalized.

This research seeks to investigate how the intersection of sociological structures and ecological systems contributes to the reconstruction of the Earth's social ecosystem under the pressures of climate disruption. By examining established and emergent theories from both disciplines, this study contributes to the development of integrated conceptual frameworks that enable deeper understanding of how human-environment interactions evolve. The findings offer theoretical value for scholars, educators, and policymakers seeking to respond constructively to environmental degradation through systemic insights.

B. METHOD

This study employs a literature-based research approach grounded in qualitative interpretive analysis. The method is designed to engage with a wide array of interdisciplinary academic sources, particularly those situated within environmental sociology, political ecology, and critical environmental studies. By examining scholarly texts, policy reports, and theoretical contributions, the research seeks to trace conceptual trajectories and thematic patterns that reveal how social structures and ecological systems are interwoven in the current climate crisis. As noted by Neuman (2006), literature-based research is a powerful tool for theory building and synthesis, especially when the goal is to explore complex, abstract relationships that cannot be easily captured through empirical measurement. This approach allows for nuanced interpretation of discourses, ideologies, and institutional frameworks that shape human-environment relations.

The selection of materials in this study adheres to academic credibility and relevance, ensuring that each source contributes to the construction of an integrated analytical perspective. The method follows the logic of theoretical sampling, where texts are chosen based on their conceptual richness and their capacity to illuminate the research question. As outlined by Creswell (2007), qualitative literature-based inquiry emphasizes depth of understanding, intertextual coherence, and contextual reading of ideas. Through a process of thematic coding, comparison, and critical reflection, the research constructs a narrative that bridges gaps between sociological theory and ecological reality. This allows for a robust conceptual examination of the Earth's social ecosystem and offers an academic contribution that is both theoretically grounded and responsive to contemporary challenges.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Modern environmental challenges no longer permit a simplistic distinction between society and nature. The intricate patterns of climate instability reveal that the biosphere responds not merely to meteorological shifts but to choices made through political authority, market logic, and cultural symbolism. These choices are embedded within systems that prioritize consumption, expansion, and efficiency, often at the expense of ecological resilience (Folke et al., 2021). As such, understanding environmental crises demands more than atmospheric data; it requires decoding the frameworks through which societies organize meaning and exercise control.

Rethinking the planet as a socially constructed field of interaction invites a reconsideration of long-standing assumptions within both natural and social sciences. The idea that ecosystems operate independently of social institutions collapses under scrutiny when one considers the extent to which policy, economic agendas, and communication regimes dictate environmental outcomes. From urban zoning laws to agricultural subsidies and international treaties, human interventions permeate every level of ecological functioning (Sirakaya et al., 2018). Consequently, environmental transformation is not an event but a process saturated with human intent and institutional inertia.

The growing prevalence of climate-related emergencies illustrates how environmental instability is co-produced by anthropogenic systems. These crises arise not in a vacuum but within networks shaped by infrastructural planning, labor exploitation, and knowledge production (Sultana, 2021). As climate unpredictability intensifies, the search for accountability turns increasingly toward the societal mechanisms that normalize extractive development and conceal its consequences (Bruna, 2022). This shift in attention underscores the need to interrogate the foundations of contemporary ecological imagination.

Efforts to conceptualize the Earth as a dynamic social ecosystem stem from the recognition that material changes are always accompanied by symbolic and institutional shifts. The rise of environmental justice movements, the redefinition of property regimes, and the politicization of resource distribution point to the fact that climate impacts are unevenly distributed and socially encoded (Borras & Franco, 2020). These developments challenge linear models of causality and invite interdisciplinary engagement that bridges biology, sociology, and critical theory (Carrera, 2023).

In light of these insights, the framing of climate change as a purely technical or scientific issue proves inadequate. A comprehensive approach must account for how systems of governance, narratives of progress, and societal values collectively generate environmental outcomes (Weinstein et al., 2023). Such an approach emphasizes the interplay between lived experience and planetary processes, positioning environmental transformation not as an external condition but as an expression of structural configurations (Cooke et al., 2016). This perspective offers an entry point for analyzing how ecological disruption is fundamentally social in origin and consequence.

The concept of the Earth as a social ecosystem recognizes that environmental change cannot be isolated from human behavior, institutional structures, and cultural narratives. Climate disruption is not simply a physical alteration of ecosystems, but a socially mediated process shaped by power, governance, and ideology (Gillard et al., 2016). As Giddens (2009) observed, global warming introduces a new dimension of risk that is reflexively produced by society's industrial and economic systems. This

framing challenges conventional separations between nature and culture, calling for analytical tools capable of revealing their entanglement.

Ecological degradation often follows patterns established by economic inequality and geopolitical influence. Affluent nations and social classes contribute disproportionately to carbon emissions, while the ecological consequences are borne most heavily by marginalized populations (Harlan et al., 2015). Roberts & Parks (2007) argue that this disparity reflects a structural injustice rooted in historical patterns of colonization and capital accumulation. Consequently, environmental harm becomes both a material and symbolic extension of class and global hierarchy.

Technological development, while often framed as a solution to ecological crisis, also embodies contradictions that complicate its role within the social ecosystem. Renewable energy infrastructures, for instance, depend on extractive industries that carry their own environmental and social burdens. As Jasanoff (2010) notes, the social life of technology reveals how scientific knowledge and its applications are deeply embedded in values, institutions, and cultural expectations. Technological fixes can reproduce existing inequalities if deployed without critical reflection on their broader socio-political implications (Etherington & Jones, 2018).

Urbanization further illustrates the convergence of ecological and social pressures. Expanding megacities increase demand for land, water, and energy while simultaneously creating zones of concentrated vulnerability (Hunt et al., 2017). As Bulkeley & Betsill (2003) highlight, local governments are often positioned at the frontline of climate adaptation but lack adequate resources or authority to implement systemic change. The fragmentation of governance across levels and sectors impedes coordination, leaving cities as contested spaces where environmental justice and social planning collide.

Cultural representations of nature shape how societies interpret ecological limits and define appropriate responses (Moran, 2016). Ingram (2000) argues that environmental narratives often rely on romanticized visions of wilderness or technocratic optimism, both of which obscure the complexity of socio-ecological dynamics. These narratives influence policy priorities, public engagement, and individual behavior. When nature is perceived as external or subordinate, the ethical imperative to protect it is weakened, perpetuating cycles of exploitation and neglect.

The commodification of ecological processes, such as carbon trading and biodiversity offsets, reflects neoliberal logics that abstract nature into market units (Apostolopoulou & Adams, 2019). This practice, while aimed at incentivizing conservation, often reduces ecological systems to financial instruments, marginalizing holistic stewardship. McAfee (2012) contends that market-based environmentalism risks masking the underlying causes of ecological degradation, which lie in unsustainable modes of production and consumption. It can also displace Indigenous and local knowledge systems that offer alternative ecological insights.

Food systems provide a vivid example of how sociological and ecological forces co-produce unsustainable outcomes. Industrial agriculture relies heavily on fossil fuels, chemical inputs, and monocultures, contributing to greenhouse gas emissions, soil degradation, and biodiversity loss (Crews et al., 2018). Patel (2007) emphasizes how corporate control over agriculture not only undermines ecological resilience but also disempowers small-scale farmers, eroding local autonomy and food sovereignty. Climate change exacerbates these vulnerabilities through altered growing seasons, pest pressures, and water scarcity.

Environmental migration is another site where sociological and ecological variables intersect. Rising sea levels, droughts, and extreme weather events displace millions, generating new forms of mobility that challenge conventional categories of citizenship and security (Adger et al., 2018). As Castles (2002) explains, climate-induced displacement is not merely a matter of environmental exposure but also of political will, legal frameworks, and institutional preparedness. Displacement exposes failures in governance and reveals the uneven capacities of states to protect vulnerable populations.

Discourse surrounding sustainability itself is often co-opted by institutional actors to maintain the status quo. As Dryzek (2005) shows, different environmental discourses—from survivalism to ecological modernization—frame the climate crisis in ways that reflect political ideologies. These discourses influence which solutions are deemed viable, which

voices are included, and which values are prioritized. Sociological analysis helps unpack these narratives, revealing the interests and assumptions they carry (Işık, 2015).

Power asymmetries within international climate negotiations further distort the potential for equitable responses. Powerful countries and corporations exert disproportionate influence over global environmental governance, often sidelining the interests of developing nations (Gupta & Mason, 2016). As Okereke & Dooley (2010) argue, procedural inequality and discursive dominance reproduce hierarchies under the guise of consensus. These dynamics raise critical questions about legitimacy, justice, and representation in climate policymaking.

Education and environmental awareness campaigns play a critical role in shaping public perception and engagement. However, when such efforts lack critical sociological grounding, they risk promoting individualized behavioral change over structural reform (Carey et al., 2017). As Bonnett (2006) points out, environmental education must move beyond moral exhortation toward critical reflection on systems of power, privilege, and inequality. Effective ecological literacy requires contextual understanding and collective agency.

The relationship between extractivism and ecological collapse remains central to the reconfiguration of the Earth's social ecosystem (Nygren et al., 2022). Bunker & Ciccantell (2005) demonstrate how the global economy's reliance on raw material extraction reinforces patterns of ecological depletion and social marginalization. These dynamics are not incidental but structurally embedded, requiring theoretical frameworks that link material flows to institutional logics and social practices.

Climate justice movements offer alternative paradigms grounded in equity and resilience. These grassroots initiatives foreground Indigenous knowledge, participatory governance, and socio-ecological regeneration (Paulson, 2018). As Escobar (2008) suggests, transformative change emerges not from top-down innovation but from community-led practices that challenge dominant epistemologies. These movements articulate an ethic of relationality and care that contrasts sharply with extractive paradigms.

The militarization of environmental response, such as the securitization of water or borders in response to climate stress, exemplifies how ecological crises are often met with authoritarian strategies (Selby & Hoffman, 2017). Dalby (2009) argues that such responses misdiagnose the crisis by treating symptoms instead of structural causes. This shift reflects a broader tendency to prioritize control over justice, reinforcing exclusion and violence in the name of security.

The sociological and ecological entanglement at the heart of the climate crisis underscores the inadequacy of disciplinary silos. The Earth's social ecosystem must be understood as a living system, characterized by feedback loops, historical inequalities, and contested visions of the future. Interdisciplinary inquiry offers not only richer analysis but also more inclusive pathways for navigating uncertainty and fostering collective resilience (Naderpajouh et al., 2018).

Viewing the planet as a socially embedded ecological system compels us to revise how we interpret agency, causality, and interdependence. Environmental instability is not merely an outcome of resource overuse but a consequence of historical choices made by institutions, markets, and societies that prioritized growth over equilibrium (Barbier, 2021). Recognizing this, scholars and practitioners must go beyond conventional categories that separate nature from social constructs, and instead adopt an integrated perspective that reflects the complexity of shared planetary existence.

The separation of disciplines has too often limited the capacity to respond meaningfully to global environmental shifts. Fragmented knowledge frameworks produce fragmented solutions, reinforcing the illusion that ecological damage can be addressed in isolation from social reform. Addressing climate volatility requires a synthesis of insight from multiple domains, where ecological data and social theory inform one another in the pursuit of sustainable transformation (Görg et al., 2017). In this sense, interdisciplinary engagement becomes not a luxury, but a prerequisite for relevance.

Understanding the Earth's social ecosystem demands sensitivity to temporal and spatial asymmetries. Patterns of environmental harm reflect legacies of displacement, industrial expansion, and colonial extractivism (Healy et al., 2019). These legacies are not passive remnants of the past but active conditions shaping today's vulnerabilities and tomorrow's

prospects. Therefore, any attempt to repair the biosphere must confront the uneven distributions of exposure, decision-making power, and adaptive capacity that define the current global order.

Collective resilience is not built through technocratic fixes alone. It emerges through cooperation, critical awareness, and a shared commitment to redefine prosperity in ecological terms. The language of interconnectedness must be accompanied by systems of accountability that reflect ecological justice. Interdisciplinary analysis offers the tools to map these relationships, but it is ethical responsibility and institutional reform that can convert knowledge into meaningful practice.

As climate transformations intensify, the urgency of coherent, cross-disciplinary understanding becomes ever more apparent. The Earth's future cannot be charted through isolated expertise, nor sustained by siloed interventions. It is through a deep reorientation toward shared knowledge, inclusive values, and long-term stewardship that societies may begin to shape responses adequate to the scope and scale of the crisis. Only then can we imagine futures that honor the intricate ecology of life on this planet.

D. CONCLUSION

The exploration of the Earth's social ecosystem reveals a profound entanglement between environmental disruption and the socio-institutional configurations that sustain it. Climate change, far from being a purely ecological issue, is deeply conditioned by human behavior, technological systems, political economies, and cultural ideologies. Through interdisciplinary synthesis, it becomes evident that the climate crisis is both produced and perpetuated by asymmetrical power relations, fragmented governance, and normalized extractivist practices that destabilize both ecological and social foundations.

This inquiry suggests that interpreting climate disruption through the integrated lens of sociology and ecology unveils more than interdependencies—it reveals mechanisms of systemic reproduction, exclusion, and adaptation. Institutions, narratives, and technologies emerge not as neutral tools but as historical agents that shape the distribution of risk and possibility. The implications extend across public policy, education, environmental justice, and the ethics of development.

Understanding these dimensions is critical to reimagining societal resilience in the face of accelerating planetary change.

It is essential that future scholarship, governance, and civil society engagements foster analytical frameworks that break down disciplinary divides and commit to systemic insight. Addressing the climate crisis requires not just technological solutions or behavioral shifts, but intellectual transformations that place ecological consciousness at the heart of social inquiry. Such engagement must be attentive to equity, cultural specificity, and long-term planetary stewardship. Academic contributions, like the one offered here, are a starting point for deeper reflection and collective imagination.

REFERENCES

Adger, W. N., R. S. De Campos, & C. Mortreux. 2018. Mobility, Displacement and Migration, and Their Interactions with Vulnerability and Adaptation to Environmental Risks. In Routledge Handbook of Environmental Displacement and Migration (pp. 29-41). Routledge, London.

Apostolopoulou, E., E. Greco, & W. M. Adams. 2019. Biodiversity Offsetting and the Production of 'Equivalent Natures': A Marxist Critique. ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies, 17(3), 861-892.

Asaaga, F. A., B. V. Purse, M. Rahman, P. N. Srinivas, S. D. Kalegowda, T. Seshadri, J. C. Young, & M. A. Oommen. 2023. The Role of Social Vulnerability in Improving Interventions for Neglected Zoonotic Diseases: The Example of Kyasanur Forest Disease in India. PLOS Global Public Health, 3(2), 1-28.

Barbier, E. B. 2021. The Evolution of Economic Views on Natural Resource Scarcity. Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 15(1), 24-44.

Barry, J. 1999. Rethinking Green Politics: Nature, Virtue and Progress. SAGE Publications, California.

Beck, U. 1995. Ecological Politics in an Age of Risk. Polity Press, USA.

Beck, U. 2009. World at Risk. Polity Press, USA.

Bonnett, M. 2006. Education for Sustainability as a Frame of Mind. Environmental Education Research, 12(3–4), 265–276.

Borras, S. M., & J. C. Franco. 2020. The Challenge of Locating Land-Based Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Politics Within a

Social Justice Perspective: Towards an Idea of Agrarian Climate Justice. In Converging Social Justice Issues and Movements (pp. 82-99). Routledge, Dutch.

Bruna, N. 2022. A Climate-Smart World and the Rise of Green Extractivism. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 49(4), 839-864.

Bulkeley, H., & M. Betsill. 2003. Cities and Climate Change: Urban Sustainability and Global Environmental Governance. Routledge, London.

Bunker, S. G., & P. S. Ciccantell. 2005. Globalization and the Race for Resources. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Burgess, A. 2019. Environmental Risk Narratives in Historical Perspective: From Early Warnings to 'Risk Society' Blame. Journal of Risk Research, 22(9), 1128-1142.

Carey, G., E. Malbon, B. Crammond, M. Pescud, & P. Baker. 2017. Can the Sociology of Social Problems Help Us to Understand and Manage 'Lifestyle Drift'?. Health Promotion International, 32(4), 755-761.

Carrera, J. S. 2023. Advancing Du Bois's Legacy Through Emancipatory Environmental Sociology. Environmental Sociology, 9(4), 349-365.

Castles, S. 2002. Environmental Change and Forced Migration. International Migration Review, 36(1), 31–62.

Catton, W. R., & R. E. Dunlap. 1994. Environmental Sociology: A New Paradigm. The American Sociologist, 13(1), 41–49.

Cooke, B., S. West, & W. J. Boonstra. 2016. Dwelling in the Biosphere: Exploring an Embodied Human–Environment Connection in Resilience Thinking. Sustainability Science, 11, 831-843.

Creswell, J. W. 2007. Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Crews, T. E., W. Carton, & L. Olsson. 2018. Is the Future of Agriculture Perennial? Imperatives and Opportunities to Reinvent Agriculture by Shifting from Annual Monocultures to Perennial Polycultures. Global Sustainability, 1(11), 1-18.

Dalby, S. 2009. Security and Environmental Change. Polity Press, USA.

Danylova, T., & G. Salata. 2018. The Ecological Imperative and Human Nature: A New Perspective on Ecological Education. Міждисциплінарні дослідження складних систем, (12), 17-24.

Dryzek, J. S. 2005. The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Escobar, A. 2008. Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes. Duke University Press, USA.

Etherington, D., & M. Jones. 2018. Re-Stating the Post-Political: Depoliticization, Social Inequalities, and City-Region Growth. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 50(1), 51-72.

Folke, C., S. Polasky, J. Rockström, V. Galaz, F. Westley, M. Lamont, & B. H. Walker. 2021. Our Future in the Anthropocene Biosphere. Ambio, 50, 834-869.

Giddens, A. 2009. The Politics of Climate Change. Polity Press, USA.

Gillard, R., A. Gouldson, J. Paavola, & J. Van Alstine. 2016. Transformational Responses to Climate Change: Beyond a Systems Perspective of Social Change in Mitigation and Adaptation. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 7(2), 251-265.

Görg, C., U. Brand, H. Haberl, D. Hummel, T. Jahn, & S. Liehr. 2017. Challenges for Social-Ecological Transformations: Contributions from Social and Political Ecology. Sustainability, 9(7), 1-21.

Gupta, A., & M. Mason. 2016. Disclosing or Obscuring? The Politics of Transparency in Global Climate Governance. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 18, 82-90.

Hariani, M., R. Mardikaningsih, & N. E. Essa. 2022. HR and Environmental Policy Management Strategies to Create a Sustainable Organization that Improves Company Performance, Journal of Social Science Studies, 2(2), 249 – 254.

Harlan, S. L., D. N. Pellow, J. T. Roberts, S. E. Bell, W. G. Holt, J. Nagel, & R. J. Brulle. 2015. Climate Justice and Inequality. Climate Change and Society: Sociological Perspectives, 2015(1), 127-163.

Healy, N., J. C. Stephens, & S. A. Malin. 2019. Embodied Energy Injustices: Unveiling and Politicizing the Transboundary Harms of Fossil Fuel Extractivism and Fossil Fuel Supply Chains. Energy Research & Social Science, 48, 219-234.

Hosseini, S. H., & B. K. Gills. 2020. Beyond the Critical: Reinventing the Radical Imagination in Transformative Development and Global (ization) Studies. Globalizations, 17(8), 1350-1366.

Hunt, J. C., Y. D. Aktas, A. Mahalov, M. Moustaoui, F. Salamanca, & M. Georgescu. 2017. Climate Change and Growing Megacities: Hazards and Vulnerability. In Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Engineering Sustainability, 171(6), 314-326. Thomas Telford Ltd, London.

Ingram, D. 2000. Green Screen: Environmentalism and Hollywood Cinema. Maryland: University Press of America.

Işık, N. E. 2015. The Role of Narrative Methods in Sociology: Stories as a Powerful Tool to Understand Individual and Society. Sosyoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi, 18(1), 103-125.

Jasanoff, S. 2010. Designs on Nature: Science and Democracy in Europe and the United States. Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Luederitz, C., D. J. Abson, R. Audet, & D. J. Lang. 2017. Many Pathways Toward Sustainability: Not Conflict but Co-Learning Between Transition Narratives. Sustainability Science, 12(1), 393-407.

Mardikaningsih, R. & D. Darmawan. 2022. Ethical Principles in Business Decision Making: Implications for Corporate Sustainability and Relationships with External Stakeholders, Journal of Social Science Studies, 2(2), 131 – 138.

Mardikaningsih, R. & D. T. W. Wardoyo. 2024. The Role of Technology in Human Resource Development for Sustainability: A Literature Review on Digital Innovation, Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 3(3), 20-26.

McAfee, K. 2012. The Contradictions of Eco-Commerce. Capitalism Nature Socialism, 23(1), 44–60.

McDonnell, J. E., H. Abelvik-Lawson, & D. Short. 2020. A Paradox of 'Sustainable Development': A Critique of the Ecological Order of Capitalism. In The Emerald Handbook of Crime, Justice and Sustainable Development (pp. 439-463). Emerald Publishing Limited, Leeds, England.

Moran, E. F. 2016. People and Nature: An Introduction to Human Ecological Relations. John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey.

Naderpajouh, N., D. J. Yu, D. P. Aldrich, I. Linkov, & J. Matinheikki. 2018. Engineering Meets Institutions: An Interdisciplinary Approach to the Management of Resilience. Environment Systems and Decisions, 38(3), 306-317.

Neuman, W. L. 2006. Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches (6th ed.). Pearson Education, London.

Nygren, A., M. Kröger, & B. Gills. 2022. Global Extractivisms and Transformative Alternatives. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 49(4), 734-759.

O'Brien, K. L. 2016. Climate Change and Social Transformations: Is it Time for a Quantum Leap? Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 7(5), 618-626.

Okereke, C., & K. Dooley. 2010. Principles of Justice in Proposals and Policy Approaches to Climate Change. Global Environmental Change, 20(1), 82–95.

Patel, R. 2007. Stuffed and Starved: The Hidden Battle for the World Food System. Melville House, Brooklyn.

Paulson, S. 2018. Pluriversal Learning: Pathways Toward a World of Many Worlds. Nordia Geographical Publications, 47(5), 85-109.

Plowright, S. 2016. Action, an 'Encompassing Ethic' and Academics in the Midst of the Climate Crisis. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 48(14), 1442-1451.

Roberts, J. T., & B. C. Parks. 2007. A Climate of Injustice: Global Inequality, North-South Politics, and Climate Policy. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Ruttonsha, P. 2018. Systemic Design: Theory, Methods, and Practice: Towards a (Socio-Ecological) Science of Settlement: Relational Dynamics as a Basis for Place. Springer Nature, Japan.

Selby, J., & C. Hoffmann (Eds.). 2017. Rethinking Climate Change, Conflict and Security. Routledge, London.

Sirakaya, A., A. Cliquet, & J. Harris. 2018. Ecosystem Services in Cities: Towards the International Legal Protection of Ecosystem Services in Urban Environments. Ecosystem Services, 29(B), 205-212.

Sultana, F. 2021. Climate Change, COVID-19, and the Co-Production of Injustices: A Feminist Reading of Overlapping Crises. Social & Cultural Geography, 22(4), 447-460.

Weinstein, M., C. Pouliot, I. Martins, R. Levinson, L. Carter, L. Bencze, & A. Sharma. 2023. Science Education Towards Social and Ecological Justice (Vol. 24). Springer International Publishing, Switzerland.

Yearley, S. 1992. The Green Case: A Sociology of Environmental Issues, Arguments and Politics. HarperCollins Academic, New York.