Debrief: The class agreed that this article had a lot to offer in terms of methodology and methodology justification. They also agreed that this was all the article had to offer and agreed that overall the article was confusing and unclear regarding its overall purpose. Wright and Eric, however, state that each statement of purpose addressed one of the three main points as referenced in the title (policy, pedagogy, and practice). Additionally, the class stated that the research “gap” was never clearly identified by the author. When I asked the class if this article had swayed anyone to use or justify their research methodology, the response was mixed. Kali said that it helped her better understand triangulation better. She also said that she had a better understanding of how to justify her methodology. Andreea, Samantha, Siegrun, Mike and I all agreed. Wynton said the article did not change his mind about his own research approach and he would continue with the methodological approach he had already identified.

I. Summary

This article intends to examine the role of environmental justice movements in policy, pedagogy, and practice by analyzing the role that the Friends of the Earth Scotland assumed in the environmental justice movement following the devolution of Scotland.

This article also provides a critical examination of two environmental justice reports that were commissioned by the Scottish Executive. The Fairburn et al (2005) report examined correlations (not causation) between social deprivation and environmentally damaging land uses or environmental assets; while the Curtice et al (2005) focused on perceptions of environmental justice in deprived communities through interviews.

II. Purpose statements

There are three clearly stated purpose statements.

A. In abstract- “This paper analyses how a discourse developed within policy narratives which separated environmental justice from economic growth and the interests of capital.”

B. In section one, paragraph one, second sentence- “This paper will argue that environmental justice should be seen more as a discourse embedded in social movement, always provisional and contested, and reflecting interests.”

C. In context and methodology, last paragraph, last sentence before 2. Adoption of environmental justice in Scotland- “It is the argument of this paper, moreover, that the findings of constructivist research in Scotland have contributed to a policy discourse inimical to environmental justice, whereas rigour is achieved by a process of dialogue with the experience of those affected by environmental injustices and who struggle, individually and collectively, against them.”

III. Study Justification

This study does not clearly identify what the lacuna in the literature is or how they are going to fill it. I surmise that their “original” contribution to the preexisting literature resides in their theoretical and methodological framework (e.g.,
Freirean pedagogy, constructivist paradigm, cultural and Marxist paradigms, emancipator theory and dialectics, and multi-method approaches ("bricolage") to qualitative research. How does the research justify their research? Has the research clearly identified the gap in the literature that she/he is trying to fill?

IV. Data Collection
Identifying all data used in the study and classifying them as original (primary), archival (secondary), or tertiary (data published by someone else). What type of data does the researcher use? What type of study is this? Where is this best illustrated in the article? What types of methods are used in this study?

Qualitative methods- participant observation; dialogue with grassroots activists in the structured context of Freirean pedagogy (theoretical); interviews with civil servants, NGO staff and other policy makers and stakeholders; analysis of policy documents and research reports; and critical reflexive interactions between these and with myself as situated practitioner. What do you think of the methodology used? How does the author validate or justify using this method of research? How does the author justify using these methods? What are the benefits/flaws of using this type of methodology? Has this article made you reconsider your methodology choices and why?

V. Results
Are these results supported by the researcher’s literature review and methods?

A. Second to last paragraph on page 5- “First, not all the participants are deprived, although they are disproportionately from communities which are poor, working class, discriminated against, geographically or culturally isolated or in some other way politically marginalized.”

B. Second paragraph on page 6- “Secondly, participants regard infrastructure and polluting industries as much a significant cause of environmental injustice as environmental problems of poor communities not facing these industries: each group is able to identify its experience as environmental injustice.”

C. Third paragraph on page 6- “Finally, there is a sense in which the diverse contexts in which they are active are held together by connected valorization of the environment, just as Martinez-Alier (2003) has understood the environmentalism of the poor as a conflict between languages of valuation incommensurate with the economics of the market.”

VI. Conclusion
Last paragraph first sentence- “Environmental injustices are therefore not so much discovered by research (and then responded to by policy makers), as constructed by social processes of which research is part. The question is not which discourse is most valid, in the sense of representing an objective reality, but rather what are the political implications of two discourses, the validity of which can be justified in different ways.” Does this conclusion accurately sum up the research? What did you think of this article overall?