Indian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJOMR)
(Yearly, Blind Peer-Reviewed, Multidisciplinary Journal)
Home Page: https://ijomr.org

ISSN: 3048-8036 *(Online)*
July, 2026 Vol. 3 Issue 1
Page No: 108-116

Greening the Public Conversation: A Qualitative Inquiry into the Role of Media in Spreading Environmental Awareness

Arijit Ghosh
Assistant Professor, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, Netaji Subhas Open University

Received:
19.06.2026

Accepted:
03.07.2026

Published:
09.07.2026

Abstract

Environmental problems become public problems only after they become visible, and visibility is something the media confer. This paper asks how media — the legacy press and broadcasting alongside digital and social platforms — work as the connective tissue between expert knowledge of ecological risk and the everyday awareness of ordinary citizens. Working within an interpretive paradigm, the study uses qualitative content analysis and thematic analysis of documented cases of environmental communication and the scholarship surrounding them, rather than primary data gathered from human participants. The corpus ranges across global and Indian episodes, from Rachel Carson's Silent Spring and decades of climate-change coverage to the Chipko movement, the Narmada Bachao Andolan, and recent social-media mobilisations such as the global youth climate strikes and India's urban tree-felling protests. Four interlocking themes emerged: media as agenda-setters that decide which ecological concerns reach the public; media as framers that supply the interpretive lenses through which audiences make sense of those concerns; the participatory, networked awareness opened up by social media; and the recurring distortions of sensationalism, episodic framing, and greenwashing that can hollow out awareness even while appearing to raise it. The paper argues that media do not merely transmit environmental information; they help constitute what counts as an environmental issue in the first place. Yet it also cautions that mediated awareness is necessary but not sufficient for environmental action, because attention is fragile, framing is contestable, and visibility can be manufactured. The findings carry practical implications for environmental journalists, science communicators, educators, and civil-society organisations who seek not merely to inform audiences but to sustain durable public engagement with the ecological crisis.

Keywords: *environmental communication; media framing; agenda-setting; environmental awareness; social media; qualitative content analysis*

Introduction

When Rachel Carson published Silent Spring in 1962, the chemistry of pesticide toxicity was already known to a small circle of scientists and regulators. What changed public life was not the discovery itself but the act of telling - a widely read book that turned a technical concern into a moral and political one (Carson,1962). That episode captures a simple but easily forgotten truth: an environmental problem becomes a public problem only when it is communicated, and the form that communication takes shapes how, and whether, people care. Most of what citizens know about

ISSN: 3048-8036 (Online)
July, 2026 Vol. 3 Issue 1
Page No: 108-116

the state of the planet they have never witnessed directly. They know it through reporting, images, documentaries, advertisements, and, increasingly, the steady churn of social feeds. The environment, in other words, reaches the public already mediated.

This study is concerned with that mediation. It examines how media — understood broadly to include newspapers and magazines, television and radio, documentary film, and the digital and social platforms that now sit alongside them — help spread awareness of environmental issues. Environmental communication, as a field, treats human communication not as a neutral conduit but as a constitutive force that influences how we perceive and act toward the natural world (Cox, 2013). Awareness, from this vantage point, is never a raw transfer of facts from experts to publics; it is assembled, selected, and given meaning along the way.

The question matters with new urgency. Climate change, biodiversity loss, air and water pollution, and plastic waste are slow, diffuse, and often invisible in daily life, which makes them peculiarly dependent on representation to register at all. At the same time, the media ecosystem that carries these issues has been transformed. Where a handful of editors once decided what counted as environmental news, hundreds of millions of users now circulate, contest, and amplify ecological claims of their own. This shift promises a more participatory environmental public sphere, but it also multiplies the risks of distortion, fatigue, and manufactured concern.

Despite a rich literature on environmental journalism and climate communication, much of it leans toward quantitative content counts or audience surveys. There remains room for interpretive work that reads media episodes closely and asks what they reveal about the mechanisms through which awareness is built. This paper takes up that task through a qualitative synthesis of documented cases and the scholarship around them, attending to both Western and Indian experiences so that the argument is not confined to a single national context.

The article proceeds as follows. It first reviews the theoretical and empirical literature that connects media to environmental awareness. It then states its objectives and research questions, describes a qualitative methodology built on content and thematic analysis of secondary material, and presents the resulting themes. The discussion weaves findings together with theory, and the conclusion considers what the analysis means for those who communicate the environment for a living.

Review of Related Literature

Scholarship on media and the environment sits at the meeting point of mass communication theory and environmental sociology. Two communication theories anchor most of this work. The first is agenda-setting, the proposition that media may not tell people what to think but are strikingly successful in telling them what to think about (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Applied to ecology, agenda-setting explains why some hazards — an oil spill caught on camera, a burning forest — dominate public attention while equally serious but less photogenic problems remain unseen. The second is framing, the selection and salience of certain aspects of a perceived reality so as to promote a particular interpretation (Entman, 1993). Frames decide whether climate change appears as an economic burden, a scientific debate, a public-health threat, or a question of justice, and these choices measurably shape how audiences respond (Nisbet, 2009).

These theories were absorbed into a dedicated field of environmental communication. Cox (2013) describes the field as the study of how communication shapes the way we understand and act upon nature, distinguishing pragmatic communication that informs and persuades from constitutive

ISSN: 3048-8036 ***(Online)***
July, 2026 Vol. 3 Issue 1
Page No: 108-116

communication that helps define what the environment is in the first place. Hansen (2010) traces how media representations of the environment are produced, organised, and contested, arguing that journalists, scientists, corporations, and activists all compete to shape the public meaning of ecological issues. Anderson (1997) and Lester (2010) similarly treat environmental news as the outcome of negotiation among sources rather than a transparent window onto facts.

A constructionist strand within environmental sociology deepens this point. Hannigan (2006) argues that environmental problems do not announce themselves; they must be assembled and successfully claimed in public arenas before they are recognised as problems at all. Hilgartner and Bosk (1988) model those arenas as crowded and competitive, with limited carrying capacity, so that issues must struggle against one another for scarce attention. Downs (1972) had already captured the temporal dimension with his idea of an issue-attention cycle, in which public alarm about an environmental danger rises sharply, peaks, and then fades as people confront the costs of solving it. Together, these accounts suggest that media attention to the environment is selective, rivalrous, and impermanent by nature.

Climate change has become the central case for testing these ideas. Boykoff (2011) shows how journalistic norms, especially the habit of balancing every claim with a counter-claim, distorted early climate coverage by granting marginal skeptics a visibility out of proportion to their standing in the science. His work illustrates how a professional routine intended to ensure fairness can, in practice, manufacture a sense of unresolved debate. Studies of framing extend the lesson, demonstrating that audiences engage more deeply when climate change is framed around tangible local consequences or shared moral values than around distant statistics (Nisbet, 2009).

The digital turn has reshaped the terrain again. Schäfer (2012) reviews how online and social media have expanded who can speak about the environment, lowering the barriers that once concentrated influence in professional newsrooms and enabling activists and ordinary users to set agendas of their own. Reception theory reminds us that audiences are not passive: Hall's (1980) encoding and decoding model holds that messages are read in dominant, negotiated, or oppositional ways, so a media campaign about conservation may be embraced, partly accepted, or rejected outright depending on the cultural position of the viewer.

Much of this theory was developed in Western settings, yet the relationship between media and environmental awareness has a vivid history in the global South. In India, the Chipko movement of the 1970s, in which Himalayan villagers embraced trees to prevent commercial felling, drew national and international attention in part because its imagery travelled through the press and lodged in public memory (Guha, 1989). The Narmada Bachao Andolan against large dams later became a long-running media story that put questions of displacement and environmental justice before a wide audience. These episodes confirm that media visibility can convert a local grievance into a national conversation, while also showing how coverage can simplify or romanticise complex struggles.

More recent scholarship has carried these foundations into the digital era and into Southern contexts. Reviewing research on communication and climate mitigation, Chatterjee et al. (2024) observe that social media now do much of the work of encouraging pro-environmental behaviour, even as the same platforms speed the spread of misinformation. Studies of online debate temper any easy optimism about participation. Examining climate discussion on Reddit, Treen et al. (2022) found a mixture of genuine deliberation and hardened polarisation rather than one shared

ISSN: 3048-8036 ***(Online)***
July, 2026 Vol. 3 Issue 1
Page No: 108-116

conversation. Recent Indian work points in a similar direction. Looking at how leading Indian newspapers framed climate change around the COP-26 summit, Tiwari (2023) shows that coverage leaned on a narrow set of frames that put politics and policy ahead of lived consequences, while Mutyala and Manisha (2024), in a textual analysis of environmental reporting in India, find that frames stressing responsibility and conflict tend to crowd out frames that might sustain public engagement. Taken together, this newer literature suggests that the mechanisms named by earlier theory persist online, but now operate amid fresh pressures of speed, misinformation, and platform-driven attention.

Taken together, the literature establishes that media shape environmental awareness by setting agendas, supplying frames, and serving as arenas where rival claims compete, and that digital platforms have widened participation in this process. What is comparatively underdeveloped is interpretive synthesis that reads these mechanisms across cases and contexts, including Indian ones, to ask not only that media matter but how they do their work — and where that work goes wrong. This study addresses that gap.

Objectives of the Study

Within a qualitative and interpretive frame, the study pursues the following objectives:

1. To examine the mechanisms through which different media forms — print, broadcast, and digital — generate and spread public awareness of environmental issues.
2. To analyse how the framing of environmental issues in media shapes the meanings audiences attach to them.
3. To assess the changing role of social and participatory media in democratising environmental communication.
4. To identify the limitations and distortions that can weaken media-driven environmental awareness, and to draw out implications for environmental communicators.

Research Questions

The objectives translate into four guiding research questions:

1. RQ1. How do media set the public agenda on environmental issues, determining which concerns become visible and which remain neglected?
2. RQ2. In what ways do media frames influence how audiences interpret and emotionally engage with environmental problems?
3. RQ3. How have social and participatory media altered the production and circulation of environmental awareness?
4. RQ4. What recurring distortions limit the capacity of media to build durable environmental awareness, and how might they be addressed?
5.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, interpretive research design. Its aim is not to measure the frequency of environmental coverage or to quantify audience attitudes but to understand the mechanisms and meanings through which media build environmental awareness. Consistent with an interpretivist paradigm, it treats media texts and documented communication episodes as meaningful artefacts whose significance is to be interpreted rather than counted. No primary data were collected from

ISSN: 3048-8036 *(Online)*
July, 2026 Vol. 3 Issue 1
Page No: 108-116

human participants; the study therefore involves no surveys, interviews, or sampling of respondents. Instead, it works with secondary textual material already in the public and scholarly record.

Two complementary analytical strategies were used. The first is qualitative content analysis, which examines texts for their themes, frames, and underlying meanings rather than for surface counts (Krippendorff, 2018). The second is thematic analysis, following the six-phase approach of familiarisation, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the account (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The two were used together: content analysis guided close reading of individual cases, while thematic analysis drew patterns across them into a coherent set of themes.

The corpus was assembled through purposive selection. Cases were chosen because they are well documented, frequently discussed in the environmental communication literature, and collectively span print, broadcast, and digital media as well as both Western and Indian contexts. They include the reception of Silent Spring; long-running press and television coverage of climate change; the mediated histories of the Chipko movement and the Narmada Bachao Andolan; documentary interventions and broadcast nature programming; corporate environmental advertising; and recent social-media mobilisations such as the global youth climate strikes and urban campaigns against tree felling in Indian cities. Scholarly analyses of these episodes were read alongside the episodes themselves, so that the study interprets both the communication and the existing interpretation of it.

Analysis proceeded iteratively. Each case was read closely and annotated for how an issue gained visibility, how it was framed, which actors spoke, and how audiences were positioned. Codes were compared across cases, clustered, and refined until four stable, recurring themes emerged. These themes structure the results that follow. Throughout, the interpretation was kept anchored in concrete textual detail to avoid drifting into unsupported generalisation.

Because the study relies on documented and secondary material, the conventional criteria for rigour in qualitative inquiry were addressed in place of statistical validity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Credibility was sought by triangulating each case against multiple scholarly sources rather than a single account. Transferability is supported by selecting cases across media types and national settings, allowing readers to judge how far the findings travel. Dependability and confirmability were pursued through transparent description of how cases were selected and how themes were derived, so that the analytical path can be followed and questioned.

Two limitations follow from this design and are acknowledged openly. First, reliance on already-documented cases tilts the corpus toward episodes that achieved visibility, which is itself part of the phenomenon under study and may understate the quieter failures of environmental communication. Second, interpretive analysis is shaped by the researcher's own position; reflexivity and explicit reasoning are offered as partial safeguards rather than a claim to neutrality.

Results and Discussion

Four themes emerged from the analysis. Each is presented below with illustrative cases and read against the relevant theory.

Media as Agenda-Setters: Conferring Visibility

The clearest finding is that media decide which environmental concerns enter public awareness at

all. Across the cases, an ecological problem acquired public life only once it was carried into circulation. Silent Spring did not create pesticide toxicity, but by narrating it for a general readership it pushed the issue onto the national agenda and helped catalyse a regulatory response (Carson, 1962). The pattern recurs: oil spills, smog episodes, and forest fires command attention partly because they yield dramatic, photographable events that fit the rhythms of news, whereas chronic problems such as soil degradation or groundwater depletion struggle for the same visibility. This is agenda-setting in action — the media shaping not opinion so much as the very list of issues considered worth opinion (McCombs & Shaw, 1972).

The competitive and impermanent character of attention also showed clearly. Coverage of any single issue tends to surge around a triggering event and then recede, even when the underlying problem persists, echoing the issue-attention cycle (Downs, 1972) and the crowded public arenas in which issues must outcompete one another for limited space (Hilgartner & Bosk, 1988). For environmental communicators, this carries a practical lesson: visibility is not won once and kept, but must be renewed, because the agenda is restless and the carrying capacity of public attention is finite.

Media as Framers: Supplying the Lens

Agenda-setting tells us what to pay attention to. Framing does something different: it tells us what that thing means. Looking across the cases, the same piece of environmental information could be presented in very different ways, and the way it was presented made a real difference. If climate change is treated as a far-off scientific argument, it becomes easy for people to switch off. But when it is shown as something that affects health, jobs, or the future of one's children, people tend to pay closer attention and care more (Nisbet, 2009). Boykoff (2011) offers a useful example through the idea of journalistic balance. In trying to be fair, reporters often placed mainstream science right next to fringe opinion. The result was that a question scientists had largely settled looked like an open debate to the public. So a rule meant to ensure fairness ended up confusing people instead.

The Indian cases bring this out even more clearly. When the press reported on the Chipko movement, it presented the villagers as ordinary people standing up to protect their forests and their way of life. That picture spread widely and stayed in the public memory for years (Guha, 1989). The Narmada Bachao Andolan was reported in more than one way. At times it was a story about development and progress. At other times it was a story about families losing their homes and being treated unfairly. Each version pulled different readers towards different sides. This is really what framing does. It is the point where plain awareness turns into feeling, because there is a gap between knowing a problem exists and believing that something must be done about it. Still, framing is never the last word. People read the same message in their own way: some accept it, some accept part of it, and some reject it (Hall, 1980). For that reason, no frame can be certain of having the effect its makers intended.

Participatory and Networked Awareness

The third theme concerns the democratisation of environmental communication through digital and social media. The cases show a meaningful shift in who can set agendas and frame issues. Where professional gatekeepers once held that power tightly, networked publics now generate, remix, and amplify environmental claims at scale, broadening participation in the environmental public sphere (Schäfer, 2012). The global youth climate strikes spread less through editorial

ISSN: 3048-8036 ***(Online)***
July, 2026 Vol. 3 Issue 1
Page No: 108-116

decisions than through hashtags, shared images, and peer-to-peer circulation, with mainstream coverage often following rather than leading. In Indian cities, social-media campaigns against the felling of urban trees mobilised residents quickly, turned local administrative decisions into public controversies, and pressured authorities in ways that would have been slow or impossible a generation earlier.

This participatory capacity has genuine democratic value: it lets affected communities tell their own stories and contest official frames directly. Yet the analysis also surfaced its fragility. Networked attention is fast but shallow, prone to spikes of outrage that dissipate as quickly as they form, and vulnerable to misinformation that spreads as easily as accurate claims (Chatterjee et al., 2024). The same architecture that empowers grassroots awareness can fragment it into echo chambers and reduce sustained engagement to fleeting gestures (Treen et al., 2022). Participation, then, widens the door to awareness without guaranteeing that what passes through it is durable or well founded.

Distortions: Sensationalism, Episodic Framing, and Greenwashing

The last theme is a warning against being too hopeful. Media build awareness, but they also bend it in fairly predictable ways. One problem is sensationalism. Big, dramatic disasters grab the headlines, while slower harms, like land or water that degrades little by little, get pushed aside. Another problem is the way news tends to cover the environment as a string of separate incidents rather than as one connected system. People come away knowing that something happened, but not really why. The way news works, jumping from one event to the next, only makes this worse. So we can end up with a public that is worried but never really helped to see the bigger picture behind the problems.

Greenwashing is a more deliberate kind of distortion. A lot of corporate advertising paints products and brands as good for the planet, often with very little to back it up. It borrows the words and images of conservation to create concern that serves the company's interests, not the environment's. And because the way we talk about an issue shapes what we think counts as responsible behaviour (Cox, 2013), greenwashing does more than mislead people about a single product. It can take over the very language we use to talk about caring for the environment. Put together, these problems show that more media coverage does not automatically mean better awareness. Attention can be empty, framing can mislead, and concern can be faked. That is why the quality and honesty of environmental communication matters just as much as how much of it there is.

Synthesis

Read together, the four themes answer the research questions. Media set the environmental agenda by conferring or withholding visibility (RQ1); they frame issues in ways that shape interpretation and feeling (RQ2); social media have widened participation while introducing new fragilities (RQ3); and recurring distortions limit the durability and reliability of mediated awareness (RQ4). The cumulative picture supports the study's central argument: media do not simply relay environmental information but participate in constituting what the environment is taken to be. Awareness is therefore necessary but not sufficient. It is the entry point to engagement, yet attention fades, frames are contested, and concern can be manufactured, so awareness must be continually renewed, carefully framed, and critically received if it is to support meaningful environmental action.

ISSN: 3048-8036 *(Online)*
July, 2026 Vol. 3 Issue 1
Page No: 108-116

Conclusions

This qualitative inquiry set out to understand how media spread awareness of environmental issues. Reading documented cases across print, broadcast, and digital media and across Western and Indian contexts, it found that media perform this role through four mechanisms: setting the public agenda, framing issues to give them meaning, enabling participatory and networked awareness, and — less happily — distorting awareness through sensationalism, episodic framing, and greenwashing. The thread connecting these findings is that communication is constitutive: media help decide what counts as an environmental problem, not merely how widely a settled problem is known.

The implications are practical. For environmental journalists, the findings counsel against event-driven coverage that informs without explaining, and in favour of thematic reporting that connects incidents to systems. For science communicators and educators, they underline that frames anchored in tangible, local, and value-laden terms engage audiences more effectively than abstract data. For civil-society organisations, they suggest that social media can launch awareness quickly but that sustaining it demands deliberate effort against the natural decay of attention. And for audiences, the analysis is an argument for media literacy: the capacity to decode frames, recognise greenwashing, and distinguish manufactured concern from grounded understanding is now part of environmental citizenship.

The study's limits also mark its future directions. Its reliance on documented, already-visible cases means it captures the successes of environmental communication more readily than its silences; future work could examine issues that failed to achieve visibility and ask why. Its interpretive, secondary design invites complementary research that listens directly to audiences and communicators. There is particular scope for grounded, qualitative study of environmental communication in the global South, where the relationship between media and ecological awareness unfolds under different political, linguistic, and infrastructural conditions than the Western literature assumes.

In the end, the environment will continue to reach most people already mediated. Whether that mediation produces a public that is genuinely aware — able not only to see ecological problems but to understand and act on them — depends on the choices made by those who tell its story. Media are not a neutral mirror held up to nature. They are one of the places where our relationship with nature is, for better or worse, being decided.

References

Anderson, A. (1997). *Media, culture and the environment*. UCL Press.

Boykoff, M. T. (2011). *Who speaks for the climate? Making sense of media reporting on climate change*. Cambridge University Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

Carson, R. (1962). *Silent spring*. Houghton Mifflin.

Chatterjee, J. S., Thongprasert, S., & Some, S. (2024). Communication, climate mitigation, and behavior change interventions: Understanding message design and digital media technologies. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 49*, 655–672. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-121322-070317

Cox, R. (2013). *Environmental communication and the public sphere* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Downs, A. (1972). Up and down with ecology: The "issue-attention cycle." *The Public Interest, 28*, 38–50.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43*(4), 51–58.

Guha, R. (1989). *The unquiet woods: Ecological change and peasant resistance in the Himalaya*. Oxford University Press.

Hall, S. (1980). Encoding/decoding. In S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe, & P. Willis (Eds.), *Culture, media, language* (pp. 128–138). Hutchinson.

Hannigan, J. (2006). *Environmental sociology* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Hansen, A. (2010). *Environment, media and communication*. Routledge.

Hilgartner, S., & Bosk, C. L. (1988). The rise and fall of social problems: A public arenas model. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*(1), 53–78.

Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Lester, L. (2010). *Media and environment: Conflict, politics and the news*. Polity Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE.

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 36*(2), 176–187.

Mutyala, P., & Manisha, R. (2024). A textual analysis of media frames toward environmental issues in India. *Journal of Communication and Management, 3*(2), 95–100. https://doi.org/10.58966/JCM2024321

Nisbet, M. C. (2009). Communicating climate change: Why frames matter for public engagement. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development, 51*(2), 12–23.

Schäfer, M. S. (2012). Online communication on climate change and climate politics: A literature review. *WIREs Climate Change, 3*(6), 527–543.

Tiwari, M. (2023). Enquiring framing in India's mainstream newspapers: Interpreting frames of the climate change news in India during COP-26. In D. Briesen & S. P. Das (Eds.), *Media, politics and environment*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-31252-6_3

Treen, K., Williams, H., O'Neill, S., & Coan, T. G. (2022). Discussion of climate change on Reddit: Polarized discourse or deliberative debate? *Environmental Communication, 16*(5), 680–698.