CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 GENERAL

The documentary films under discussion are to be primarily studied using the approach of analysis of framing processes in relation to social movements as portrayed in these films. Documentary films are, in a sense, social movements as they carry a central message so that the creators as well as the supporters and followers of such films are in constant touch with such issues and concerns for which these documentaries are created and circulated. Through innumerable documentary films and short films, many individual activists and NGOs throughout the world, have tried to bring about tangible changes in the minds and lives of the masses effectively using the advantages of undertaking intensive campaigns in their contemporary social movements. It is in this context that the current scholarship assumes significance.

3.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

The current study uses two important methods as its theoretical framework. In the first place it applies the theory of Core Framing Tasks in Social Movements as adapted from Benford and Snow (2000) to these environmental documentary films and to find out the different framed tasks. Secondly, another theory of Persuasive Functions in Social Movements as adapted from the seminal work of Charles J Stewart, Craig Allen Smith, Robert E. Denton, Jr.(2012) is applied on environmental documentary films to find out how the persuasive functions are effectively performed to make the movement remain in existence for long periods.
While analysing social movements using core framing tasks, Benford and Snow (2000) in their remarkable scholarship on framing processes and social movements have classified three types of core framing tasks, i.e. diagnostic framing tasks, prognostic framing tasks and motivational framing tasks under which different issues and problems, solutions and consequences and motivational actions that are encountered in social movements are generally identified. Charles J. Stewart and others (2012) analyze the six persuasive functions that members and protesters in a social movement perform to make the movement alive, active and running for a very long time. These functions as classified by Charles and others are of paramount importance and any social movement worth its salt should strive to perform one or more such persuasive functions such as Transforming Perceptions of Social Reality, Altering Self-Perceptions, Legitimizing the Social Movement, Prescribing Courses of Action, Mobilizing for Action and Sustaining the Social Movement.

Applying these approaches, the current study focuses as to how the 12 documentary films that are taken for analysis, are plentifully supplied with core framing tasks under the above three categories and how these tasks pave the way for enriching social movements through their six persuasive functions thereby uplifting the lives and minds of millions of people for whom such documentary films are aimed at.

While the contents of these documentary films dealt with many themes and issues related to environmental concerns, the current study is very particular about bringing out the different concerns, solutions and actions through framing process tasks that are exposed through the visuals and sound bytes. In the process a detailed analysis is also done to highlight the constructive aspects of social movements through the discursive interpretation of performance of six persuasive functions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Analysis of Core Framing Tasks in Social Movements</strong></td>
<td>Core Framing Tasks that include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as adapted from Benford and Snow (2000)</td>
<td>Diagnostic, Prognostic and Motivational Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Analysis of Persuasive Functions in Social Movements</strong></td>
<td>Persuasive Functions in Social Movements such as Transforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as adapted from Charles J. Stewart, Craig Allen Smith, Robert E. Denton</td>
<td>Perceptions of Social Reality, Altering Self-Perceptions, Legitimizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jr. (2012)</td>
<td>the Social Movement, Prescribing Courses of Action, Mobilizing for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action and Sustaining the Social Movement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 Details of Environmental Documentary Films Taken for Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Duration in minutes</th>
<th>Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>En Peyar Palaru (My Name is Paalar)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>R.R. Seenivasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noyyal-Tholaintha Thadangal (Noyyal the Lost Path)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>M. Balamurugan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pallikaranai IyarkaiyinMaranam (Pallikaranai the Nature’s Death)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>S.Cyril Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kathirveechu KathaigalPagam 2 Kalpakam (Kalpakam Radiation Stories)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Amudhan. R.P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sare Sahan Se Accha-Artham Puriyathu (Don’t Know the Meaning)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Chandran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Niranthara Velanmai (Permaculture)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Vindodh Baluchamy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Muzhgum Nathi (River that Drowns)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>P. Kathir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Solaikkaadugalai Kaapom (Save our Sholas)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shekar Dattatri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mercury in the Mist</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Amudhan .R.P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Paalaivanamagum Kaveri Delta Methane (Kaveri Delta becoming Desert Methene)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nimir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Point Calimere</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Shekar Dattatri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ovvoru Sottum (Every Drop Counts)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Vaigai Selvi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The documentary and short films dealing with environment are selected from many independent documentary filmmakers, either their own productions or productions by NGOs, who are concerned about the deteriorating environmental conditions prevailing in Tamil Nadu.

These films are not belonging to any one environmental movement. Instead they are all produced by independent documentary film makers or produced on behalf of some NGOs/Groups working on the specific issues of environment. After consulting film critics, scholars, environmental activists and filmmakers, the more widely circulated short films and documentaries which advocate change were narrowed down to these 12 films. Most of the selected films were made between the years 2000 to 2017. For this study, 12 documentary films that are dealing with the broader theme of environment were chosen. The films were selected based on the issues they represent.

While three films on river water pollution that deal with different issues of different nature, one film is about marsh lands. Whereas one film is about depletion of water for irrigation, the other one is about organic farming. The next film is about a rare theme of sanctuary. The other film is about water conservation. Toxic waste is dealt with in the next film. One film is about radiation hazard and the last film is about saving the Western Ghats.

Some films are made by seasoned documentary filmmakers like R P Amuthan, R. R. Seenivasan and Shekar Thathatri. The durations vary from 19 minutes to 89 minutes. Some are available in social video platforms like You Tube but most of the films are screened for public in film festivals or in public screenings. None of them were screened in the regular commercial theaters. The target audience for the films is general public. These films are distributed through NGOs. Activists and protest groups in the form of DVDs and
CDs. Almost all the films used the documentary film techniques of narration, interviews and onsite documentation. Some films used animation and enacting. Many preferred natural sound some used BGM and songs.

The 12 documentary films are first analysed as to the aspects of core framing tasks as advocated by Benford and Snow (2000) and then create an interpretative discussion based on persuasive functions performed in the films that result in an effective understanding of an exposed contemporary social movement scenario in the society for which these documentary films are presented with.

For Goffman (1974), frames denoted ‘schemata of interpretation’ that enable individuals “to locate, perceive, identify, and label” occurrences within their life space and the world at large’. Before evolved into a social movement theory, framing was considered as a concept of psychology. It served as an interpretative tool to organize and understand the outside world in a meaningful way. It is from the individual perspective. Frames help the individuals to perceive and identify the external world. Later the framing theory was used to study social movements. There, a paradigm shift happened. This interpretation framework was shifted from the individuals to social movements.

Social movement scholars conceptualize this signifying work or meaning construction by employing the verb ‘framing’ (Gamson et al, 1982,’ Snow et al, 1986’,Snow&Benford 1988). Movements are dynamic. When they try to mobilize people for their causes they engage in the framing process of constructing meaning for their supporters and others. Since it is an active ongoing process the framing is denoted by a verb instead of noun. The framing process involves framing tasks which helps to mobilize people for their goals. Scholars call this in the name of collective action frames.
3.3 ANALYSIS OF CORE FRAMING TASKS IN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

ADAPTED FROM BENFORD AND SNOW(2000)

Collective action frames also perform this interpretive function by simplifying and condensing aspects of the ‘world out there,’ but in ways that are ‘intended to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists’ (Snow & Benford, 1988: 198). The main function of the collective action frame is to interpret the happenings of the world to the members of the group in a simplified and condensed manner. It helps the movement to get support from several quarters of the society and also counter the oppositional views. A crucial feature that distinguishes collective action frames from schema and other related cognitive constructs is that ‘collective action frames are not merely aggregations of individual attitudes and perceptions but also the outcome of negotiating shared meaning’ (Gamson 1992a:111). These collective action frames are evolved from the movement’s side and not from the individual member’s side. It is not just a psychological or cognitive construct based on the individual’s attitudes and perceptions. Instead the collective action frames are constructed from the ideological position of the movement in tune with the existing socio political cultural context. These collective action frames are developed by the help of core framing tasks.

Snow & Benford (1988) refer to these core framing tasks as ‘diagnostic framing’ (problem identification and attributions), ‘prognostic framing,’ and ‘motivational framing.’ From the point of view of the movement, the reasons/causes of the issues should be explained and its effects must be described and the possible solutions must be told. Also
the plan of action must be prescribed. These framing tasks were identified as Diagnostic, Prognostic and Motivational framing.

In effective frames, the diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational components are clearly specified, richly developed, and well-integrated (Snow and Benford 1988; Stoecker 1995). Successful campaigns and movement activities will have clearly defined diagnostic, prognostic and motivational framing. If these components are well integrated the frames will be very effective.

Benford and Snow (2000) says that diagnostic framing deals primarily with problem identification and attributions, ‘wherein injustice frames’ (i.e., identifying victims and amplifying victimhood) constitute the main part of the framing process (p.615). Diagnostic framing also pinpoints the ‘sources of causality, blame and culpable agents’ (p.616). Diagnostic framing try to pinpoint the causes for the issue. It attributes the causes to some persons, organisations or institutions. So that people can understand the causes of the said issue from the point of view of the movement.

Prognostic framing involves the ‘articulation of a proposed solution to the problem or at least a plan of attack and the strategies for carrying out the plan’ p.617). Prognostic framing explains the possible consequences of the issues if that permitted to develop. And also suggests possible solutions for solving the issue/concern.

As for motivational framing, it is a ‘call to arms’ of sorts—a ‘rationale for engaging in ameliorative collective action, including the construction of appropriate vocabularies of motive (p.617). Motivational framing try to mobilize the people to change the situation. In any given scenario this framings explain the possible reasons and the consequences and the solutions to the issue. Moreover, it calls for an action and suggest a plan of action too.
### Table 3.3 Core Framing Processes and Framed Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Core Framing Processes</th>
<th>Framed Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diagnostic Framing</td>
<td>Causes for the Problem/Issue from the Movement Point of View, Attributing to Somebody or Something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prognostic Framing</td>
<td>Future Consequences of the Issue if Unchecked, Solutions to the Problem/Issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Motivational Framing</td>
<td>Mobilizing Support from Members and the Public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.1 Diagnostic Framing Tasks


Most of the movements were born out of some social injustice. So many studies focus on the injustice as a frame. The type of injustice was done and the effects and the possible course of protest been studied. Social injustice economic injustice environmental injustice cultural injustice is some of the recurring themes in these studies. It gave a scope of moving the theory from movements to other areas like mass media. Reporting and news coverage were seen from the perspective of framing and the dominant theme is injustice. In a way it justifies the Gamson theory.


The other popular theme in diagnostic framing is victimization. There were number of studies done in this manner. These studies try to identify the victims of the injustice and their plight. Taken together, these studies support Gamson et al. (1982) initial conceptualization of injustice frames as a mode of interpretation—prefatory to collective noncompliance, protest, and/or rebellion—generated and adopted by those who come to define the actions of an authority as unjust.
Most of the earlier studies on framing supported Gamson et al. (1982) injustice frames as the key perspective in approaching social issues. It advocated a collective action of protest or agitation against the unjust authority.

Since social movements seek to remedy or alter some problematic situation or issue, it follows that directed action is contingent on identification of the source(s) of causality, blame, and/or culpable agents. This attributional component of diagnostic framing attends to this function by focusing blame or responsibility. However, consensus regarding the source of the problem does not follow automatically from agreement regarding the nature of the problem; say Bedford and Snow (2000).

When a problematic situation or issue arises, the causes must be identified. Then the actions are directed towards the solution. Social movements use this situation to focusing the blame or responsibility on something or somebody whom they wanted to modify and change. It helps the public and the members of the movement to focus their energy on the attributed targets. Thus diagnostic framing plays an important role.

### 3.3.2 Prognostic Framing Tasks

Prognostic framing, the second core framing task, involves the articulation of a proposed solution to the problem, or at least a plan of attack, and the strategies for carrying out the plan. In short, it addresses the Leninesque question of what is to be done, as well as the problems of consensus and action mobilization, say Benford and Snow (2000).

Once the causes been identified the next phase of action is look for the solution and strategies to reach the solution. Precisely Prognostic framing fulfils this function. Besides this prognostic framing project the future development and consequences of the present crisis. Thus plays a very important role in the framing process.
Studies have identified additional constraints on prognostic framings. As with other framing activities, it is important to keep in mind that prognostic framing takes place within a multi-organizational field (Evans, 1997, Klandermans, 1992; also see Curtis & Zurcher, 1973) consisting of various SMOs constituting a movement industry, their opponents, targets of influence, media, and bystanders.

Whatever proposed as the future development of the issue and its solution, prognostic framing must take into account of many things. It cannot simply prescribe anything without taking into account of the movement’s opponents, media and other factors of influence. Actually these are real constraints for the social movements to come out with its own kind of prognostic framing.

Thus it is not surprising that an SMO’s prognostic framing activity typically includes refutations of the logic or efficacy of solutions advocated by opponents as well as a rationale for its own remedies. The former has been referred to as ‘counter framing’ (Benford 1987:75). Each movement has its own vision and ideology. The policies and the functioning of the movement entirely depend on that. Hence to make its presence unique and undisputable it has to counter the actions and policies of other opponent movements. So counter framing is an essential component in prognostic framing. It has to give its own rationale for its own prescriptions and remedies.

3.3.3 Motivational Framing Tasks

Motivational framing, the final core framing task, provides a ‘call to arms’ rationale for engaging in ameliorative collective action, including the construction of appropriate vocabularies of motive. Attending to this framing task essentially entails the development of what Gamson (1995) refers to as the ‘agency’ component of collective action frames.
In a study of the US nuclear disarmament movement, Benford (1993b) addressed this agency issue by identifying four generic vocabularies of motive that emerged in the course of interaction among movement activists, rank-and-file supporters, recruits, and significant others: vocabularies of severity, urgency, efficacy, and propriety. These socially constructed vocabularies provided adherents with compelling accounts for engaging in collective action and for sustaining their participation. Each movement insists on change. Social change is not possible without the collaboration of people. But people must be motivated to engage in the process of change making. Mere awareness about the injustice, social issue will not make the people force to act. So the issues must be presented in a different manner. People should feel the urgency, severity, efficacy and propriety of the issues. Motivational framing fulfils this function. It even creates new vocabularies to motivate people.

3.4 ANALYSIS OF PERSUASIVE FUNCTIONS IN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

With the support of organizers, protesters and activists, it is possible for any social movements to exist and serve the general public for whom these were set-up and run. In their many roles and responsibilities, these movements carry out many persuasive functions as part of their activities. One of their many objectives is to persuade the members, protesters and the common men so that ultimate success is achieved.

3.4.1 Environmental Documentary Films as Tools of Social Movements

By pursuing these core framing tasks, movement actors attend to the interrelated problems of ‘consensus mobilization’ and ‘action mobilization’ (Klandermans, 1984). Creating awareness and make people to act are the two challenges the movements normally face. Core framing tasks like diagnostic, prognostic and motivational frames
should address this interrelated problems prevailing in the social movements. Generating a common understanding among the supporters and make them participate in social action are the important tasks for the movement actors.

Discursive processes refer to the talk and conversations—the speech acts—and written communications of movement members that occur primarily in the context of, or in relation to, movement activities. Movement slogans such as ‘Liberte, Fraternite, Egalilte,’ ‘Power to the People,’ ‘We Shall Overcome,’ and ‘Homeless, Not Helpless’ illustrate this function. Through these slogans and strategic action plans the social movement tries to achieve its goals of social change. It is done through extensive interactions and other communication activities. Not just conversations and written communications these days intense media campaigns were used. Where many different media forms been used.

By strategic processes, we refer to framing processes that are deliberative, utilitarian, and goal directed: Frames are developed and deployed to achieve a specific purpose—to recruit new members, to mobilize adherents, to acquire resources, and so forth. Strategic efforts by social movement organizations to link their interests and interpretive frames with those of prospective constituents and actual or prospective resource providers were initially conceptualized as ‘frame alignment processes’ (Snow et al, 1986)

Social movements must constantly increase its supporter’s base and expand the organisational power. This process is done by various activities of the movement. Here the movement as a strategy strikes a balance between the people’s expectations and the goals of the organisation. Accordingly, frames are developed by the social movements. Contested processes are those which are widespread agreement among movement framing researchers that the development, generation, and elaboration of collective action frames are contested processes. All actors within the collective action arena who engage in
this reality construction work are embroiled in the politics of signification. This means that activists are not able to construct and impose on their intended targets any version of reality they would like; rather there are a variety of challenges confronting all those who engage in movement framing activities. It is not easy to construct and impose any idea by a social movement. Even though the issues are very important and need an urgent action creating a mood for it is not easy. There is a variety of challenges one has to face.

The very existence of a social movement indicates differences within a society regarding the meaning of some aspect of reality (Benford, 1993). Those who oppose the changes advocated by a movement sometimes publicly challenge the movement’s diagnostic and prognostic framings. Attempts ‘to rebut, undermine, or neutralize a person’s or group’s myths, versions of reality, or interpretive framework’ have been referred to as counter framing (Benford, 1987:75). Through the act of counter framing the movements try to protect their place and position in the fight for social change. When the opponent is very powerful and able to counter the movement counter framing is the only strategy to face the opposition.

Opponents’ counter frames; in turn, often spawn reframing activity by the movement: attempts ‘to ward off, contain, limit, or reverse potential damage to the movement’s previous claims or attributes’ (Benford & Hunt, 1994). The movement has to reframe itself to sustain its existence without compromising its primary goals and activities.

One of the major themes permeating the movement literature in recent years is the contention that an understanding of identity processes, and particularly collective identity, is fundamental to understanding the dynamics of social movements (e.g. Jasper, 1997, ‘Melucci 1989,’ Snow & Oliver, 1995, Taylor & Whittier 1992). The framing process indirectly helps the movement to concentrate on the identity of the movement. The studies
reveal the movements try to preserve and maintain their identity. They engage in very many activities to retain and keep the identity.

Social movements presumably emerge in order to advance the interests of their adherents or beneficiaries by securing specifiable objectives typically conceptualized as outcomes. Research on this topic has identified several sets of factors (e.g. organization, tactical disruption, and political mediation) that appear to affect movements ‘outcome attainment efforts (see Giugni, 1998). Social movements emerge out of the need of the followers, but due to many reasons the outcome is affected and the movements are not able to achieve their desired goals.

Social movements exist and operate under many pressures and constraints. Because of these constraints, persuasion is the primary agency for satisfying requirements and meeting obstacles (Stewart, Smith & Denton, 2007, p. 21). Social movements exist and function in a society which has its own socio political and cultural understanding of the issues. In a tightly knit society introducing new viewpoints and new practices is not that easy. Movement actors operate in a very stressful situation. The supporter’s base should be strengthened. So, social movements engage themselves in the activity of persuasion.

Stewart, Smith and Denton (2007) claim that enhancing the self-perceptions of protesters is an essential rhetorical function of social movements because taking on powerful institutions and entrenched cultural norms requires a strong, healthy ego (p. 58). The participants must come out of their victims mindset and able to feel that they are empowered. They must have a positive attitude about their protests and collective actions. And the general public also must feel as if the goal and the activities of the movement are genuine and feasible. Essentially this means that a social movement must gain the trust of the general public, establish worth and right, and utilize a strong moral stance and tone ‘to attain positive relational patterns with the larger society’ (Stewart, Smith & Denton, 2007,
The positive evaluation enjoyed by the social movement is very crucial. The general public must come forward and support the movement.

A social movement must provide a resonant discourse that specifies a set of beliefs about how the world should operate and what should be done as a result of those beliefs (Stewart, Smith & Denton, 2007, p.69). This set of beliefs or ideology articulates what is to be done, how it should be done, and who must do it (Stewart, Smith & Denton, 2007, p.69-70). The social movement must present a holistic view about the world and a logically convincing interpretation about the world and its problems and the possible solutions.

Mobilizing social movement action means organizing and uniting disconnected individuals into institutionalized collectives, convincing people to join together to bring about or resist change (Stewart, Smith & Denton, 2007, p.73-74). By making powerful arguments the movements try to unite the individuals from different walks of life. It is through the act of convincing movements try to achieve this target.

Indeed, much of the work of movements involved various ‘frame alignment’ processes aimed at linking individual interests, values, and beliefs to those of the movement (Snow et al. 1986; Gamson 1988). It is an art to align the movement’s goals with the expectations of the participants.

Frames have generally been conceptualized as the interpretive packages that activists develop to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, appeal to authorities, and demobilize antagonists (Snow et al. 1986; Gamson 1988; Snow and Benford 1988; Tarrow 1998). This is the primary function of the frames. They function as interpretative packages. It means they interpret the world for the participants as well as the public. They try to negotiate their views with power centres and also their opponents.

Frames combine a diagnosis of the social condition in need of remedy, a prognosis for how to effect such a remedy, and a rationale for action, a ‘call to arms’ (Snow and
We must find out the integrity of these three aspects and how effectively they communicate the issues.

Environmental documentary film has the ability to dramatize the reality of environmental issues and empower audiences to become an active part of the change necessary to address environmental crises (Rachel, 2011). Environmental documentary films function as social movement by providing a comprehensive world view and make the audience care for the environment.

Unlike fictional films, documentary films that expose reality make issues more palpable and perhaps even more personal, and act as an organizing tool, providing an ‘outlet for people to listen up, speak out and take the initiative for positive change’ (Smithline, 2005). Because of its reality context the documentary films has more power to convince the public mind and function like an organizing tool for the environmental movements.

The role of documentary film in social movement has made it a popular and significant artefact for communication scholars analyzing media, visual rhetoric, and the implications for culture and pedagogy (Opel, 2007). Documentary films play a very important role in creating awareness and support many social initiatives. Documentary films can reflect and intensify existing environmental discourse (Rosteck & Frentz, 2009), disrupt social myths (Lindenfeld, 2010) and articulate new ideas about environmental activism and agency (Monani, 2008). Documentary films play an important role in society. They can support the social movements in a great way. Indian environment movements benefitted a lot by the documentaries portrays the alternative reality to counter government or corporate dominant viewpoints. Documentaries strongly question the
existing social myths by presenting powerful arguments against them. Throughout the world documentary films played a vital role in promoting environmental cause and issues.

As documentary films gain popularity and notoriety, these messages are reaching a wider audience, which warrants attention by communication scholars looking to understand the complexities of environmental discourse and the ways it is interpreted (Rosteck & Frentz, 2009). Unlike the west, documentary scholarship in India is only in the budding stages. But communication scholars started comprehending the power of the documentary films. The environmental discourse emerging through media must be studied in detail.

While the analysis of rhetorical strategies will focus primarily on the films themselves, this study applies the coalition model for assessing documentaries (Whiteman, 2004), taking into consideration the production and distribution process as well as the activists and resources surrounding these films that transport the message beyond the screen. Though it is desirable the production and distribution process for a documentary film vary from region to region, documentary theme to subject theme and social movement to movement and call for a separate independent research study.

As a social movement, the ultimate goal of the environmental movement is to create a sustainable society; however, the movement is comprised of multiple communities that embrace environmentalism in different ways for different reasons (Brulle, 2008). There are Anti-Nuclear movements, organic farming movements, anti-MNC movements. Anti-fast food culture movements, movements for clean water, clean air etc. they follow different ideologies strategies and action plans. The definition of environment and sustainable society are also varying from movement to movement. There are fringe groups, organisations, NGOs, government bodies, activists working in the area of environment.
Within the environmental movement the diversity of interests, issues and tactics often hinders progress, spreads resources thin, and complicates any sense of unified effort (Rosenblatt, 2004). Due to the multiple interests and strategies the environmental movements are not able to provide a coherent picture of their goals and activities. Though they collaborate on several issues and show solidarity functionally speaking they are on their own. It makes them less attractive in public perception and poses problems in mobilizing resources and people participation.

Confrontational strategies, though often controversial, have the ability to raise critical consciousness and challenge the status quo when all other forms of communication have been exhausted (Cathcart, 1978, p.236), and the environmental movement continues to reap the rewards of the confrontational approach (Silveira, 2001). Confronting the big corporate forces, Government and other industrial houses the environmental movements adopt the strategy of confrontation. This confrontation raises questions in public mind regarding the environmental projects. By challenging the status quo and prescribing alternatives critical consciousness of the people would rise. Lacking financial and other resources, confrontational approach cannot sustain for a long period. Yet it is proved to be an effective method in gaining momentum for the environmental group.

Even though not all environmental discourses are created equal, studies show that most environmental organizations are represented by the long-established discursive frames of Conservationism, Preservationism, or Reform Environmentalism (Brulle, 2008, p.11). In the Indian context, out of these three discursive frames many environmental movements adopt the frames of conservationism and reform environmentalism than presservationalism.

The success of grassroots environmental efforts, heightening consciousness of social environmental issues, provides testament to the power of the public sphere (Silveira,
2001). Persuading an accommodating society to embrace the urgency and gravity of environmental crisis is a complex process. It involves political leadership, science, public pressure, catastrophes that illustrate issues, and a moral dimension involving responsibility to future generations (Tickell, 2002). The combination of all factors will only create responsibility in the minds of future protesters in their respective movements.

3.4.2. Persuasive Functions

Stewart, Smith & Denton (2007) say that social movements exist and operate under many pressures and constraints. Because of these constraints, persuasion is the primary agency for satisfying requirements and meeting obstacles. Since social movements are a collection of individuals, it is ideal and suitable that persuasion can perform better than compulsions. For movements and organizations the function of persuasion helps all concerned to collect members for effective social movement. They suggest six important persuasive functions which are (1) transforming perceptions of reality; (2) altering self-perceptions of protesters; (3) legitimizing the movement; (4) prescribing courses of action; (5) mobilizing for action; and (6) sustaining the movement. In other words, these functions try to persuade the individual or individuals or groups to transform the perceptions of reality, alter self-perceptions of protesters, legitimize the movement, prescribe courses of action, mobilize for action and finally sustain the movement. All these six functions are to be studiously followed by any social movement.

3.4.2.1 Transforming Perceptions of Reality

Stewart, Smith and Denton (2007) say that social movement persuaders must transform how people see their environment – the past, the present and the future – to convince them that an intolerable situation exists that warrants urgent attention and action
They must be aware of the fact that the existing reality is so bad that something tangible should be done to salvage the problem. From the past realities the failures can be considered and the present conditions of reality should be well understood. Based on the analysis of the past and the present, futuristic course of action can be planned.

Educating people about a present situation can help them become aware of its existence and severity, and emphasize paradoxes or inconsistencies of institutions the movement opposes (Stewart, Smith & Denton, 2007, p.52-55). Awareness on any inconsistency or difficult position or even paradoxical element of the opposed organization should be made known to the protesters or members of the social movement.

A focus on present institutional conflicts allows the movement to show how the values of the institution are corrupt or opposite what they should be (Stewart, Smith & Denton, 2007, p.55). Here, the adverse aspects of value system in the institution vis-à-vis the objectives of the movement are to be discussed. A vision of the future illustrates that something must be done before it is too late, which instills a sense of the urgent need for a change in the status quo (Stewart, Smith & Denton, 2007, p. 55). Visioning the future of the department is another area of concern in the matters of transforming reality. Russil (2008) opines that the use of apocalyptic and tipping point narratives of climate change distorts human responses by focusing on avoidance rather than adaptation. The severe warnings through the above narratives will make the people escape rather than stand and face the reality.

These warnings emphasize the magnitude of problems in a way that devalues conventional ways of responding to environmental concern, or promote an urgency that is exaggerated to the point that any possible human response is inadequate (Russil, 2008,

3.4.2.2 Altering Self-perceptions of Protesters

According to Stewart, Smith and Denton, (2007), movements are either self-directed, populated by those who perceive themselves to be dispossessed and struggling for their own freedom, equality and justice; or other-directed, populated by people struggling for the rights of others (p.58). The people under self-directed movements are those who work for their own benefit and freedom, whereas the members under other-directed work for others. McKinley, (2008) says that even as environmental awareness increases, adoption of pro-environmental behaviour is elusive. The more the awareness on environment, the lesser the adoption of pro-environmental behaviour is.

3.4.2.3 Legitimizing the Movement

Stewart, Smith and Denton (2007) suggest two rhetorical elements necessary for legitimization of movement: (1) conferring the right to exercise authoritative influence and make demands; and (2) retaining legitimacy once it is conferred. The right to exercise influence and the right to retain legitimacy are conferred upon.

Since then, the environmental movement has experienced a number of political defeats (Brulle & Jenkins, 2008) and some believe that the institutions of environmentalism have become ‘outmoded’ (Shellenberger & Nordhaus, 2004) and are in need of ‘overhaul’ (Harder, 2011). Though fought throughout the length and breadth of the world, many environmental movements have failed. In other words, the current environmental activism has not brought about enough successes.
3.4.2.4 Prescribing Courses of Action

‘Prescribing courses of action,’ say Stewart, Smith and Denton (2007), ‘constitutes selling the social movement’s ideology’ (p. 69). Accordingly prescribing correct courses of action is like a commercial act dealing in ideology. The action to be taken by a social movement should be equivalent to a commercial activity entailing all aspects of a trading activity.

3.4.2.5 Mobilizing for Action

Movements working to mobilize must also pressure their opposition and gain the sympathy and support of legitimizers (Stewart, Smith & Denton, 2007, p.76-77). The members or protesters or persuaders in a movement try vehemently to put pressure on the opposition parties to a movement, either government or otherwise. It is neither easy nor plausible, but can be achieved only after so many deliberations. Once pressurized, the opposition parties’ sympathy will be easily gained.

Gaining sympathy and legitimacy involves provoking opposing institutions into actions that reveal their ugliness (Stewart, Smith & Denton, 2007, p.77). There is another way to gain sympathy also. By provoking and challenging them, members of the movement can make them act, the result of which may be the outcome of shady transactions. Out of them being exposed, they may come to terms with the protesters and support the cause for which the movement has been initiated.

3.4.2.6 Sustaining the Movement

Even after all these functions if the movement fails, then sustaining the movement will be a daunting task. To motivate and encourage the members of the movement, the
leaders or the organizers can resort to tools and techniques to sustain the movement. To sustain a social movement, Stewart, Smith and Denton (2007) argue that setbacks and delays must be justified, and the viability and visibility of the movement must be maintained (p.78-80). In spite of setbacks and delays, the organizers should interact with the members and convince them of their future role and the ensuing benefits of such sustainable activity.

Based on measurements of perceived impact of the environmental movement, these attitudes were shown by the poll to specifically be a result of evaluations of the environmental movement itself, rather than a result of other factors such as political polarization (Dunlap, 2010). Political factors may speed up the process of obtaining a solution in the light of a sustained effort, but the resultant impact of such a sustained movement is always critical and memorable.