Nupus & Ainani
MetaCommunication: Journal of Communication Studies
Vol. 11 No. 1, 2026, pp. 62-77

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

The Role of Banjarmasin Post Online Media in Educating Waste Management in North Banjarmasin

Hayatun Nupus, Muhammad Ainani
Communication Science Study Program, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, Kalimantan Selatan, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author: 2210414220008@mhs.ulm.ac.id

Submitted: June 09, 2025 Revised: October 04, 2025 Accepted: May 13, 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examines how Banjarmasin Post, a local online news outlet in South Kalimantan, frames waste management as a topic of public education in North Banjarmasin. Using Robert N. Entman's framing analysis model, this research analyzes three news articles published by the outlet in April 2025. The study uses a descriptive qualitative approach focused entirely on textual analysis, systematically applying Entman's four framing elements—problem definition, causal diagnosis, moral judgment, and treatment recommendation—to each article. The findings show that all three articles assign moral value to waste management efforts and include treatment recommendations consistent with public education goals. However, the framing consistently portrays the government and schools as the primary drivers of change, while overlooking structural barriers such as inadequate infrastructure and weak policy enforcement. The coverage of SDN Pengambangan 5 exhibits a characteristic individual responsibility frame, which places the burden of environmental change on individuals and educational institutions rather than on systemic actors. Overall, Banjarmasin Post's reporting remains event-driven and lacks the critical depth needed to sustain meaningful public education on waste management. These findings have implications for how local media can strengthen its role as an environmental communication platform.

Keywords: Framing Analysis; Banjarmasin Post; Waste Management; Environmental Education; Online Media

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

INTRODUCTION

Waste management is one of the most persistent urban challenges in Indonesia, particularly in mid-sized cities where population growth has outpaced waste infrastructure development. In Banjarmasin, the capital of South Kalimantan, the problem is both logistical and behavioral. The local government has introduced programs such as the *"Surung Sintak"* system to improve waste collection from temporary to final disposal sites. Yet these efforts have been limited by a shortage of waste management personnel and insufficient supporting infrastructure (Triani, 2025). More fundamentally, community-level participation in waste sorting remains low, partly because public awareness of the importance of waste separation at the household level is still lacking (Muhaimin & Jumriani, 2023).

This behavioral gap points to the central role that public communication—particularly media—can play in shaping environmental knowledge and attitudes. Across different national contexts, research has consistently shown that how media frames environmental issues influences how the public understands, values, and responds to those issues (Carvalho, 2007; Moser, 2010). In the Indonesian context, local online media has emerged as a primary source of daily information for urban communities, making its framing choices particularly significant for environmental education (Ida et al., 2020).

However, existing research on Indonesian media and environmental communication tends to focus on national outlets and broad issues such as forest fires or climate change (Sujoko et al., 2019; Wahidar & Yozani, 2020). Very little attention has been paid to how *local* online media frames hyper-local waste issues in specific urban communities. This is a meaningful gap, because local media operates with different editorial priorities, audience proximities, and resource constraints than national outlets—all of which may shape how waste management is constructed as a public problem.

This study addresses that gap by examining how Banjarmasin Post frames waste management education in three news articles published in April 2025. The analysis applies Robert N. Entman's (1993) framing analysis model, which provides a structured framework for identifying the values, causes, judgments, and solutions embedded in media texts. The central research

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

question is: *how does Banjarmasin Post frame waste management as a public education issue in North Banjarmasin, and what are the implications of these frames for the media's educational function?*

This study makes two contributions. First, it extends framing analysis to hyper-local online journalism in Indonesia, a context that has been largely overlooked in the literature. Second, it produces an evaluative account of how a local media outlet constructs environmental responsibility, specifically whether it distributes responsibility across systemic and individual actors or concentrates it in particular sites. The findings are relevant not only to media scholars but also to journalists and local policymakers seeking to improve the quality of environmental public education.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Framing Theory and Media Texts

Framing refers to the process by which media select, emphasize, and present aspects of a social reality in ways that promote particular interpretations (Entman, 1993). Rather than passively reflecting events, media texts actively construct meanings by choosing which facts to highlight and which to omit, which actors to center and which to marginalize, and which values to invoke. Framing is therefore a form of power: it shapes the boundaries of legitimate public debate and influences what audiences regard as the causes of, and solutions to, social problems (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007).

Entman's (1993) model identifies four functions that frames perform in a text. First, frames *define problems* by specifying what is going wrong and whose costs and benefits are involved. Second, they *diagnose causes* by identifying the forces responsible for creating the problem. Third, they *make moral judgments* by evaluating causal agents and their effects. Fourth, they *suggest remedies* by recommending treatments and predicting their likely effects. These four elements do not always appear together in a single text, but their presence or absence is analytically meaningful: what a text says about solutions, for example, is shaped by what it has already said about causes and blame.

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

Framing analysis has been widely applied to environmental journalism. Researchers have found that news coverage of environmental issues tends to favor certain types of frames particularly those that foreground government action, technological solutions, or individual behavioral change while downplaying structural and political dimensions of environmental problems (Boyce & Lewis, 2009; Carvalho, 2007). These framing tendencies have important consequences for environmental public education: they may inspire concern or action in some readers while depoliticizing issues for others (Nisbet, 2009).

Environmental Communication and Local Media

Environmental communication encompasses the range of practices through which public actors—governments, NGOs, scientists, and media—convey information about environmental issues and motivate responses (Cox, 2013). Media plays a particularly central role in this ecosystem because it mediates between expert knowledge and public understanding. As Corbett (2006) notes, news media can function as an environmental educator, but only if its coverage moves beyond event-driven reporting to engage with the underlying social, political, and ecological dimensions of environmental problems.

In Indonesia, digital news platforms have become the primary medium through which urban communities access environmental information (Ida et al., 2020). Local online outlets such as Banjarmasin Post occupy a distinctive position: they have strong ties to their communities and cover issues that national media ignores, but they also operate with smaller editorial teams, tighter resource constraints, and greater dependence on official sources (Prastya, 2016). These structural conditions can shape framing choices—for instance, by making journalists more reliant on government press releases as primary sources, or less likely to invest in investigative environmental reporting.

Research on Indonesian media and environmental issues has identified recurring patterns. Sujoko et al. (2019) found that online media covering forest fire disasters in Indonesia tended to emphasize the scale and impact of the disaster while framing the government response as slow and inadequate. Similarly, Wahidar and Yozani (2020) observed that local digital news outlets frame environmental crises primarily through an event-centered lens, rarely engaging with structural or

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

policy-level analysis. These findings provide a comparative baseline for the present study's analysis of Banjarmasin Post.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a descriptive qualitative design with textual framing analysis as its sole method of data collection and analysis. No interviews or surveys were conducted. The analytical approach draws entirely on the written content of three news articles published by Banjarmasin Post, which are treated as texts that embed specific framing choices amenable to systematic interpretation (Krippendorff, 2018). This text-based approach is appropriate given the study's objective: to understand how a media outlet constructs an issue through its language, emphasis, and narrative choices, rather than to assess audience reception or journalist intent.

The corpus consists of three online news articles published by Banjarmasin Post in April 2025, retrieved from the outlet's digital archive. Articles were identified through a keyword search using the terms "sampah" (waste) and "Banjarmasin Utara" (North Banjarmasin). From the resulting list, three articles were purposively selected based on two criteria: (1) direct relevance to waste management education in the North Banjarmasin district, and (2) diversity of focus to ensure the sample represents a range of actors (government, school, community) and framing strategies rather than a single narrative. Purposive sampling in textual research is justified when the goal is theoretical illustration rather than statistical generalization (Neuman, 2014). The three selected articles are listed in Table 2.

Each article was analyzed by applying Entman's (1993) four-element framing model to the paragraph as the unit of analysis. The paragraph was chosen because it constitutes a coherent argumentative unit in which framing choices become visible through the selection and ordering of information (Pan & Kosicki, 1993). A structured coding sheet was developed *a priori* from the four elements of the model. Each paragraph was coded for the presence of one or more framing elements, and the patterns identified across each article were then synthesized to characterize the dominant frames.

To ensure coding consistency, the researcher applied the coding scheme independently to all three articles in two rounds separated by a one-week interval. Any coding discrepancies

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

between rounds were resolved by returning to the theoretical definitions of each framing element. This reflexive process is consistent with established practice in qualitative content analysis (Mayring, 2014). The results of the framing analysis are presented both narratively and in a summary table (Table 3) that maps each article to the four framing elements.

Table 1 Robert Entman's Framing Elements

No	Element	Description
1	Define Problems	How the issue is framed as a problem: what is going wrong, whose interests are at stake, and what costs and benefits are involved.
2	Diagnose Causes	Who or what is identified as the cause of the problem: individuals, institutions, social conditions, or policies.
3	Make Moral Judgments	What moral or ethical evaluations are attached to the problem and its causes, expressed through tone, word choice, and the selection of evidence.
4	Treatment Recommendations	What solutions or courses of action are proposed or implied, and who is expected to act.

Source: Entman (1993) ; Eriyanto (2002)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

This section presents the findings of the framing analysis of the three selected Banjarmasin Post articles. For each article, the four elements of Entman's model are applied in sequence, followed by a critical discussion of the framing implications. A cross-article synthesis then identifies the dominant framing patterns and their consequences for the media's educational function.

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

Table 2 Articles Selected for Framing Analysis

No	News Title	Date	Summary of Focus
1	Optimistis Benahi Pengelolaan Sampah di Banjarmasin, Pemko Rancang Sistem	15 April 2025	City government's plan to introduce a structured waste-sorting system across North Banjarmasin, involving public education campaigns and expert support.
2	Aksi Nyata SDN Pengambangan 5 Banjarmasin, Sudah Kelola Sampah Sejak Dulu	16 April 2025	A primary school presented as a model of long-standing environmental education, with student practices in waste sorting and reuse.
3	Kumpulkan Ratusan Warga di Balai Kota, Pemko Banjarmasin Ajak Masyarakat Pilah Sampah dari Rumah	4 April 2025	A mass community event at City Hall to promote household-level waste sorting, co-organized by the government and local waste banks.

Source: Banjarmasin Post Digital Archive (2025)

Article 1: *"Optimistis Benahi Pengelolaan Sampah di Banjarmasin, Pemko Rancang Sistem"*

At the level of *problem definition*, this article frames the central issue as the absence of a systematic, city-wide mechanism for sorting waste at the household level. The problem is characterized as both technical and behavioral: residents lack both the infrastructure and the knowledge to sort waste correctly. This framing is consistent with what Gamson and Modigliani (1989) describe as a *systemic progress frame*, in which complex social problems are presented as solvable through organized institutional action.

The *causal diagnosis* in this article is primarily institutional. Responsibility for the current state of waste mismanagement is implicitly attributed to the absence of a coordinated system—a gap the city government is now positioned to fill. Individual behavior is mentioned, but it is framed as a product of insufficient guidance rather than as a cause in its own right. This distribution of blame has a significant implication: it locates agency at the governmental level, which can

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

encourage readers to see themselves as passive beneficiaries of institutional action rather than as active participants in waste management (Nisbet, 2009).

The *moral judgment* embedded in the article is openly positive toward the city government. The administration is described as "committed" and "forward-thinking," using terms that carry normative weight without being tested against evidence. This type of *promotional framing*—in which official actors are valorized without critical scrutiny—has been identified as a recurring feature of Indonesian regional media's environmental coverage, partly because reporters often rely heavily on official press releases as their primary source (Prastya, 2016).

The *treatment recommendation* is collaborative and education-oriented: the article proposes waste collection schedules organized by waste type, district-level outreach, and involvement of the Indonesian Waste Bank Association. These solutions are constructive and concrete, which aligns with what Moser (2010) calls *efficacious framing* was coverage that not only identifies a problem but provides audiences with a sense that meaningful action is possible. However, the article stops short of acknowledging potential implementation barriers such as budget constraints, limited bin infrastructure, or low institutional capacity at the district level omissions that weaken its educational depth.

Article 2: *"Aksi Nyata SDN Pengambangan 5 Banjarmasin, Sudah Kelola Sampah Sejak Dulu"*

This article introduces a qualitatively different framing logic. At the *problem definition* level, environmental irresponsibility is framed as a failure of education and habit formation that begins in early life. The underlying assumption is that if children develop pro-environmental habits in school, these habits will eventually transform community behavior more broadly. This is a recognizable frame in environmental communication, sometimes referred to as the *educational multiplier frame* in which schools are positioned as agents of long-term cultural change (Chawla & Cushing, 2007).

The *causal diagnosis* is correspondingly individualistic. The article implies that the root of the community's waste problem lies in the absence of early environmental education, rather than in structural conditions such as inadequate government investment in waste infrastructure or the

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

unequal distribution of waste services across districts. This is a critical limitation. Research on environmental behavior has consistently shown that individual knowledge and attitudes are insufficient predictors of pro-environmental action when structural enablers such as accessible bins, clear signage, or reliable collection services are absent (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Steg & Vlek, 2009). By omitting structural causes, the article risks producing a misleading account of why waste management problems persist.

The *moral judgment* is celebratory: the school is presented as an exceptional institution, morally praiseworthy for its long-standing commitment to environmental education. This valorization is not inherently problematic, but it becomes so when the school's success is presented without context, specifically without acknowledging the resources, parental support, and institutional culture that make such achievements possible and that may not be replicable in other schools. As Boyce and Lewis (2009) observe, inspirational environmental stories can inadvertently *depoliticize* an issue by suggesting that local determination is sufficient without addressing the systemic conditions that constrain it.

The *treatment recommendation* follows naturally from the framing, more schools should adopt similar environmental education programs. The article presents classroom learning, real-world practice, and parental engagement as the key pathways to behavioral change. While these are valuable, the absence of any structural recommendations, such as calls for government investment in school waste facilities or policy mandates for environmental education reflects what scholars call the *individual responsibility frame*: a narrative in which the burden of addressing a systemic problem is placed on individuals and small institutions rather than on the state or industry (Boyce & Lewis, 2009; Carvalho, 2007). This frame may be empowering for motivated readers but can produce a sense of inadequacy in those who recognize that individual effort alone is insufficient.

Article 3: *"Kumpulkan Ratusan Warga di Balai Kota, Pemko Banjarmasin Ajak Masyarakat Pilah Sampah dari Rumah"*

The third article adopts a participatory framing centered on mass community engagement. At the *problem definition* level, the article identifies low household-level waste sorting adoption

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

as the central issue, with the implication that what is needed is not more government policy but more direct public engagement and behavior change. This is a subtle but important shift from Article 1: whereas that article framed the problem as primarily systemic, this article frames it as primarily behavioral, with households as the key site of intervention.

The *causal diagnosis* points to insufficient public education and limited community and government coordination as the primary drivers of low participation. The government event at City Hall is implicitly presented as the corrective to this gap. However, as with the previous articles, structural factors such as the limited availability of differentiated waste bins in residential areas, or the inconsistency of waste collection services are not addressed.

The *moral judgment* is again government-favorable. The city administration is presented as proactive, responsive, and community-oriented. The event itself is constructed as evidence of institutional commitment, with quantitative markers "hundreds of residents" used to signal scale and legitimacy. This type of *scale-and-authority framing* is common in coverage of government-organized events and tends to foreclose critical questions about long-term effectiveness or follow-up (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007).

The *treatment recommendation* is direct and action-oriented: residents are encouraged to sort waste at home, and the article presents practical demonstrations at the event as models for household adoption. This is the closest any of the three articles comes to what Wakefield et al. (2001) call *action-enabling framing* coverage that provides audiences with concrete, replicable steps rather than abstract calls for behavioral change. However, the article ends at the event itself; there is no mention of how success will be measured, how the behavior will be sustained, or what institutional follow-up is planned. This event-driven closure is characteristic of media that prioritize episodic over thematic framing, a distinction that has been shown to affect how audiences assign responsibility for social problems (Iyengar, 1991).

Table 3 Articles Selected for Framing Analysis

Framing Element	Article 1	Article 2	Article 3
Define Problems	Absence of systemic waste-sorting mechanism	Lack of early environmental education	Low household participation in waste sorting

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

Diagnose Causes	Absence of coordinated government system	Insufficient education and individual habits	Weak community–government coordination
Make Moral Judgments	Government praised as committed and forward-thinking	School valorized as morally exemplary	Government praised as proactive and community-oriented
Treatment Recommendations	District outreach, waste-type schedules, expert involvement	School-based environmental programs and parental engagement	Community events, household demonstrations, waste bank partnerships
Dominant Frame	Systemic progress frame	Individual responsibility frame	Participatory/event-driven frame

Cross-Article Analysis: Framing Patterns and Educational Implications

Read together, the three articles reveal a coherent but limited editorial logic. Across all three, Banjarmasin Post consistently adopts a constructive and optimistic tone, foregrounding progress and institutional effort rather than failure or contestation. This *positive framing* tendency serves a legitimate motivational function: research in environmental psychology has shown that hopeful and efficacious frames can increase public willingness to engage in pro-environmental behavior (Moser, 2010; Nabi et al., 2018). However, positive framing alone is insufficient for deep environmental education if it systematically excludes critical perspectives on why problems persist.

The most important structural pattern across all three articles is the consistent omission of *structural barriers* to effective waste management. None of the articles mentions the scarcity of differentiated waste bins in residential areas, the inconsistency of collection services, the limited government budget allocated to waste infrastructure, or the regulatory weaknesses that allow informal waste dumping to continue. This pattern of omission is analytically significant. As Entman (1993, p. 52) observes, frames operate not only through what is present in a text but through what is absent. By systematically excluding structural explanations, Banjarmasin Post's framing narrows the public's understanding of why waste management problems exist and reduces the range of solutions that appear thinkable.

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

A second pattern is the *concentration of moral approval* on government actors and individual institutions. In all three articles, those who act whether the city government, the school, or event organizers are presented positively, while those who do not (ordinary households, informal sector actors) are implicitly positioned as the problem to be solved. This distributional logic reinforces a top-down model of environmental education, in which change flows from authorized institutions to passive communities, rather than emerging from collective civic engagement (Corbett, 2006; Cox, 2013).

A third pattern is the *episodic structure* of all three articles. Each piece reports on a discrete event or initiative without situating it in a longer history of waste management efforts, comparing it to outcomes in other cities, or asking whether similar past initiatives have succeeded or failed. Iyengar (1991) (1991) has shown that episodic framing coverage of single events without thematic context tends to make audiences attribute problems to individual actors and circumstances rather than to structural conditions. This framing effect is directly counterproductive for environmental education, which aims to build sustained, systemic understanding of complex issues (Moser, 2010).

Despite these limitations, Banjarmasin Post's coverage does demonstrate genuine educational potential. The treatment recommendations embedded in the three articles are concrete, locally relevant, and actionable. The articles consistently motivate participation, communicate basic information about waste sorting, and celebrate community level initiatives. These are meaningful contributions to environmental public communication, even if they do not yet achieve the depth of critical environmental journalism. The challenge for the outlet is to move from *informational* framing—reporting what is happening—to *interpretive and critical* framing—explaining why problems persist and what structural changes are needed (Schäfer & O'Neill, 2017).

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

CONCLUSION

This study analyzed how Banjarmasin Post frames waste management as a public education issue through three news articles published in April 2025. Using Entman's (1993) four-element framing model and a text-based qualitative approach, the analysis identified three dominant frames: a *systemic progress frame* in Article 1, an *individual responsibility frame* in Article 2, and a *participatory/event-driven frame* in Article 3. While these frames differ in their specific emphases, they share a common structure: they foreground institutional action and positive outcomes, assign moral approval to government and school actors, and omit structural barriers to effective waste management.

The findings indicate that Banjarmasin Post currently fulfills an informational and motivational function in environmental public education its articles are constructive, action-oriented, and locally relevant. However, the coverage falls short of the critical and thematic depth needed to build sustained public understanding of why waste management problems persist in North Banjarmasin. The consistent absence of structural analysis, diverse source perspectives, and follow-up reporting limits the outlet's capacity to function as a genuine environmental educator rather than an amplifier of official communication.

These findings carry practical implications. To strengthen its environmental education function, Banjarmasin Post would benefit from diversifying its source base to include environmental experts, residents, and civil society actors; from adopting thematic framing that situates individual events within longer-term trends; and from covering not only government initiatives but also the structural conditions infrastructure gaps, enforcement weaknesses, and resource inequalities that shape household waste behavior. Such shifts would bring the outlet's framing closer to what scholars of environmental journalism describe as *solution journalism*: coverage that engages rigorously with both the problems and the systemic conditions needed to address them (Cox, 2013; Schäfer & O'Neill, 2017).

This study has several limitations. The corpus is small—three articles from a single outlet over a one-month period—which limits the generalizability of the findings. Future research should

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

analyze a larger corpus of Banjarmasin Post articles on environmental topics over a longer time frame, and could usefully compare the outlet's framing with that of other local and national online media covering similar issues. The study also does not assess how audiences receive or act on the frames identified; future work combining textual framing analysis with reader surveys or reception studies would provide a more complete account of the outlet's educational effects.

REFERENCES

Boyce, T., & Lewis, J. (2009). *Climate change and the media*.

Carvalho, A. (2007). Ideological cultures and media discourses on scientific knowledge: re-reading news on climate change. *Public Understanding of Science*, *16*(2), 223–243. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662506066775

Chawla, L., & Cushing, D. F. (2007). Education for strategic environmental behavior. *Environmental Education Research*, *13*(4), 437–452. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620701581539

Corbett, J. B. (2006). *Communicating nature: How we create and understand environmental messages*. Island Press.

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

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, *43*(4), 51–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x

Eriyanto. (2002). *Analisis framing: Konstruksi, ideologi, dan politik media*. PT LKiS.

Ida, R., Saud, M., & Mashud, M. (2020). An empirical analysis of social media usage, political learning and participation among youth: a comparative study of Indonesia and Pakistan. *Quality & Quantity*, *54*(4), 1285–1297. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-020-00985-9

Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues*. University of Chicago Press.

Kollmuss, A., & Agyeman, J. (2002). Mind the gap: Why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior? *Environmental Education Research*, *8*(3), 239–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620210145401

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

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

Mayring, P. (2014). *Qualitative content analysis: Theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution*. SSOAR.

Moser, S. C. (2010). Communicating climate change: History, challenges, process and future directions. *WIREs Climate Change*, *1*(1), 31–53. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.11

Muhaimin, M., & Jumriani, J. (2023). Analisis permasalahan sampah rumah tangga di bantaran sungai Kota Banjarmasin. *ASANKA: Journal of Social Science and Education*, *4*(1), 34–43.

Nabi, R. L., Gustafson, A., & Jensen, R. (2018). Framing climate change: Exploring the role of emotion in generating advocacy behavior. *Science Communication*, *40*(4), 442–468. https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547018776019

Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7, Ed.). Pearson.

Nisbet, M. C. (2009). Communicating climate change: Why frames matter for public engagement. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, *51*(2), 12–23. https://doi.org/10.3200/ENVT.51.2.12-23

Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, *10*(1), 55–75. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.1993.9962963

Prastya, N. M. (2016). Analisis framing dalam riset public relations. *Informasi: Kajian Ilmu Komunikasi*, *46*(2), 191–200. https://doi.org/10.21831/informasi.v46i2.10565

Schäfer, M. S., & O'Neill, S. (2017). Frame analysis in climate change communication. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of climate science*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228620.013.487

Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models. *Journal of Communication*, *57*(1), 9–20. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9916.2007.00326.x

Steg, L., & Vlek, C. (2009). Encouraging pro-environmental behaviour: An integrative review and research agenda. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *29*(3), 309–317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2008.10.004

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies

P-ISSN: 2356-4490
E-ISSN :2549-693X

Sujoko, A., Apriliani, C., & Fikri, A. R. (2019). Bencana kabut asap dalam bingkai media online. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, *17*(3), 224–234. https://doi.org/10.31315/jik.v17i3.3773

Triani, N. (2025). *Efektivitas Program Surung Sintak dalam pengelolaan sampah oleh Dinas Lingkungan Hidup di Kota Banjarmasin*.

Wahidar, T. I., & Yozani, R. E. (2020). Analisis framing pemberitaan kebakaran hutan dan lahan di Riaupos.co dan Tribunpekanbaru.com periode 15-17 September 2019. *Jurnal Kajian Jurnalisme*, *4*(1), 47–60. https://doi.org/10.24198/jkj.v4i1.26224

Wakefield, S. E. L., Elliott, S. J., Cole, D. C., & Eyles, J. D. (2001). Environmental risk and (re)action: air quality, health, and civic involvement in an urban industrial neighbourhood. *Health & Place*, *7*(3), 163–177. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1353-8292(01)00006-5

© 2026 MetaCommunication; Journal of Communication Studies