Impact Factor (SJIF): 6.126 E-ISSN: 2583-1615, P-ISSN: 3049-3498

International Journal of Research in Academic World

Received: 06/August/2025 **IJRAW:** 2025; 4(9):230-234 **Accepted:** 19/September/2025

Beyond Greenwashing: A Critical Analysis of Environmental Education in India's National Education Policy 2020

[*1]Dr. Mohammad Irshad Hussain

[*1]Associate Professor, Department of Teacher Education, Halim Muslim P.G. College, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India.

Abstract

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 of India explicitly mandates the integration of environmental awareness and sensitivity throughout the educational continuum. This paper conducts a rigorous critical analysis of the NEP's framework for Environmental Education (EE), moving beyond a descriptive summary to interrogate its underlying philosophy, operational feasibility, and potential to foster transformative ecological citizenship. Through a qualitative content analysis of the NEP 2020 policy document, supplemented by a review of subsequent foundational curricula frameworks, this research argues that while the NEP represents a significant discursive advancement by mainstreaming EE, its approach risks remaining symbolic and cognitively focused. The analysis identifies three central tensions:

i). The juxtaposition of a perceived "global citizenship" ethos promoting sustainability against a concurrent nationalist emphasis on economic growth and development;

ii). The gap between the interdisciplinary ambition of EE and its likely implementation within a siloed, assessment-driven system; and

iii). The challenge of transitioning from awareness-based pedagogy to action-oriented, experiential learning.

The paper concludes that without explicit pedagogical guidance, substantial teacher preparation, and a critical reconceptualization of the human-nature relationship within curricula, the NEP's environmental vision may culminate in "greenwashing" the education system rather than catalyzing the deep, behavioral, and structural change necessary to address India's profound ecological crises.

Keywords: Environmental Education, NEP 2020, Ecological Citizenship, Sustainability Education, Curriculum Policy, India.

Introduction

India stands at a critical juncture of ecological precarity and educational reform. Facing escalating crises—from catastrophic air pollution and water scarcity to biodiversity loss and climate vulnerability—the need for an ecologically literate citizenry has never been more urgent. Concurrently, the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 proposes the most comprehensive overhaul of the Indian education system in over three decades. Within its expansive vision, the NEP accords notable, repeated emphasis on environmental education (EE), stating its goal to develop "awareness and sensitivity to the environment" as a foundational pillar from early childhood onwards (Government of India [GoI], 2020, p. 6). This explicit integration marks a departure from previous policies where EE was often peripheral or confined to a single subject.

However, policy pronouncements do not automatically translate into transformative educational practice. This paper argues that a rigorous examination of the NEP's environmental mandate must look beyond its laudable intentions to critically analyze its conceptual framing, structural coherence, and likely implementation challenges. The central research question guiding this inquiry is: To what extent does the framework for Environmental Education in NEP 2020 possess the conceptual clarity, pedagogical direction, and critical edge necessary to foster transformative ecological citizenship, rather than merely reinforcing awareness-based or symbolic approaches?

This study employs a qualitative content analysis methodology, primarily focusing on the NEP 2020 policy document. It examines explicit mentions, thematic placements, and the discursive construction of environmental concerns. This analysis is contextualized within the broader literature on EE paradigms—from instrumental "education about the environment" to emancipatory "education for the environment" (Fien, 1993)—and informed by critical policy analysis frameworks that consider the interplay between text, context, and potential outcomes (Ball, 1993). The paper is

***Corresponding Author:** Dr. Mohammad Irshad Hussain

structured to first outline the NEP's stated vision for EE, then critically analyze its philosophical tensions, pedagogical gaps, and implementation barriers, before concluding with recommendations for a more robust and transformative pathway.

The NEP 2020 Vision for Environmental Education: A Descriptive Overview

The NEP 2020 integrates environmental concerns across multiple sections, signaling a cross-curricular and holistic intent. Its most direct articulation is found in the section on "Curriculum and Pedagogy in Schools," which lists "Environmental Awareness" as a core foundational pillar for curriculum development (GoI, 2020, p. 11). The policy explicitly states:

"Environmental awareness will be integrated into all subjects and in every year of schooling. This will include... understanding of how humans and the environment interact, the impact of human activity on the environment, the need for sustainable living, and the steps that can be taken to protect and conserve the environment." (GoI, 2020, p. 15).

This integration is envisioned across all stages of the new 5+3+3+4 curricular structure. At the Foundational Stage (ages 3-8), the focus is on developing "awareness and sensitivity towards the immediate environment" through interactive and activity-based methods (GoI, 2020, p. 12). The Preparatory Stage (ages 8-11) aims to build a more formal understanding of environmental issues. The Middle Stage (ages 11-14) proposes a significant shift by introducing "experiential learning" in environmental science, including "hands-on activities, surveys, field visits, and projects" (GoI, 2020, p. 14). Finally, the Secondary Stage (ages 14-18) promises greater depth, choice, and critical thinking, allowing students to engage with complex environmental challenges (GoI, 2020, p. 15).

Beyond subject integration, the NEP links EE to broader curricular themes like "Ethical and Moral Reasoning" and "Community Service" (GoI, 2020, p. 11). It also connects to the promotion of Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS), suggesting that traditional ecological knowledge from texts and practices could inform sustainable living (GoI, 2020, p. 16). In higher education, the policy's emphasis on multidisciplinary learning creates a potential space for sophisticated environmental studies programs that integrate sciences, social sciences, ethics, and policy.

On the surface, this framework appears comprehensive. It spans all ages, advocates for interdisciplinary, and promotes active pedagogy. However, a critical deconstruction reveals significant tensions and ambiguities that threaten to dilute its transformative potential.

Critical Analysis: Philosophical Tensions and Discursive Contradictions

The NEP's treatment of the environment is not situated within a singular, coherent philosophical framework. Instead, it oscillates between competing paradigms, creating a fundamental tension at the heart of its proposal.

1. Instrumental 'Green Growth' vs. Critical Ecology:

A dominant thread within the NEP aligns with an instrumental, "green growth" narrative. The environment is often framed as a resource to be managed or a problem to be solved through human ingenuity, within the broader imperative of national development. For instance, the policy's introduction links education directly to national goals, stating it is "the key to achieving full human potential, developing an equitable and just society, and promoting national development" (GoI, 2020, p. 4). This developmentalist discourse, while not inherently anti-environmental, often subordinates ecological limits to economic objectives. EE, in this reading, becomes a tool for producing skilled human capital to drive a future "green economy," rather than questioning the growth paradigm itself.

This stands in tension with more critical ecological perspectives hinted at elsewhere, such as the call for "sustainable living" and understanding "the impact of human activity" (GoI, 2020, p. 15). A truly critical EE would encourage students to interrogate the structural drivers of environmental degradation—consumerism, inequitable resource distribution, and power dynamics—as outlined by scholars like Huckle and Sterling (1996). The NEP, however, shies away from this political dimension. The lack of terms like "environmental justice," "climate justice," or "political ecology" is telling. The focus remains largely on individual awareness and behavior change (e.g., conservation steps), potentially obscuring the need for systemic critique and collective action against powerful polluting industries or unsustainable policies.

2. Universal 'Global Citizenship' vs. Nationalist Particularism:

The NEP repeatedly invokes the idea of preparing students as "global citizens" who possess "21st-century skills" (GoI, 2020, p. 6). Environmental stewardship is a key attribute of this global citizen, connected to universal challenges like climate change. Simultaneously, the policy is deeply imbued with a spirit of cultural nationalism and "India-centeredness," most evident in the push for Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS). This creates a discursive field where environmental wisdom is to be sourced from ancient Indian texts and traditions—a potentially valuable but also romanticized and selective endeavor.

The challenge lies in harmonizing these frames. Will EE draw from IKS to reinforce a narrative of India's historical ecological harmony, or will it critically engage with both traditional wisdom and modern scientific ecology to address contemporary problems? The policy does not provide guidance on navigating this potential clash between universalist scientific paradigms and particularist cultural claims, which could lead to inconsistent or ideologically charged interpretations at the implementation stage.

Pedagogical Ambiguities: From Rhetoric to Classroom Reality

The NEP's pedagogical recommendations for EE, while progressive in language, suffer from vagueness and disconnect from ground realities.

i). **The Experiential Learning Gap:** The policy's strong advocacy for "experiential learning" in the Middle Stage is commendable. However, it offers no concrete blueprint for how this will be operationalized in diverse Indian contexts. For a school in a crowded urban settlement with no green space, or a rural school with minimal infrastructure, what constitutes "field visits" or "hands-on activities"? The document states learning should be "rooted in the Indian and local context" (GoI, 2020, p. 11) but fails to address the resource inequity that determines access to such contextually rich experiences. Experiential EE requires time, funding, logistical support, and teacher confidence—none of which are guaranteed.

Without specific resource allocation and guidelines, this mandate risks becoming an elite privilege or a tokenistic activity, reducing "field visits" to sporadic, poorly integrated outings.

ii). **Interdisciplinary as a Structural Challenge:** The call to integrate EE "into all subjects" is a classic formulation in EE literature (UNESCO, 1978). Yet, the Indian school system is notoriously siloed, with rigid subject boundaries, separate teacher cadres, and high-stakes board examinations that prioritize disciplinary knowledge. Asking a language teacher or a mathematics teacher to seamlessly incorporate environmental awareness requires not just will, but deep pedagogical retooling. The NEP proposes no structural mechanisms to facilitate this integration, such as collaborative lesson planning time, interdisciplinary curriculum modules, or revised assessment patterns that value integrated projects. As Stevenson (2007) argues, without systemic support, interdisciplinary remains a rhetorical ideal, and EE becomes confined to science and geography periods, perpetuating its status as an "add-on" rather than a lens for all learning.

iii). **The Absence of a Critical Action Orientation:** The ultimate goal of transformative EE is not just knowledge but action—fostering "environmental citizenship" where learners feel empowered to engage in sustainable practices and civic advocacy (Dobson, 2007). The NEP mentions "community service" and "participation in activities for caring for the environment" (GoI, 2020, p. 15), but its tone is largely apolitical and consensual. There is no encouragement for students to analyze environmental conflicts in their locality, engage with different stakeholders (including activists and affected communities), or develop skills for advocacy, persuasion, and peaceful protest. This sanitized approach produces what Sauvé (2005) might term a "conservationist" model of EE, focused on stewardship and protection, while avoiding the "socially critical" model that addresses issues of power, conflict, and transformative change.

Implementation Barriers: The Ecosystem Beyond the Text

A policy document exists within a complex ecosystem. Several systemic barriers threaten to undermine the NEP's environmental ambitions.

i). **Teacher Preparedness as the Primary Bottleneck:** Teachers are the ultimate arbiters of any curricular reform. The current teaching workforce, trained in outdated, chalk-and-talk methods and often lacking deep environmental understanding themselves, is ill-prepared to facilitate experiential, interdisciplinary, critical EE. The NEP's own vision for a new National Professional Standards for Teachers (NPST) and a 4-year integrated B.Ed. is promising but long-term (GoI, 2020, p. 20). The critical question is: what happens in the interim? The massive task of in-service teacher professional development (CPD) on EE is hinted at but not elaborated. Without sustained, high-quality, and mandatory CPD that moves beyond content updating to pedagogical transformation, teachers will likely fall back on textbook-centric, fact-delivery modes, reducing EE to memorizing definitions of biodiversity or the three R's (Reduce, Reuse, Recycle).

ii). **The Tyranny of Assessment:** As long as high-stakes board examinations prioritize recall of discrete facts, any pedagogical innovation will struggle. The NEP proposes moving towards "competency-based" and "formative" assessment (GoI, 2020, p. 18), which is essential for evaluating critical thinking, values, and action competencies in EE. However, designing and administering such assessments at scale is a monumental challenge. Without explicit examples of how to assess "environmental sensitivity" or "action-taking," schools and examination boards will default to what is easily measurable: written tests on environmental science facts. This will inevitably "wash back" into teaching, negating all pedagogical promises.

iii). **Resource Constraints and Institutional Priorities:** Implementing dynamic EE requires investment: in creating green campuses, developing local learning resources (e.g., biodiversity registers, water auditing kits), funding field trips, and providing digital tools for virtual explorations. In a system grappling with basic shortages of classrooms, toilets, and textbooks, EE will naturally be deprioritized unless backed by dedicated, non-negotiable funding. Furthermore, school leadership must value and champion EE. In a climate obsessed with academic rankings in STEM subjects, persuading school principals to allocate time and resources to environmental projects will be an uphill battle without clear mandates and success indicators from regulatory bodies.

Case in Point: The National Curriculum Framework 2023

A preliminary analysis of the subsequent National Curriculum Framework for School Education (NCF-SE) 2023, developed to operationalize the NEP, reveals both promise and persistent gaps. On one hand, it strengthens the EE mandate by embedding "Environmental Sensitivity" as a panchakosha (five-fold) "Vidya Pravesh" area and emphasizing "habitat-based learning" (National Council of Educational Research and Training [NCERT], 2023, pp. 23, 41). It provides more concrete thematic suggestions, such as studying local ecosystems and waste management.

However, critical analysis suggests the fundamental tensions remain. The NCF-SE (2023) states, "The curriculum should help learners develop a deep understanding of the natural world… and the impact of human activities on it, and motivate them to work towards sustainable development" (p. 19). The phrase "sustainable development" again encapsulates the compromise between ecological integrity and developmental needs. While it advocates for "critical thinking," the examples largely steer clear of politically charged local environmental disputes. The framework's success hinges entirely on the yet-to-be-developed school textbooks, teacher handbooks, and assessment patterns, leaving the door open for both transformative practice and diluted implementation.

Towards a Transformative Pathway: Recommendations

For the NEP's environmental vision to move beyond symbolic greenwashing, a concerted, multi-level effort is required. The following recommendations address the gaps identified:

1. **Conceptual and Curricular Clarity:**

- **Develop an EE Position Paper:** The Ministry of Education should commission and publish a clear position paper on EE under NEP, explicitly embracing a critical, action-oriented paradigm of ecological citizenship, drawing from frameworks like UNESCO's (2017) Education for Sustainable Development (ESD).

- **Integrate Justice and Ethics:** Curricular materials must explicitly incorporate concepts of environmental justice, intergenerational equity, and the rights of nature. Case studies should include stories of both local grassroots activism and corporate/policy failure.
- **Contextualize IKS Critically:** Engage scholars of IKS and environmental science to collaboratively develop modules that present traditional knowledge not as monolithic truth, but as a dynamic, contextual body of practice to be understood and evaluated alongside contemporary science.

2. Pedagogical and Assessment Reformation:

- **Mandate "Eco-Pedagogical" Training:** Revamp both pre-service and in-service teacher education to include mandatory courses on eco-pedagogy (Kahn, 2010)—teaching methods that are place-based, experiential, and ethically grounded.
- **Create Open Educational Resources (OERs):** Develop and disseminate a national repository of OERs with adaptable lesson plans, local project ideas (e.g., auditing school water/energy use, mapping local biodiversity), and guides for virtual exchanges on environmental issues.
- **Pioneer Authentic Assessment:** Direct examination boards (like CBSE) to pilot and then mandate a component of environmental portfolio assessment. This could include documented participation in a sustainability project, a researched report on a local environmental issue, or a creative advocacy campaign, contributing to final grades.

3. Systemic and Enabling Support:

- **Issue Implementation Guidelines with Budgets:** State governments must be provided with detailed operational guidelines for EE, accompanied by specific, ring-fenced budgetary allocations for infrastructure (school gardens, labs), field trips, and community partnerships.
- **Establish School-Ecosystem Partnerships:** Create formal linkages between schools and local institutions (forest departments, water boards, NGOs, university environmental science departments) to provide expertise, resources, and real-world learning sites.
- **Incentivize and Recognize:** Launch a national "Green School" accreditation and award system that recognizes holistic excellence in EE—integrating curriculum, campus management, community outreach, and student leadership—and links it to institutional reputation and funding.

Conclusion

The National Education Policy 2020 undeniably creates a historic opening for Environmental Education in India. By mandating its integration throughout the educational journey, it has the potential to shape a generation that is not only aware of but also ethically committed to and capable of addressing the planet's pressing ecological crises. However, as this critical analysis has demonstrated, between the policy's aspirational text and transformative classroom practice lies a chasm filled with philosophical ambiguities, pedagogical oversights, and formidable systemic barriers.

The NEP's environmental discourse currently sits at a crossroads. One path, the easier and more likely given current constraints, leads to a co-opted, "greenwashed" version of EE—where students can recite sustainability slogans but are not equipped to critique the systems that make societies unsustainable, and where tree-planting drives occur while the school's own consumption patterns go unchallenged. This path aligns with what Jickling and Wals (2008) critique as an "instrumental" form of education that serves predefined, often uncritical, societal goals. The other path, more arduous but essential, leads to a critical, emancipatory EE that nurtures ecological citizens: individuals who are knowledgeable, caring, critical of oppressive structures, and empowered to act individually and collectively for a just and sustainable future. This path requires embracing what Sobel (2004) terms "place-based education" and Gruenewald (2003) frames as a "critical pedagogy of place," connecting local ecological understanding with a critique of power dynamics.

The choice of path will not be determined by the NEP text alone. It will be determined by the political will manifested in subsequent curriculum frameworks like the NCF-SE 2023, the resources allocated in state budgets, the depth of teacher transformation enabled by the new National Professional Standards for Teachers (NPST), and the courage to reimagine assessment paradigms. The policy's success hinges on moving beyond "environmental awareness" as a curricular tick-box exercise and embracing "ecological consciousness" as the very ethos of the educational ecosystem. As the NEP itself states, the purpose of education is the "development of a good person… one who can think rationally and act ethically" (GoI, 2020, p. 5). In the 21st century, this ideal is untenable without a foundational and critical ecological ethic.

The stakes—for India's environment, its democracy, and its role in global sustainability—could not be higher. The NEP has provided the mandate; the real work of building a truly transformative and sustainable education system has just begun. It is a work that demands vigilance, collaboration, and an unwavering commitment to ensuring that the green threads woven into the policy's fabric do not fray into mere decoration but become the strong, integral weave of a new educational tapestry.

References

1. Ball SJ. What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. 1993;13(2):10–17. doi:10.1080/0159630930130203
2. Dobson A. Environmental citizenship: Towards sustainable development. *Sustainable Development*. 2007;15(5):276–285. doi:10.1002/sd.344
3. Fien J. *Education for the environment: Critical curriculum theorising and environmental education*. Deakin University Press; 1993.
4. Government of India. *National Education Policy 2020*. Ministry of Human Resource Development; 2020. Available from: https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf
5. Gruenewald DA. The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher*. 2003;32(4):3–12. doi:10.3102/0013189X032004003
6. Huckle J, Sterling S, editors. *Education for sustainability*. Earthscan Publications; 1996.
7. Jickling B, Wals AEJ. Globalization and environmental education: Looking beyond sustainable development. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 2008;40(1):1–21. doi:10.1080/00220270701684667
8. Kahn R. *Critical pedagogy, ecoliteracy, and planetary crisis: The ecopedagogy movement*. Peter Lang Publishing; 2010.
9. National Council of Educational Research and Training.

National Curriculum Framework for School Education; 2023. Available from: https://ncert.nic.in/pdf/NCF-School-Education-2023.pdf
10. Sauvé L. Currents in environmental education: Mapping a complex and evolving pedagogical field. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*. 2005;10(1):11–37.
11. Sobel D. *Place-based education: Connecting classrooms and communities*. The Orion Society; 2004.
12. Stevenson RB. Schooling and environmental education: Contradictions in purpose and practice. *Environmental Education Research*. 2007;13(2):139–153. doi:10.1080/13504620701295726
13. UNESCO. *Final report: Intergovernmental Conference on Environmental Education*. Tbilisi, USSR; 1978.
14. UNESCO. *Education for Sustainable Development Goals: Learning objectives*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; 2017. Available from: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000247444