FRAMING CLIMATE CHANGE IN NEWS DISCOURSE: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYTICAL STUDY

Nabeela Sharif
MPhil Scholar English Linguistics, University of Okara, Pakistan
Email: nabeelsharif263@gmail.com
Aqsa Bibi
MPhil Scholar English Linguistics, University of Okara, Pakistan
Email: mujtabaaqsa8@gmail.com
Muhammad Khurm
Lecturer, University of Okara, Pakistan,
Email: m.khuram@uo.edu.pk

Abstract

Climate change is accepted as an environmental and scientific crisis with most of the public knowledge of the same being influenced through media discourse and not by scientific reports alone. This paper will utilize the Critical Discourse Analysis to explore the manner in which news media contextualize climate change and how these constructions interrelate to establish ideology, responsibility and power associations. Based on the three-dimensional model by Fairclough, the analysis assesses language features, discursive practices, and larger socio-political backgrounds in the chosen news articles on English. The experiment aims at analyzing the construction of urgency, uncertainty, and agency in terms of headlines, lexical decisions, modality, metaphors, and sourcing patterns. It is found that the news discourse will frequently shift between discussing the climate change as an immediate crisis and a political controversy, which may weaken the sense of urgency. Voting elite groups like politicians and corporate entities are often given a greater priority at the expense of scientists and victimized communities. In addition, the language hedging and individualization of blame divert the attention to structural and institutional reasons. The effects of these discursive strategies are that they normalize dominant economic interests, and create a perception on the part of the population that could be a barrier to effective climate action. The paper sheds some light on the critical analysis of media discourses as a way of fostering responsible and transformational environmental communication.

Keywords: Critical discourse analysis, climate change, new media, ideology, power.

Introduction:

Climate change has emerged as one of the most pressing and complicated issues facing the modern societies. Global warming, climate change, severe weather condition, melting glaciers, food crisis, and environmental displacement have turned climate change into a far-off scientific issue to the present day, a social, political and economic crisis. Despite the overwhelming scientific evidence that global warming is anthropogenic in nature, scientific information does not create the impression of climate change amongst the populace. Rather it is mostly mediated by language, representation and communication especially by the news media. The newspapers, television and digital platforms are the main information providers to citizens, policy makers and institutions and thus they have a decisive role in how the climate change is perceived, interpreted and responded. Climate change therefore is not merely a physical or environmental reality but a discursive and an ideological reality.

News media are not merely a conduit that passes on dispassionate information on environmental issues. Instead, they construct issues, choose specific positions, give priority to specific voices and use specific linguistic practices that impact the social construction of meaning. Media organizations create specific versions of reality, through preferences in vocabulary, headlines, metaphors, and through source selection. These discursive formations may emphasize the crisis as urgent, or reduce its severity; may place blame on governments and corporations or blame individuals; may put climate change on the level of scientific consensus, or make it a political debate. These representational decisions can hardly be

innocent or accidental. On the contrary, they are entrenched in the larger ideological and institutional structures, which are manifestations of the prevailing power relations in the society. This is why the analysis of the discourse of news media is critical to comprehending the process of social construction and negotiation of climate change.

In recent 20 years, media scholars and environmental communication have focused their attention on framing in climate reporting. Framing can be described as a process whereby some features of a reality are foregrounded and others backgrounded or omitted. As an example, climate change can be perceived as an environmental disaster that needs urgent intervention, an economic cost that puts national development under threat, or a hot-tempered topic where there is a divide in opinion between scientists. These frames all make different interpretations and policy preferences to the audiences. The gravity of environmental hazards could be understated when political confrontation or economic expenditures are the main concerns of the media. In its turn, the imperative of collective action would be more evident when the focus is put on scientific evidence and human suffering. Consequently, the frame structures of climate change are highly influential on the level of public awareness, civic engagement, and environmental policymaking.

Though the effects of media representations are acknowledged, the coverage of climate change frequently demonstrates the trends that support the dominating political and economic interests. Some studies have noted that news discourse has a tendency of privileging elite voices, including politicians, corporate people and policy makers, over ignoring the voices of scientists, activists and communities who are most affected by environmental degradation. This unequal allocation of voice is an indication of wider forms of power and authority within the society. Moreover, linguistic attributes of hedging, modality, and uncertainty expressions can raise uncertainty in the solid scientific discoveries. This kind of strategy may unwillingly scaffold skepticism and procrastinate policy interventions. Moreover, the tackling of climate change is often made individual based on health care advice on lifestyle adjustments at a personal level, which diverts the focus towards structural and institutional factors. Such discursive models reveal the fact that the reporting of climate change is highly ideological and not just informative.

Due to these anxieties, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) can offer a useful theoretical and methodological model of exploring the connection between power and language and society. CDA considers discourse as a type of social practice, which constitutes and replicates dominance and inequality structures. Fairclough, van Dijk, and Wodak, among others, are of the opinion that the production of texts is influenced by institutional forces and ideological presuppositions that are not usually noticeable to readers. In the systematic examination of linguistic decisions and situational aspects, CDA aims at discovering implicit meanings, power relations, and interests within the discourse. The method is especially appropriate to study the topic of climate change communication due to the strong connection of the environmental debates to the political agenda, economic interests, and inequalities in the global contexts. With the help of CDA, one can get out of the surface meanings and unveil how media discourses construct social realities and affect collective action.

This research paper, thus, tries to investigate the way climate change is constructed in the modern news talk by critically analyzing the use of language and meaning. The study is based on the three-dimensional model by Fairclough to interpret the textual characteristics, discursive practices, and the overarching socio-political situations to determine how multiple levels of meaning are created. On the textual level, there are lexical choices, metaphors, modality and agency patterns. On the discursive practice level, the study takes into account the nature of production, sourcing, and consumption of news articles. On the social practice

level, it places the discourse of media into the broader ideological contexts of neoliberalism, political polarization, and global capitalism. Having combined these dimensions, the analysis tries to demonstrate how news reporting can be used to normalize certain interests at the cost of other possible points of view.

This research has been important in advancing academic knowledge as well as the general awareness of people. Academically, the research broadens the uses of CDA to environmental communication and how the linguistic method can help to shed light on the politics of climate reporting. Socially speaking, a better insight into the discursive construction of climate change can assist the reader in being a better consumer of media and promote more responsible journalism. Such critical awareness is necessary in the conditions, in which the problems of the environment become more pressing, to facilitate awareness-informed decision-making and democratic engagement.

Altogether, climate change is not only covered by the media but also produced and shaped by discourse. News language defines the way in which the crisis is interpreted, those who are to be blamed and the solutions that can be viable. Through a critical analysis of such representations, this article aims to challenge the implicit ideological practices of reporting on climate change, and to point to the place of the media in creating environmental awareness. The study concludes by arguing through Critical Discourse Analysis that changing the way climate is communicated is an essential measure to be taken to having meaningful and equitable climate action.

Theoretical Framework of the Study:

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is an interdisciplinary method of the study of language, which considers discourse as a type of social practice that is tightly related to power, ideology, and inequality. In contrast to the classical methods of linguistics where the emphasis is made on grammar or sentence construction, CDA examines the functioning of language in the social, political, and cultural contexts. It attempts to find the latent meaning, assumptions and power relations within the texts and to expose the role of discourse in reproduction and creation of dominance within the society. This is where CDA is not only descriptive, but also critical and emancipatory, since its goal is to oppose injustice and enhance social change.

Theoretical background of CDA is based on the critical social theory, specifically, on the works of Michel Foucault, Antonio Gramsci, and the Frankfurt School. The idea of discourse developed by Foucault points out the fact that the notions of knowledge and power cannot be separated and that discourse can determine what can be said, think and believed as true in a given society. Foucault would argue that discourse creates social realities and does not just reflect it. On the same note, the concept of hegemony by Gramsci emphasizes the way dominant people can sustain power by consent and coercion not by force. The concepts have an impact on CDA as they propose that language has a focal position in justifying social hierarchies and naturalizing inequality. Discourse therefore becomes one of the most important areas where meaning and power struggles take place.

The fundamental assumption in CDA is that there is no such thing as a neutral language. Each text represents certain views, values, and interests. Implicit ideologies can be found in media reports, political speech, institutional documents, and on regular interactions and are used to construct representations of events and social actors. CDA is thus concerned with the role of choices of language: vocabulary, grammar, metaphors and narrative in providing particular interpretations of reality. Talking of climate change as a challenge, but not as a crisis, makes it less serious, and calling migrants illegals, instead of undocumented, is an ideological move. These decisions affect the way the readers comprehend a social issue and decide who is accused, believed or disregarded.

A three-dimensional model developed by Norman Fairclough is one of the most influential ones in the CDA that offers a systematic approach to discourse analysis. Fairclough theorizes discourse in three levels of interrelation, which include text, discursive practice, and social practice. Textual analysis is the first level as it is concerned with the linguistic specifics of the text, such as vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, modality, and figures of speech. This tier focuses on the way language creates meaning based on certain decisions and patterns. Examples of these include active constructions taking responsibility (the company polluted the river) and passive forms of the same (mistakes were made). It is through such features that power and accountability are discursively governed.

The second tier is called discursive practice and looks at the mechanisms of producing, distributing and consuming texts. This includes the investigation of who is the producer of the text, who is given voice or not and how the text is perceived by the audiences. In the news media, such as in the example of journalists, one tends to use as an official source information politicians and corporate representatives and this puts elites advantage over ordinary citizens. The examination of these production practices meant that CDA reveals the influence of institutional routines on the content and sense of discourse.

Other scholars have also offered valuable insight to CDA besides Fairclough. Teun A. van Dijk focuses more on the cognitive aspect of discourse when he suggests that the ideologies are stored in the mental models of people and determine the way of how they read texts. He pays special attention to the reproduction of racism and inequality by the media discourse based on the biased representations. The discourse-historical approach of Ruth Wodak puts an emphas on the significance of the historical context and intertextuality because it studies the way discourses develop through time and rely on the previous narratives. These parallel strategies enhance CDA by offering a variety of instruments that can be used to study the connection between knowledge, power, and language.

In general, the CDA theoretical framework offers a critical perspective of analysis of discourse and its impact on social reality. When combined with social theory and the linguistic analysis, CDA helps the researcher reveal the ideologies behind the scenes, dismantle the mainstream discourse, and provide the representation to the marginal groups. It applies particularly to the analysis of the discourse of the media, in which representations play a prominent role in shaping the opinion of the populace as well as policy outcome. Its power, inequality, and social justice orientation help CDA go beyond superficial meanings and prompt us to reflect more seriously on the manner in which language forms the world in which we conduct our lives.

Research Questions:

How do news media linguistically and discursively frame climate change through lexical choices, metaphors, modality, and patterns of agency to construct it as a crisis, controversy, or manageable risk?

How do these discursive representations reproduce or challenge existing power relations and ideologies by privileging certain social actors, attributing responsibility, and shaping public understanding of climate change?

Literature Review:

Climate change has grown to become a fundamental issue of issue in environmental, political and media research with considerable academic interest in the manner the issue is conveyed to the population. Although scientific evidence addresses the fact of the anthropogenic causes and devastating effects of the global warming process, mass consciousness and actions are mainly conditioned by the media images of the processes instead of the actual scientific activity. Accordingly, scholars claim that climate change is not merely an environmental

process, but a discursive process that is mediated by the use of language, ideology and power. This understanding has prompted researchers to study the nature of news discourse concerning climate change, and how it is framed and affects social perception, policy-making, and action.

Initial research on environmental communication had focused on the agenda setting of the media. Based on McCombs and Shaw (1972), media houses define what issues are given Dominance hence affecting what is seen by audiences as important. As an extension of this viewpoint, the framing theory holds that media not only has the power to choose what to write about, but it also has the power to influence the interpretations that are made of these topics. According to Entman (1993), the concept of framing can be described as a process of highlighting particular aspects of reality and ensuring that it becomes more salient to encourage particular problem definitions, causal interpretations, and evaluations of morality. Frames like environmental catastrophe, economic burden or scientific controversy have the effects of causing audiences to form different interpretations and policy choices when applied in the context of climate change. These works underscore the great influence of media in meaning construction as opposed to the reporting of facts.

Later studies have revealed that there is a tendency of lack of balance and politicking in climate change coverage. Boykoff and Boykoff (2004) are of the opinion that journalistic rules of balanced reporting have occasionally provided false equivalency between scientific consensus and climate skepticism. Media discourse may amplify the lack of knowledge and weaken citizen faith in climate science since one side is treated with equal consideration as the other. Likewise, Carvalho and Burgess (2005) indicate that the ideological sides define the media representations, where conservative sources can highlight the economic costs and regulatory weight, whereas the progressive ones can focus on the environmental risks and the social justice. In these findings, it can be concluded that climate reporting is entrenched in political and institutional interests.

Despite the insight offered by the framing theory and media studies, they usually concentrate on the patterns of content without necessarily going into details and analysis of the linguistic processes in which ideology is executed. This weakness has prompted scholars to implement Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a more involved methodology. As a conceptualization of discourse, CDA, as theorized by Fairclough (1995), van Dijk (2008) and Wodak (2001) sees discourse as a social practice that produces and duplicates power relations. Instead of considering language as neutral, CDA explores the role of particular lexical, grammatical and rhetorical strategies in the production of social realities. CA explains the process of naturalization of dominant ideologies, and privileges some voices, marginalizing others, through textual analysis.

The three-dimensional model of Fairclough has had a strong impact especially in environmental discourse studies. This framework allows scholars to relate micro-level linguistic patterns of micro-level structures of power through the integration textual analysis with discursive and social practices. As an example, passive constructions can be used to hide the accountability of environmental harm, and modality and hedging can cast uncertainty over science. These linguistic strategies determine the blame- and blame-solution-allocation of the readers. In such a way, CDA offers mechanisms to reveal a latent manner in which media discourses can justify certain predominant political and economic interests.

Various researchers have used CDA in climate change coverage specifically. Carvalho (2007) shows that media texts take certain ideological presuppositions concerning the economic growth and modernization and tend to emphasize market-driven solutions rather than structural changes. Likewise, it is the view of Olausson (2009) that news discourse often

personalizes blame by promoting lifestyle change thus misdirecting our attention on systemic causes of industrial pollution and government failure in policy. This trend of replacing collective to individual responsibility is indicative of the concept of neoliberalism and constraints of institutional change. Such works demonstrate how media discourse does not only inform, but also limits the imagination of the people as to what can be done in relation to the climate change.

The socio-cognitive perspective is yet another perspective that is enhanced with the help of Van Dijk who focuses on the importance of mental models and shared knowledge in the interpretation of discourse. Van Dijk (2008) says that recurring patterns of representation have an impact on the perception of social actors and events by the audience. Within the context of climate change reporting, again and again giving more platform to politicians and corporate elites than scientists or vulnerable populations may influence how readers perceive those with the authority and legitimacy. These discursive practices support the existent hierarchies and become normalized unequal power distributions. This observation is especially important when it comes to analyzing how media discourses affect societal opinion and policymaking.

In spite of the accumulating literature, even there are gaps in the explanation of the functioning of linguistic strategies at textual, institutional and ideological levels at the same time. There are several studies that are largely dependent on quantitative content analysis, thus they might not capture the subtle meanings in how language is used to construct meaning. Furthermore, further qualitative studies that merge framing theory and CDA are required in order to yield more information about the influence of discourse on environmental politics. To fill these gaps, a case-by-case study is necessary to understand lexical options, metaphors, modality and agency patterns in certain news scenarios.

The current work fits into this developing field by using the CDA framework of Fairclough to investigate the discourse of climate change as portrayed in the modern news. The analysis of linguistic and discursive mechanisms allows the study to go beyond the analysis of surface-level content analysis to the uncovering of the ideological processes of media representations. By so doing, it is an extension of earlier studies and a deeper integration of the relationship between power, language, and environmental communication.

Overall, the reviewed literature confirms that media are very important to determine how people view climate change through agenda-setting, framing, and ideological representation. Nonetheless, CDA provides a more critical approach to the analysis of the way these representations are constructed linguistically and embedded in society. This theoretical and methodological basis has been used to inform the analysis of news discourse in the current study and the significance of critical analysis of media narratives, in light of the global crisis of climate change.

Analysis and Discussion:

This part of the paper includes a Critical Discourse Analysis of chosen news articles on climate change in the light of three-dimensional framework created by Fairclough: textual analysis, discursive practice, and social practice. This should serve to find out how language decisions and media practices shape specific meanings of climate change and how these meanings reproduce or disrupt prevailing relations of power and ideology. The results indicate that the news discourse is not only the reflection of the realities of the environmental situation but also the active process of creating the understanding of the climate crisis, the people to blame, and the legitimate solutions.

1. Textual Analysis: Linguistic Construction of Meaning

On the textual level, there are some common patterns of language that can be traced especially in vocabulary, modality, metaphors, and agency. To start with, lexical expressions are important in positioning climate change as a crisis or a solvable problem. Climate emergency, catastrophe and crisis are serious and immediate terms and challenge, issue and concern are terms that dilute the gravity of the problem. This difference in words that is used affects the way readers perceive the significance of climate action. Differing softer terms are likely to normalize delay and minimize the perceived radical intervention.

Second, modality and hedging is a common phenomenon in scientific findings reporting. Even well proven scientific facts are brought about with uncertainty by modal verbs like may, might, could or possibly. As an illustration, such sentences as "increasing temperatures may impact the cities located along the coastlines undermine the accuracy of the scientific forecasts. This linguistic tactic makes climate change appear to be imaginary and not a fact, something that can create doubts in the readers. As far as the CDA is concerned, these hedges operate on the ideological level by ensuring that the matters of political and economic interests that could be jeopardized by stringent environmental policies are secured.

Third, the agency analysis shows the systematic patterns of responsibility attribution. Passive forms like releasing the emissions or destroying the forests lose the persons who did the damage to the environment. The discourse naturalizes the environmental harm as natural but not socially constructed by eliminating human or corporate agents in the sentence. As opposed to that, the active constructions can be found when people are involved, e.g., "citizens should decrease their carbon footprint." This opposition allows shifting the burden of guilt off institutions and on everyday individuals, which supports the notion that climate change is mostly a question of individual actions but not structural changes.

Constructs are formed by metaphors as well. Metaphors of climate change are at times represented as war metaphors (e.g. fight against climate change) or as economic metaphors (e.g. cost of going green). Although war metaphors describe the urgency, economic metaphors present environmental action as a financial sacrifice, which can demoralize the policy change support. These language practices indicate that a meaning is created by making subtle textual decisions as opposed to neutral reporting.

2. Discursive Practice: Representation and Production

In the discursive practice, the analysis is being investigated in the production of the news text and the voices included or omitted. The results indicate that there is a regular favoring of elite sources, such as politicians, government representatives, and corporate representatives. These actors are often quoted as those who have the authority and the science, environmental activists and the affected communities are given little to no coverage. Such imbalance indicates that climate change is framed as a political, or economic problem, but not a scientific or a humanitarian problem.

These sourcing habits portray institutionalized practices in journalism where official voices are viewed as more valid and available as compared to grassroots opinions. Nonetheless, it is also a way to strengthen existing power structures because it gives authority to the already influential people. Consequently, other perspectives that either require a holistic change or disparage corporate responsibility are sidelined. This biased portrayal influences the sense of people by reducing the number of acceptable meanings and resolutions.

Framing effects are also added by headlines and lead paragraphs. A lot of the articles focus on political conflict, i.e. differences between parties or cost arguments, instead of environmental impact. Such emphasis on controversy forms climate change as a belief piece as opposed to a scientific fact. As a result, the readers can note that climate action is a negotiable or optional rather than urgent and necessary one.

3. Social Practice: ideology and Relations of Power

On a larger level of the social practice, these discursive patterns depict prevailing ideological discourses, especially neoliberalism and economic rationalism. The discourse of news often puts economic growth, market stability, and national interests above the ecological sustainability. In most instances, environmental policies have been reviewed with regards to financial expenses as compared to long run social and environmental gains. This focus is in line with the ideologies of capitalism that favors profit and development even at the cost of environmental conservation.

The concurrent individualization of responsibility in the texts is an indication of the neoliberal values, as well. Media talk tends to cause people to focus on specific lifestyle changes, like recycling or energy saving, and in the process, the media takes focus off of the structural problems (such as industrial pollution, corporate responsibility and governmental policy failures). This framing restricts the use of systems change by the people and keeps the status quo. By means of this, discourse is employed as an instrument of ideological domination, legitimizing the status quo of power and minimizing the chances of collective politics.

Using a critical approach, the findings prove that media portrayals of climate change are not objective but framed in social and political conflicts. The discourse not only mirrors but also recreates the inequalities by giving priority to some actors and silencing the others. In this way, the language turns out to be a place where the politics of the environment is negotiated and fought.

Discussion

On the whole, the discussion has shown that news talk simultaneously builds up climate change as a crisis but not a certainty, mass but at the same time personal, and scientific but at the same time political. Such inconsistent displays thin out the gravity of the crisis and cause confusion with the sense of responsibility and ways out. Using CDA, the research reveals the ideological mechanisms behind such representations and the necessity to have more balanced and responsible environmental communication.

These discursive practices should be critically analyzed to help promote an informed public discourse and promote action on climate that can be changed. Unless media talk starts to act in the interests of the elite and play down structural reasons, then a significant solution might not be forthcoming. Thus, CDA does not only aid in the explanation of media texts, but it also contributes to the increased knowledge of the way language constructs environmental realities.

Limitations

Although the study provides some useful insights into how the news media construct discursively the phenomenon of climate change, one must admit that it has a number of limitations. To begin with, the research takes the qualitative Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach that is interpretive by nature. CDA, though allowing one to dive into the depths of linguistic and ideological patterns, can be biased, because of the interpretative point of view of the researcher. As opposed to the quantitative analysis, qualitative analysis does not purport absolute objectivity or statistic generalizability. Opinions given in this research therefore are interpretations possible and no conclusive points.

Second, the number of news articles reviewed is not very large. The purposive selection of texts was due to a limited amount of time and practical conditions as it was done with only a few texts and not a large-scale corpus of all media outlets. Consequently, the results might not be a complete reflection of the overall climate change coverage in various newspapers or

areas. A more comprehensive sample would expose more patterns or different discursive strategies which are not reflected in the current study.

Third, the research only dwells on written texts of news and does not involve multimodal information like images, videos, graphics, or social media content. The modern news communication is more visual and digital, and those are the elements, which have a significant contribution to meaning-making. Omitting the multimodal analysis could restrict the holistic image of how the climate change is depicted in the media.

The other weakness is related to contextual variation. Depending on political orientation, ownership structures or national conditions, news discourse can vary. The research is not able to perform a compare and contrast cross-cultural study and therefore, its results might not be universally applicable to media systems. Further research involving various nations or political stands would be in a position to offer a wider scope of the climate discourse across the world.

Lastly, this paper is focusing on how things are represented and not how they are received by the audience. Though CDA helps focus on the way in which discourses are constructed, it will not directly quantify how discourses are read and reacted to by the readers. There are different opinions to the audience based on personal beliefs, experiences and education levels. Thus, the research questions is out of scope of this research due to the actual influence of media discourse on the social attitudes.

Delimitations

To ensure the study does not lose its focus and to make it viable, there are established delimitations. First, it consciously focuses on the news media discourse, as opposed to using other types of communication like documentaries, political speeches, or social media debates. The choice of news reports was motivated by the fact that they are widely read and contribute considerably to the agenda-setting process of influencing the opinion of the population.

Second, the research is restricted to newspapers written in English language. With this decision, linguistic consistency is guaranteed in terms of analysis and enables a closer examination of the textual features. It however neglects reporting in other languages which can exhibit other discursive patterns. The delimitation assists in keeping the scope of analysis at a manageable level.

Third, the study utilizes the three-dimensional CDA model by Fairclough as the main model of analysis. Even though other methods, including socio-cognitive model introduced by van Dijk or discourse-historical approach by Ruth Wodak may give more information, choosing one framework would guarantee theoretical consistency and systematic analysis.

Fourth, linguistic aspects that are particularly analyzed include lexical choices, modality, metaphor and agency. Ampler sociological or psychological influences are recognized but not empirically examined. This is a limitation that ensures that the study is discourse and language-focused and does not extend to other irrelevant methodological avenues.

Conclusion:

Identifying these limitations and delimitations helps to identify the scope and boundaries of the study and outline the opportunities of future research. Even despite them, the targeted CDA method has already offered valuable information about how news media present climate change and how the discourse influences the perception of the environment issues by the population.

This paper aimed to identify the discursive construction of climate change within news media with reference to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The study was interested in understanding that climate change is not merely a scientific and environmental problem, it is a communicative and ideological problem as well, therefore the study examined how

linguistic decisions, framing techniques and the institutional practices influence the way people perceive the crisis. Using the three-dimensional structure of Fairclough the three text, discursive practice and social practice, the research found out that news discourse is not a detached reflection of reality but rather a dynamic construction of meaning.

On the textual level, the analysis indicated that vocabulary, modality, metaphors, and patterns of agency play a critical role in the ways of representation of climate change. The use of soft lexical options and expressions of hedging tends to dilute the urgency and the responsibility of environmental harm is lost, as passive constructions are used. According to such linguistic tactics, climate change is viewed as a problem that can be foreseen or controlled, but not instantaneous and systemic. These images are subtle influences on the perceptions of readers and can undermine calls to take decisive action.

The results of the discursive practice level revealed that the media production processes are more inclined to favor the voices of the elite, specifically politicians, policymakers, and corporate actors, and leave out the voices of scientists, activists, and vulnerable groups. This asymmetry supports the status quo of power and limits the scope of views that the people can have. News reporting can often turn climate change into a constructive rather than a unanimous issue by concentrating on political rivalry and economic effects as opposed to environmental and humanitarian ones.

On a larger social scale, these patterns of discourse indicate those ideologies of dominance, and in particular those of neoliberalism that uphold market stability and individual accountability over group and structural action. Individualization of environmental responsibility does not only take the focus off systemic causes, but also makes transformative change in the process impossible. Through this, the media discourse adds to the reproduction of social and political inequalities, and so the interrelations between language, power, and ideology are very close.

The paper thus emphasizes the need to look critically at the media portrayal of environmental matters. CDA also turns out to be a useful instrument of discovering concealed assumptions and exposing the ways in which discourse influences the creation of knowledge and action. A higher awareness of these discursive processes can promote more responsible journalism, promote more critical media literacy among the audience, and promote more informed policymaking.

To sum up, climate change is not merely being combated at scientific laboratories and in policy forums but also in the language and representation sphere. The framing of the crisis defines the manner in which the crisis is perceived and tackled. This work highlights the importance of more responsible, inclusive, and accountable climate communication by revealing the ideological aspects of the news discourse and encouraging various and valuable changes in the environmental arena.

References:

Boykoff, M. T., & Boykoff, J. M. (2004). Balance as bias: Global warming and the US prestige press. Global Environmental Change, 14(2), 125–136.

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.

Carvalho, A., & Burgess, J. (2005). Cultural circuits of climate change in UK broadsheet newspapers, 1985–2003. Risk Analysis, 25(6), 1457–1469.

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

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003). Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1972). The archaeology of knowledge. London: Tavistock.

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

Olausson, U. (2009). Global warming—global responsibility? Media frames of collective action and scientific certainty. Public Understanding of Science, 18(4), 421–436.

van Dijk, T. A. (2008). Discourse and power. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2016). Methods of critical discourse studies (3rd ed.). London: Sage.