

## Responsibility, Sustainability, and Threat: The Framing of Climate Change by King Charles III

Oleksandr Kapranov  
NLA University College  
Norway

DOI <https://doi.org/10.29081/cp.2024.29.06>

### Abstract

The issue of climate change is reflective of a cornucopia of interconnected variables, which involve political, societal, as well as ethical and moral considerations associated with empathy, responsibility, sustainability, and solidarity (Sadler-Smith & Akstinaite 2022). Due to these reasons, research in climate change discourse has gained currency in the present-day linguistic and mass media studies. One of the means of exploring how corporate and political actors view the issue of global climate change involves framing, which is copiously applied in linguistic, mass media, and discourse-related research directions (Gillings & Dayrell 2024; Schlichting 2013). To-date, however, little is known about how climate change discourse is framed by the current British monarch King Charles III. This contribution presents a qualitative study that explores the way climate change discourse is framed by King Charles III. The study involves a corpus of speeches on the topic of climate change delivered by King Charles III from 2005 to 2023. The corpus was analysed qualitatively in line with the framing methodology developed by Entman (1993, 2004, 2007). The analysis revealed that climate change was framed as A 2 Degree World, Deforestation, Responsibility, Risk, Sustainability, Threat, and Urgency. The findings and their discussion are further described in the article.

**Keywords:** *climate change discourse, frame, framing, King Charles III, speeches on climate change.*

## 1. Introduction

The topic of climate change poses a complex problem to the human race (Bickerstaffe 2024; Incropera 2016). As such, climate change is reflective of a host of intertwined challenges on a variety of levels, ranging from politics and economy to ethical and moral considerations that pertain to empathy, sustainability, and solidarity (Benn et al. 2014; Ferns & Amaeshi 2021; Sadler-Smith & Akstinaite 2022). The magnitude and scale of the issue of climate change have been addressed on multiple occasions by corporate, political, and societal actors, as well as the prominent world leaders (Kapranov 2022a, 2024a; Wright et al. 2013). In particular, the current British monarch King Charles III has delivered a score of speeches on the topic of climate change, starting from the late 1980s. The majority of his speeches on climate change are nowadays available in the form of official transcripts on the website of the British royal family at [www.royal.uk](http://www.royal.uk).

Despite their availability, the speeches on climate change by King Charles III have not been analysed extensively in the literature (Kapranov 2024b). Seeking to generate new knowledge about climate change discourse by King Charles III, the present article introduces and discusses a qualitative study, which aims at exploring how the topic of climate change is framed in his speeches. Conceivably, the study of how climate change discourse is framed in King Charles III's speeches can contribute to a substantial body of literature on climate change discourse in the United Kingdom (the UK). The UK is one of the first countries in the industrialised world that has adopted and followed through on climate change-related policies and regulations (Kapranov 2017a, 2017b; Tompkins et al. 2010). Furthermore, in the UK, the issue of climate change attracts attention of a broad palette of British political actors from the Conservative Party on the right to the populist parties on the political left (Bulkeley & Betsill 2005; Kapranov 2017c, 2018a; Meyer 2024). Whilst the representatives of the British royalty are excluded from the direct involvement in the political

process in the UK, they, nevertheless, express their opinions on the issue of climate change rather frequently (Giddens 2009; Hajer 1995; Hulme 2009). In particular, King Charles III, as previously mentioned, shows interest in climate change-related matters, which he discusses publicly in his speeches, addresses, and interviews (Kapranov 2024b).

In light of the abovementioned considerations, the present study seems to be adequately suited to employ a qualitative framing methodology in order to gain a profound insight into how the issue of climate change is framed by King Charles III in his speeches. Specifically, the study utilises the framing analysis, which has been developed by Entman (1991, 1993, 2004, 2007). In line with Entman (1993, 2004, 2007), framing in the study is seen

as the process of culling a few elements of perceived reality and assembling a narrative that highlights connections among them to promote a particular interpretation. Fully developed frames typically perform four functions: problem definition, causal analysis, moral judgment, and remedy promotion. (Entman 2007: 164)

Informed by Entman's (2007) definition of framing, the present study aims at answering the following research question (RQ):

**RQ:** What types of frames are employed in the corpus of speeches on climate change delivered by King Charles III between 2005 and 2023?

To be able to address the RQ properly, I will outline the literature on framing in British discourse on climate change and, thereafter, introduce and discuss the study on framing in the corpus of speeches on climate change by King Charles III.

## 2. Framing in British discourse on climate change: Literature review

Prior to expanding upon a literature review of the studies on framing in the British discourse on climate change, it is necessary to point out that framing and framing methodology are amply employed in a variety of discourses (Kapranov 2018b, 2018c). In particular, framing and framing methodology have been utilised in a significant bulk of literature on British media and political discourses, respectively (Boykoff 2008; Carvalho 2005, 2010; Carvalho & Burgess 2005; Carvalho et al. 2017; Gillings & Dayrell 2024; Jaspal & Nerlich 2014; Kapranov 2023a; Nerlich & Jaspal 2013; Lovell 2004; O'Neill 2013; Williams & Sovacool 2019; Willis 2017). In addition, there is a growing body of studies that use framing in casting light upon climate change discourse by British corporate and societal actors (Barr et al. 2011; Baum et al. 2024; Baumer et al. 2017; Corner et al. 2015; Kapranov 2015, 2017a, 2017b; Livesey & Graham 2007; Megura & Gunderson 2022; Pidgeon et al. 2008; Rossa-Roccor et al. 2021; Salter & Wilkinson 2024). Let us outline the literature that uses framing methodology in elucidating climate change discourse by British (i) corporate, (ii) media, (iii) political, and (iv) societal actors.

The literature indicates that British corporate actors, especially fossil fuel corporations, strive to address the issue of climate change in their annual reports (Kapranov 2015, 2017a, 2017b). In particular, the literature has established that The Royal Dutch Shell (further in the article – Shell), an international British-Dutch fossil fuel corporation, frames its climate change discourse via the frames *Battle*, *Responsible Citizen*, *Care*, *Research and Development*, and *Money*. As far as the frames *Responsible Citizen* and *Care*, respectively, are concerned, the literature indicates that the framing via the construals of care and responsibility permeates British corporate discourses on climate change (Kapranov 2017c, 2017d; Livesey & Graham 2007). In this regard, the framing of climate change discourse by British fossil fuel corporations (for instance, BP and Shell) as the frames *Responsible Citizen* and *Care* is

intended to mitigate the negative perception of corporate activities that contribute to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. These findings are further supported by the literature (Megura & Gunderson 2022), which indicates that British corporate actors seem to frame the issue of climate change by means of the frames *Techno-Optimism* (i.e., environmentally-friendly technologies can facilitate the process of climate change mitigation), *Necessitarianism* (i.e., fossil fuel corporations are useful and necessary for the economy), and *Compliance* (i.e., adherence to rules and regulations). At the same time, however, the literature (Kapranov 2015, 2017a, 2017d; Salter & Wilkinson 2024) demonstrates that British corporate actors do not seem to frame their climate change discourse by means of frames that involve direct references to the British fossil fuel industry as one of the main contributors to the causes of anthropogenic climate change.

Similarly to the abundant literature on framing associated with British corporate discourses, there is a rich research tradition of accounting for British media discourses on climate change through the lens of framing (Boykoff 2008; Carvalho 2005). In particular, the application of framing analysis to a corpus of British newspapers has revealed that the issue of climate change tends to be framed, mostly, through the prism of extreme weather events, the involvement of political actors, as well as the topics of climate justice and risk (Boykoff 2008). Notably, British mass media appear to frame the issue of climate change by means of iconic images, which quite often, depict photos of endangered species whose habitat is destroyed by the negative consequences of climate change (Boykoff 2008; O'Neill 2013). In addition, it is argued in the literature that British mass media outlets frame climate change via the following themes: "Climate change as a multi-faceted threat", "Collectivisation of threat", "Climate change and the attribution of blame", and "Speculative solutions to a complex socio-environmental problem" (Jaspal & Nerlich 2014). In unison with the aforementioned framing, the literature has discovered that, for instance, The Economist frames British fossil fuel corporations and

their climate change-related activities as the frames *Immoral Corporations* and *Sinners*, whilst The Financial Times frames them as *Growth*, *Journey*, and *Money* (Kapranov 2017a, 2017b, 2018a). Moreover, the literature posits that the British mass media frame the issue of climate change through the lenses of dissent and apocalyptic imagery, respectively (Carvalho 2005). Concurrently with the apocalyptic framing, however, there is a strong tendency on the part of the British media actors to frame the issue of climate change in conjunction with economic growth, sustainability, and environmental protection (Carvalho 2005, 2010; Carvalho & Burgess 2005; Carvalho et al. 2017; Nerlich & Jaspal 2013).

In addition to casting light on how corporate and media discourses frame the issue of climate change, framing methodology facilitates our understanding of what British political actors say about climate change and how they say it. Judging from the literature, the consecutive British governments show interest in shale development and frame it in their political discourse via the frames that are indicative of climate change mitigation measures and strategies of ecological modernisation (Williams & Sovacool 2019). In contrast to the positive framing of shale gas in the governmental discourses, however, it has been established that shale gas is framed negatively by the British opposition (Williams & Sovacool 2019). Another aspect of political discourse that is framed positively by the British government is associated with the discursive representations of sustainable housing, which is framed as *Low Carbon Housing* (Lovell 2004) that offers a viable solution to offset the negative consequences of climate change. Furthermore, the frame *Low Carbon Housing* is utilised by the British governments as a political spin to couch their climate change-related activities in “green” discourse (Lovell 2004). Based upon the literature (Lovell 2004; Williams & Sovacool 2019), it seems feasible to argue that the framing of climate change by British political actors involves a potent economic dimension, which, as pointed out in the literature, facilitates the framing of climate change via the lenses of

shale gas and climate change-neutral housing. This argument is further supported by the literature, which posits that the UK Labour Governments frame the issue of climate change through the economic perspective in the wake of the publication of the so-called Stern Report on climate change (Willis 2017). A more recent line of research on the framing of climate change (Kapranov 2024a) also buttresses the aforementioned argument by specifying that the current Conservative Government and, in particular, the present PM Rishi Sunak, frame climate change as the frames *Net Zero* (i.e., zero emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> by the industry) and *Financial Burden* (i.e., taxpayers' expenses to mitigate the negative consequences of climate change).

Whilst the framing of climate change by a number of British governments seems to foreground the economisation of climate change, the literature demonstrates that British societal actors appear to frame the measures of climate change mitigation rather positively (Barr et al. 2011; Baum et al. 2024; Pidgeon et al. 2008). Concurrently, however, the British public's perceptions of nuclear power in relation to the issue of climate change are framed negatively (Pidgeon et al. 2008). Furthermore, the literature notes that a substantial number of young people in the UK view the issue of climate change as a problem that does not impact upon their immediate quotidian concerns (Corner et al. 2015). Additionally, the youth segment of the British public at large appears to frame the issue of climate change through the lack of low-carbon infrastructure, insufficient awareness of sustainable lifestyles, and the lack of societal focus on the negative consequences of climate change on the global level (Baumer et al. 2017; Corner et al. 2015). Other types of framing, according to the literature, involve the view of climate change by the British public via the junction of health- and climate-related problems (Rossa-Roccor et al. 2021). Moreover, the British public at large perceive climate change via postapocalyptic frames, which are evocative of climate change-induced disruptions of people's daily lives (de Moor 2022). Finally, societal actors in the UK are reported to frame the issue of climate change through a sceptical

lens (de Moor 2022), which is indicative of the public scepticism and distrust as far as the origins of anthropogenic climate change are concerned (Bevan et al. 2020; de Moor 2022). Summarising the framing of climate change by the British public, the literature indicates that there is a rather mosaic picture of frames associated with the perceptions of climate change by the British societal actors (de Moore 2022; Whitmarsh & Capstick 2018).

So far, we have seen in the literature review section of this article that there is a cornucopia of research publications on the framing of climate change by corporate, media, political, and societal actors in the UK. However, as previously mentioned, there are no published studies that focus on the framing of climate change by the British royal family in general and by the current reigning monarch King Charles III in particular. Further, in section 3, I present a qualitative study that investigates this under-research matter.

### **3. The present study: Its research aims, corpus, and methodology**

As explained in the introductory part of the article, the present study focuses on the framing of climate change in the corpus of speeches by King Charles III. In the study, his speeches are argued to pertain to the orally delivered type of climate change discourse. In line with Fairclough (1995), discourse is regarded in the study as a particular way of constructing a specific domain of social practice, which, in our case, is represented by orally delivered climate change discourse. Fairclough's (1995) approach to discourse is extended in the study by the Foucauldian (1988) views of discourse as socio-culturally and historically motivated practices. Arguably, the aforementioned views are applicable to climate change discourse as well.

Given that King Charles III has been an avid supporter of climate change mitigation since the beginning of the 1990s, to-date, in 2024, there are dozens of his speeches on the matter. They are available as the official transcripts at [www.royal.uk](http://www.royal.uk).





**Figure 1.** King Charles III in Dubai at COP28 UAE with the address at the Opening Ceremony (source: [www.royal.uk](http://www.royal.uk))

As already stated in the introduction, the present qualitative study aims at (i) collecting a relevant corpus of King Charles III's speeches on the issue of climate change and (ii) providing answers to the RQ (see introduction). With the aims of the study in mind, the website [www.royal.uk](http://www.royal.uk) was searched for King Charles III's speeches on the issue of climate change by means of the following keywords: anthropogenic climate change, climate change adaptation, climate change demonstration, climate change event, climate change mass media coverage, climate change mitigation, climate change policy, climate risk/risks, CO<sub>2</sub> absorption, CO<sub>2</sub> capture and storage, CO<sub>2</sub> emission/emissions, CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction/reductions, extreme weather event/events, extreme drought, extreme rain/rainfall, global warming, green energy, greenhouse gasses/GHG, green technology, net zero, rise in sea level, wind energy, wind farm, the consequences of climate change, and (the) health effects of climate change. Following the application of the aforementioned keywords, 20 speeches (total number of words = 36 272, mean words = 1 813.6 and standard deviation words = 842.1) on the issue of climate change were identified and downloaded from [www.royal.uk](http://www.royal.uk). The earliest of King Charles III's

speeches on climate change available at [www.royal.uk](http://www.royal.uk) dated back to 2005, whilst his most recent speech was delivered in December 2023. Hence, the time frame of the corpus involved the period from 2005 to 2023.

It should be observed that whilst the keywords facilitated the search, they did not define completely the inclusion of each individual speech into the corpus. The main criteria that determined the inclusion of a particular speech in the corpus were formulated as follows. The speech was publicly available as an official transcript at [www.royal.uk](http://www.royal.uk) and contained, at least, one of the abovementioned keywords. Importantly, the topic of the entire speech had to be centred on the issue of climate change. In line with the corpus inclusion criteria, snippets and interviews with King Charles III on climate change that were embedded into other issues were factored out from the corpus collection.

The corpus was analysed qualitatively in line with the tenets of framing methodology, which were developed by Entman (1993, 2004, 2007). In concord with Entman's methodology of frame identification and analysis, King Charles III's speeches in the form of their official transcripts taken from [www.royal.uk](http://www.royal.uk) were analysed individually in the following manner. Firstly, each official transcript was searched manually for the presence of the abovementioned keywords as well as recurring phrases and sentences associated with the topic of climate change. Secondly, the manual search for the recurring phrases and sentences was supplemented by a computer-assisted search facilitated by the computer program AntConc version 4.0.11 (Anthony 2022). The computer-assisted search analysed each individual transcript of King Charles III's speeches for the presence of the most frequent notional words, N-grams (i.e. lexical clusters comprised of the N-number of words), and key words in context (KWIC). An example of the descriptive statistics yielded by AntConc was given in Table 1 below. Following Szczygłowska (2021), the N-value in N-grams was set at N =

5. The sample was comprised of one speech only, which was used for illustrative purposes.

**Table 1.** A Sample of AntConc-Generated Descriptive Statistics of one of the Speeches (in the Form of Its Transcript)

#	AntConc-Generated Descriptive Statistics	Examples
1	Key words in context	If the scientific consensus about the scale and immediacy of climate change is correct, and there really can be no; Climate change is not just about whether we have longer; We are going to make a real difference to combatting climate change in this country; I asked a marketing expert how the message about climate change could be spread more widely amongst the business; Because business is not only a major contributor to climate change, but can also play a key role in
2	N-gram	Climate change will bring us; Climate change provides a difference; Climate change could be spread; Climate change is very urgent; Climate change is just about
3	The most frequent notional words	Change Climate Combatting I We

Thirdly, with the help of KWIC and N-grams (see examples in Table 1), I reread each speech in the corpus multiple times to find out how the keywords, as well as recurring phrases and sentences were involved in (i) formulating the issue of climate change, (ii) identifying of the cause of the issue, (iii) establishing the moral judgement and/or evaluation of the issue (if any), and (iv) manifesting possible

suggestions and/or conclusions in conjunction with the issue of climate change. Finally, I gave labels to the frames based upon (i) the most frequent notional words and (ii) the way they were used in framing each individual speech.

Another important remark to be made in conjunction with the corpus analysis involved the qualitative nature of the present investigation. The qualitative analysis of frames and their subsequent interpretation were guided by the Foucauldian (1988) postulate that discourse should be regarded as a socio-culturally and historically embedded practice. In light of the qualitative parameters of the study, I did not aim at calculating the number of frames per speech or the percentage of frames in relation to the most and/or least frequent frames in the corpus. In case several identical frames (i.e., sharing identical properties and the same label) were identified in the different speeches delivered in, for instance, 2007, I indicated the presence of the identical frames only once in the results section under the respective year of speech delivery. Hence, I presented the frames in chronological order in subsection 3.1 of the article.

### 3.1. Results and discussion

The qualitative framing analysis has revealed a number of frames that are utilised by King Charles III in his speeches on climate change, namely *A 2 Degree World*, *Deforestation*, *Responsibility*, *Risk*, *Sustainability*, *Threat*, and *Urgency*. They are summarised in chronological order in Table 2.

**Table 2.** *Frames in the Corpus of King Charles III's Speeches on Climate Change*

#	Year	Frames
1	2005	<i>Responsibility</i>
2	2006	<i>Threat</i>
3	2007	<i>Deforestation; Responsibility; Sustainability; Urgency</i>
4	2008	<i>Deforestation; Responsibility; Threat</i>
5	2009	<i>Risk; Sustainability; Urgency</i>
6	2010	<i>Threat</i>

---

### Responsibility, Sustainability, and Threat...

---

7	2011	<i>Sustainability</i>
8	2014	<i>A 2 Degree World; Sustainability</i>
9	2015	<i>A 2 Degree World; Threat; Deforestation</i>
10	2023	<i>Sustainability; Threat</i>

As indicated in the prior section of the article, my intention is to analyse the frames qualitatively in chronological order. The oldest speech in the corpus dates back to 2005. In the speech, King Charles III frames the issue of climate change as the frame *Responsibility*. In this regard, it should be noted that the framing of climate change as *Responsibility* in the corpus resonates with the literature (Kapranov 2017a, 2024a; Livesey & Graham 2007; Megura & Gunderson 2022; Salter & Wilkinson 2024), which demonstrates that the construal of responsibility in discourse on climate change is associated with corporate responsibility. Judging from the data, King Charles III's framing of climate change involves a clear business-oriented dimension associated with corporate responsibility. Interestingly, whilst King Charles III does not refer to the big corporate polluters, such as Shell and BP, as the main contributors to anthropogenic climate change, he, nevertheless, praises corporate actors for their responsible stance on climate change, as seen in excerpts (1) and (2) below:

(1) ... progressive companies are realizing that action on climate change makes good business sense is both important in its own right and a direct challenge to all the business organizations who have been saying more or less the opposite! (A speech at the DEFRA Conference 'Climate Change: The Business Forecast on 6.10.2005)

(2) At the end of the day there are so many practical actions which businesses can take to tackle climate change, and working with suppliers must rank high on the list. This includes asking for information on issues such as their carbon

footprint. (A speech at the Second May Day Business Summit on Climate Change on 1.05.2008)

The frame *Responsibility* is present in King Charles III's speeches in, as mentioned, 2005 and in 2007-2008. We may argue that, whereas *Responsibility* is quite a recurrent frame in his speeches on climate change in the second half of the 2000s, the frame is not present in more recent speeches. It can be contended that King Charles III's framing of climate change in the 2000s, or, at least, the late 2000s, exhibits a clearly manifested corporate dimension as far as its relation to climate change is concerned (see excerpts (1) and (2)). To reiterate, this finding is in line with the literature (Kapranov 2017b, 2017c, 2017d, 2024a; Livesey & Graham 2007; Megura & Gunderson 2022; Salter & Wilkinson 2024), which emphasises the importance of corporate responsibility in business discourse on climate change.

Another finding, which echoes the literature (Bevan et al. 2020; de Moor 2022), involves the presence of the frame *Threat* in the corpus. Whilst there is no postapocalyptic climate change-related imagery in the frame *Threat*, King Charles III's framing of the issue of climate change bears a distinct mark of climate change as an existential threat to all humanity, as seen in excerpts (3) and (4):

(3) You hardly need me to tell you – but I will all the same! – that climate change **threatens all of us**, and all of our descendants, so it really is an issue requiring concerted action from every sector of society. And it will certainly mean doing things differently. Having barely got over the astonishment of being selected for this award, I could not be more delighted to accept it, not least because it gives me one more chance to bang the drum about climate change! (A speech at the British Environment and Media Award for raising awareness of climate change on 22.03.2006)

(4) Ladies and gentlemen, for twenty years I have been making speeches warning about climate change and I remain in no doubt that it is **the greatest threat facing Mankind**. While I am enormously encouraged that it is has now become a subject which occupies the minds of most Governments, international organizations, companies and individuals, I, for one, don't think we are doing enough or that we are doing it sufficiently quickly, that is the real problem. (A speech at the Bali to Poznan Corporate Leaders Group on Climate Change Conference on 16.07.2008).

We observe in (3) and (4) that the frame *Threat* imparts a sense of the imminent catastrophe, if no real steps to mitigate the negative consequences of climate change are undertaken. In this regard, King Charles III's framing of climate change as *Threat* finds support in the literature (Boykoff 2008; O'Neill 2013; Jaspal & Nerlich 2014), which has uncovered that British mass media actors frame the issue of climate change rather similarly, e.g., "Climate change as a multi-faceted threat" (Jaspal & Nerlich 2014). Identically to the prior findings (Boykoff 2008; Kapranov 2023a, 2024a; O'Neill 2013), the frame *Threat* is evocative of the economisation of the issue of climate change, cf. "tackling climate change is actually in **our economic interests**, then the world would be under **even greater threat than it already is**" (A speech at the "Deal or No Deal" Corporate Leaders Group on Climate Change Conference on 14.07.2010). In contrast to the literature, however, the qualitative framing analysis has revealed a novel aspect of the frame *Threat*, which is not reported in the prior studies. Specifically, King Charles III frames climate change as an issue that poses a substantial threat to human health, as illustrated in the following excerpt:

(5) I don't think you need me to tell you that climate change will cause alterations to patterns of bacterial, toxic and vector-

born disease. Through extreme weather events, it is already causing ecosystem collapse, loss of habitation, poverty, starvation, migration and conflict. Some five years ago, the Lancet's Commission on Climate Change described it as '**The greatest threat to human health** of the 21st Century' and this warning has been echoed worldwide by the American Medical Association... Seven years ago, the U.K.'s Royal College of Physicians hosted a full day's meeting on the Health Impacts of Climate Change. Four years ago, its president co-authored an editorial with two senior military figures to 'raise the alarm'. I am delighted that the meeting which my I.S.U. hosted in December 2013 to help forge a consensus on **the critical importance of the health sector speaking with a coherent voice on this issue** has encouraged others to speak up and indeed loudly. (A speech at "Putting Health at the Centre of the Climate Change debate: The role of the Health community in the run up to COP21" on 25.02.2015).

Seen chronologically, we can observe that the frame *Threat* changes its quality and magnitude with time. For instance, whereas in (3) and (4) we witness an existential degree of *Threat*, later, in the 2010s, the frame acquires a health-related dimension in (5). The portrayal of climate change through the health-related framing is supported by the literature (Kapranov 2023b; Rossa-Roccor et al. 2021), which emphasises the junction between climate change and health-related concerns. However, in his most recent speech that dates back to 1 December 2023, King Charles III conceives of *Threat* as the existential menace, just like in the 2000s, e.g.

(6) I have spent a large proportion of my life trying to warn of **the existential threats facing us over global warming, climate change** and biodiversity loss. But I was not alone. For instance, Sheikh Mohamed 's dear father, Sheikh Zayed, was advocating



for clean energy at a time even before the United Arab Emirates, as such, came into being. All these decades later, and despite all the attention, there is thirty per cent more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere now than there was back then, and almost forty per cent more methane. Some important progress has been made, but it worries me greatly that we remain so dreadfully far off track as the Global Stocktake report demonstrates so graphically. (A speech at the opening of COP28 in Dubai on 01.12.2023)

Arguably, a shift in foci in the frame *Threat* represents a novel finding, which points to the persistent, yet dynamic nature of framing the issue of climate change by King Charles III.

Whilst framing climate change as *Threat*, King Charles III utilises a similar notion of urgency, which he regards as the need to intensify a range of measures of climate change mitigation. It is evident from the corpus that the frame *Urgency*, which first appears in 2007, comes to the fore again in 2009, as illustrated by excerpts (7) and (8):

(7) I really don't think there is **a more urgent issue** for any of us to be addressing, at work, at home, and indeed in every facet of our lives, than climate change. Business is not only a major contributor to climate change, but can also play a key role in tackling the problems and reducing their impact. (A speech at the Celtic Nations Business Summit on Climate Change on 7.11.2007)

(8) ... **we had 100 months left in which to take the necessary action.** I don't know if you have ever studied the May Day logo, but you will see that it is a dandelion with the last few seeds being blown away. The idea was to symbolize the doomsday clock as we fast approach midnight. Well, ladies and

gentlemen, **now we have ninety-eight months left – and that doomsday clock ticks relentlessly and unforgivingly onwards.** That is what gives, or should give, such urgency to the work we are doing here today and which you will do when you return to your boardrooms. (A speech at the Third May Day Business Summit on Climate Change on 1.05.2009)

Notably, both (7) and (8) manifest a strong time pressure to act in order to mitigate the negative consequences of climate change. Taken in conjunction with multiple references to “the doomsday clock”, the frame *Urgency* is reminiscent of the findings that are mentioned in the literature (Boykoff 2008; Carvalho 2005, 2010; Carvalho & Burgess 2005; Carvalho et al. 2017; Jaspal & Nerlich 2014; Nerlich & Jaspal 2013). Specifically, the apocalyptic “doom-and-gloom” tonality of *Urgency* appears to be in concord with the prior studies on the framing of climate change discourse by the British mass media actors that routinely evoke the-end-of-the-times imagery (Boykoff 2008; Carvalho 2005, 2010; Carvalho & Burgess 2005; Carvalho et al. 2017).

Also mentioned for the first time in 2007, the frame *Deforestation* re-occurs in 2008 and 2015, as emblematised by excerpts (9) and (10):

(9) One of the priorities must be to **stop tropical deforestation**, which is estimated to be responsible for about 20 per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions. Only the power generation sector releases more. These forests are the greatest global public utility, regulating our temperature, cleaning our air and producing our rainfall. (A speech at The Bali Communiqué on Climate Change on 30.11. 2007)

(10) I would suggest, ladies and gentlemen, that for too long **the destruction of the rainforests** has been seen as a slightly

troubling event occurring in “far away countries about which we know little”, and something which only marginally affects us. The trouble is that nothing could be further from the truth and so this is why I particularly wanted to have this gathering this evening. At the risk of repeating things you already know, if I may I should like to give you some arresting facts. The first point to make is that climate change and the rainforests are umbilically connected. (A speech on climate change from tropical deforestation at Mansion House on 10.12.2008)

The framing of the issue of climate change by means of forest imagery and the lack thereof (i.e., deforestation) is not novel, since the literature repeatedly informs us about similar framing that is utilised by British corporate actors in their sustainability reports (Kapranov 2017a, 2017d; Livesey & Graham 2007; Megura & Gunderson 2022; Salter & Wilkinson 2024). Similarly to the annual corporate reports by big corporate actors, the frame *Deforestation* in the corpus co-occurs with the frame *Sustainability*.

In the corpus, the frame *Sustainability*, however, reveals two distinct aspects in conjunction with the issue of climate change. The first aspect is referred to in one of King Charles III’s speeches delivered in 2007. In the speech, he frames climate change via ecologically-friendly “green” technology, as seen in excerpt (11):

(11) And there are many business opportunities to be had from taking action to tackle climate change. The Stern Report said that **the potential global market for low-carbon technologies** is an estimated £350 billion a year. And here in the United Kingdom, a recent Government report indicated that the Environmental Goods and Services sector, which comprises around 17,000 companies, has an estimated turnover of over £25 billion – and this is a figure predicted to increase to £46 billion by 2015. The Government’s recent Climate Change Bill highlights the importance of carbon accounting, and this will

be an issue which will be of increasing importance for all businesses, large and small. My own Accounting for Sustainability project, which I launched in December last year, is developing ways to help business leaders make the right decisions based on the real full-life social and environmental costs of what they do. (A speech at a Climate Change Seminar of Business Leaders in Woking on 23.03.2007)

It follows from (11) that green technology, which facilitates sustainable development, is coupled with the economisation of the issue of climate change, since the use of green technology is thought to generate more income. Whilst the economisation of climate change has already been mentioned in our discussion of the frame *Responsibility*, it can be safely posited that sustainability in (11) exhibits an identical business-oriented aspect. We can also argue that this finding provides support to the literature, which has established that the issue of climate change in the UK is framed by economising it (Kapranov 2017b, 2017c, 2024a; Livesey & Graham 2007; Megura & Gunderson 2022; Salter & Wilkinson 2024).

Yet, another aspect of the frame *Sustainability* is manifested by King Charles III's focus on sustainable agricultural practices and their maintenance, as emblematised by excerpt (12):

(12) Ladies and gentlemen, in Southern Africa you are only too aware of the tensions that come from competing demands on the land. Land is the most fragile and precious of all our commodities and, as I have tried to indicate over the years, there is mounting evidence that, worldwide, we cannot carry on as we have been without suffering some very painful consequences. What with the ever-growing need for more urban development and the pressure to produce more food, it is fast becoming difficult to maintain those essential services, such as the supply of clean water and, ultimately, to protect

those areas that are rich in the diversity of life and which, whether we like it or not, are actually vital if **Nature is to continue sustaining herself and, therefore, us.** (A speech on climate change and the environment at Cape Town University on 5.11.2011)

Notwithstanding the focus on sustainable green technology as in (11) or on sustainable agriculture as in (12), it seems feasible to posit that the frame *Sustainability* is, essentially, a canonical example of framing in British discourse on climate change, especially in relation to the corporate actors in the UK. This contention is supported by the literature (Kapranov 2022b; Lovell 2004; Williams & Sovacool 2019; Willis 2017), which indicates that the construal of sustainability is amply and frequently utilised in climate change discourse in the UK. We may even argue that King Charles III's framing of climate change through the lens of *Sustainability* is entrenched in the very fabrics of British corporate and political discourse on climate change.

Now, let us turn to the frame, which, just like *Sustainability*, is reported to be characteristic of British discourses on climate change, especially political discourse (Boykoff 2008; Carvalho 2005, 2010; Carvalho & Burgess 2005; Carvalho et al. 2017; Gillings & Dayrell 2024; Jaspal & Nerlich 2014; Kapranov 2023a, 2024a; Nerlich & Jaspal 2013; O'Neill 2013). This frame is *Risk*, which is present in one of the speeches delivered by King Charles III in 2009. *Risk* is further illustrated by excerpt (13) below:

(13) As the President of Gabon said at a meeting I hosted last month, "The door to our future is closing..." This, I fear, is not an overstatement. For **climate change is a risk-multiplier**. It has the potential to take all the other critical issues we face as a global community and transform their severity into a cataclysm. Reducing poverty, increasing food production, combatting terrorism and sustaining economic development

are all vital priorities, but it is increasingly clear how rapid climate change will make them even more difficult to address. Furthermore, because climate change is intimately connected with our systemic, unsustainable consumption of natural resources, any decline in the ecological resilience of one resource base or ecosystem increases the fragility of the whole. (A speech at the Copenhagen Climate Change Summit on 15.12.2009)

Presumably, in (13) we can notice that the framing of climate change as *Risk* entails a certain degree of securitisation and, even, weaponisation of the issue of climate change. Such an interpretation of (13) is supported by a number of prior studies (Kapranov 2018a; Sovacool et al. 2023; Warner & Boas 2019; Williams & Sovacool 2019), which have discovered that climate change mitigation is increasingly regarded through the prism of securitisation in the UK. This, typically, involves risk assessment and risk management as far as the negative consequences of climate change are concerned (Kapranov 2018a, 2024a; Sovacool et al. 2023; Warner & Boas 2019).

The final frame in our discussion, *A 2 Degree World*, is also partially involved in risk management of the negative consequences of climate change, given that the current goals of climate mitigation are associated with curbing the rise in global temperature, i.e. keeping the rise below 2 degrees Celsius. The frame *A 2 Degree World* is emblematised by excerpt (14):

(14) Regarding C.O.P.21, I have been immensely touched by President Hollande's invitation to attend and speak at the opening of the Conference. Paris will be an absolutely crucial milestone in the long overdue international effort to **keep to a 2 degree world**, although I think that everyone realizes that this C.O.P. will be the beginning of a new phase in the process, not the end in itself. It must, however, send an unequivocal, long-

term signal to the international community, and to global markets, that the transition to a low carbon, sustainable, climate-compatible economy is firmly and irreversibly underway – and that **a 2 degree world** is therefore still, just, if we stretch every sinew – by setting a proper price for carbon – within reach... (A speech at a meeting about Forests and Climate Change at Lancaster House on 29.10. 2015)

The frame *A 2 Degree World* is not explicitly reported in the literature (Barr et al. 2011; Baum et al. 2024; Baumer et al. 2017; Boykoff 2008; Carvalho 2005, 2010; Carvalho & Burgess 2005; Carvalho et al. 2017; Corner et al. 2015; Gillings & Dayrell 2024; Jaspal & Nerlich 2014; Kapranov 2015, 2023a, 2024a; Megura & Gunderson 2022; Livesey & Graham 2007; Nerlich & Jaspal 2013; Lovell 2004; O'Neill 2013; Rossa-Roccor et al. 2021; Salter & Wilkinson 2024; Williams & Sovacool 2019; Willis 2017). Hence, we may assume that this finding is novel. Furthermore, it may constitute the type of frame that is specific to the climate change discourse by King Charles III.

### Conclusions

The article has presented and discussed a qualitative investigation whose aim is to establish how King Charles III frames the issue of climate change in his speeches. The qualitative framing analysis has established that there are several frames in the corpus of King Charles III's speeches on climate change, specifically *A 2 Degree World*, *Deforestation*, *Responsibility*, *Risk*, *Sustainability*, *Threat*, and *Urgency*.

The juxtaposition of the results of the qualitative investigation with the existing bulk of literature has demonstrated that such frames as *Deforestation*, *Responsibility*, *Risk*, *Sustainability*, *Threat*, and *Urgency* have their equivalents in the literature. These findings are interpreted in the study as an indication that King Charles III's framing of climate change does not differ qualitatively from the oral and written discourses on the matter by British corporate, political, and, less so,

media actors. Indeed, comparing the present findings with the literature, we can observe striking similarities between the economisation of climate change by British corporate actors, on the one hand, and King Charles III, on the other hand. Moreover, King Charles III's securitisation of climate change discourse appears to be in line with the literature, which indicates that British political actors quite often resort to framing the issue of climate change through the lens of security. Concurrently with the aforementioned findings, however, there is one frame that is not reported in the literature, namely *A 2 Degree World*. The frame seems to be specific to King Charles III discourse. Its uniqueness can be accounted by King Charles III's year-long involvement in climate change mitigation, whose prime goal is to minimise the rise of global temperature.

Given that the majority of the identified frames in the corpus do not appear to be utilised exclusively by King Charles III, the present investigation can be concluded by the following contention: King Charles III frames the issue of climate change in his speeches in unison with his subjects, first of all, corporate and political actors, and less so, media actors. This contention could serve as an indication of discursive convergence of royal, corporate, media, and political actors in the UK on the issue of climate change, which is characterised by qualitatively similar frames.

## **Bibliography**

### **A. Books:**

- Benn, S.; Edwards, M.; Williams, T. (2014): *Organizational Change for Corporate Sustainability*, London: Routledge.
- Entman, R. M. (2004): *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and US Foreign Policy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995): *Media Discourse*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Foucault, M. (1988): *Technologies of the Self*, London: Tavistock.
- Giddens, A. (2009): *Politics of Climate Change*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Hajer, M. A. (1995): *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.



Hulme, M. (2009): *Why We Disagree about Climate Change: Understanding Controversy, Inaction and Opportunity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Incropera, F. P. (2016): *Climate Change: A Wicked Problem. Complexity and Uncertainty at the Intersection of Science, Economics, Politics, and Human Behavior*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**B. Articles and book chapters:**

Anthony, L. (2022): AntConc (Version 4.0.11) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Retrieved from <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>.

Barr, S.; Gilg, A.; Shaw, G. (2011): "Citizens, consumers and sustainability: (Re) Framing environmental practice in an age of climate change", in *Global Environmental Change*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 1224-1233.

Baum, C. M.; Fritz, L.; Low, S.; Sovacool, B. K. (2024): "Like diamonds in the sky? Public perceptions, governance, and information framing of solar geoengineering activities in Mexico, the United Kingdom, and the United States", in *Environmental Politics*, vol. 33, issue 5, pp. 868-895.

Baumer, E. P.; Polletta, F.; Pierski, N.; Gay, G. K. (2017): "A simple intervention to reduce framing effects in perceptions of global climate change", in *Environmental Communication*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 289-310.

Bevan, L.D.; Colley, T.; Workman, M. (2020): "Climate change strategic narratives in the United Kingdom: Emergency, extinction, effectiveness", in *Energy Research & Social Science*, vol. 69, pp. 1-13.

Bickerstaffe, T. (2024): "A problem of generations? Habitus, social processes and climate change", in *Journal of Global Responsibility*, vol. 15, no.1, pp. 111-124.

Boykoff, M. T. (2008): "The cultural politics of climate change discourse in UK tabloids", in *Political Geography*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 549-569.

Bulkeley, H.; Betsill, M. (2005): "Rethinking sustainable cities: Multilevel governance and the 'urban' politics of climate change", in *Environmental Politics*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 42-63.

Carvalho, A. (2010): "Media (ted) discourses and climate change: a focus on political subjectivity and (dis) engagement", in *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 172-179.

Carvalho, A. (2005): "Representing the politics of the greenhouse effect: Discursive strategies in the British media", in *Critical Discourse Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1-29.

- Carvalho, A.; Burgess, J. (2005): "Cultural circuits of climate change in UK broadsheet newspapers, 1985–2003", in *Risk Analysis: An International Journal*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 1457-1469.
- Carvalho, A.; Van Wessel, M.; Maeselele, P. (2017): "Communication practices and political engagement with climate change: A research agenda", in *Environmental Communication*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 122-135.
- Corner, A., Roberts, O., Chiari, S., Völler, S., Mayrhuber, E. S., Mandl, S., & Monson, K. (2015): "How do young people engage with climate change? The role of knowledge, values, message framing, and trusted communicators", in *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 523-534.
- de Moor, J. (2022): "Postapocalyptic narratives in climate activism: their place and impact in five European cities", in *Environmental Politics*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 927-948.
- Entman, R. M. (2007): "Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power", in *Journal of Communication*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 163-173.
- Entman, R. M. (1993): "Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm", in *Journal of Communication*, vol. 43, no.4, pp. 51-58.
- Entman, R. M. (1991): "Framing US coverage of international news: Contrasts in narratives of the KAL and Iran air incidents", in *Journal of Communication*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 6-27.
- Ferns, G.; Amaeshi, K. (2021): "Fuelling climate (in) action: How organizations engage in hegemonization to avoid transformational action on climate change", in *Organization Studies*, vol. 42, no. 7, pp. 1005-1029.
- Gillings, M.; Dayrell, C. (2024): "Climate change in the UK press: Examining discourse fluctuation over time", in *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 111-133.
- Jaspal, R.; Nerlich, B. (2014): "When climate science became climate politics: British media representations of climate change in 1988", in *Public Understanding of Science*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 122-141.
- Kapranov, O. (2024a): "Between a burden and green technology: Rishi Sunak's framing of climate change discourse on Facebook and X (Twitter)", in *Information & Media*, vol. 99, pp. 85-105.
- Kapranov, O. (2024b): "Self-mentions in climate change discourse by King Charles III", in *Journal of Contemporary Philology*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 29-46.

- Kapranov, O. (2023a): "Throwing soup at Van Gogh: The framing of art in climate change activism by British mass media", in *Discourses on Culture*, vol. 19, no.1, pp. 175-200.
- Kapranov, O. (2023b): "Modal verbs in English-medium research articles on the issue of climate change and health", in *Acta Marisiensis. Philologia*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 38-48
- Kapranov, O. (2022a): "The syntax of climate change: Syntactic means in the construction of Greta Thunberg's community identity on Facebook", in *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai-Philologia*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 15-33.
- Kapranov, O. (2022b): "The discourse of sustainability in English Language Teaching (ELT) at the University of Oxford: Analyzing discursive representations", in *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 35-48.
- Kapranov, O. (2018a): "Shell's image of climate change and its representations in the British financial press", in G. E. Garzone and W. Giordano (eds.) *Discourse, Communication and the Enterprise: Where Business Meets Language*, pp. 392-409. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.
- Kapranov, O. (2018b): "The framing of the EU visa liberalization with Ukraine", in *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 97-115.
- Kapranov, O. (2018c): "The framing of an EFL primary school teacher's identity by Norwegian pre-service primary school teachers", in *Konińskie Studia Językowe*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 329-351
- Kapranov, O. (2017a): "British Petroleum's corporate discourse involving climate change before and after the Deepwater Horizon oil spill: A cognitive linguistic account", in *Selected Papers on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, vol. 22, pp. 211-223.
- Kapranov, O. (2017b): "The framing of climate-change discourse by Shell and the framing of Shell's climate change-related activities by the Economist and the Financial Times", in *Bergen Language and Linguistics Studies*, vol. 7, pp. 55-69.
- Kapranov, O. (2017c): "Conceptual metaphors involving renewable energy in corporate discourse by British Petroleum and the Royal Dutch Shell", in *Man in the Space of Language*, vol. 9, pp. 116-130.
- Kapranov, O. (2017d): "A diachronic corpus-assisted study of climate change discourse in annual reports by British Petroleum", in K. Broś and G.

- Kowalski (eds.), *Discourse Studies – Ways and Crossroads. Insights into Cultural, Diachronic and Genre Issues in the Discipline*, pp. 191-205. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Kapranov, O. (2015): “Do international corporations speak in one voice on the issue of global climate change: The case of British Petroleum and The Royal Dutch Shell Group”, in C. Can, A. Kilimci, and K. Papaja (eds.), *Social Sciences and Humanities: A Global Perspective*, pp. 306-322. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Livesey, S. M.; Graham, J. (2007): “Greening of corporations. Eco-talk and the emerging social imaginary of sustainable development”, in S. K. May, G. Cheney, and J. Roper (eds.), *The Debate over Corporate Social Responsibility*, pp. 336-350. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lovell, H. (2004): “Framing sustainable housing as a solution to climate change”, in *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 35-55.
- Meyer, J. M. (2024): “The People” and Climate Justice: Reconceptualizing Populism and Pluralism within Climate Politics”, in *Polity*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 1-23.
- Megura, M.; Gunderson, R. (2022): “Better poison is the cure? Critically examining fossil fuel companies, climate change framing, and corporate sustainability reports”, in *Energy Research & Social Science*, vol. 85, pp. 102388.
- Nerlich, B.; Jaspal, R. (2013): “UK media representations of carbon capture and storage: Actors, frames and metaphors”, in *Metaphor and the Social World*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 35-53.
- O'Neill, S. J. (2013): “Image matters: Climate change imagery in US, UK and Australian newspapers”, in *Geoforum*, vol. 49, pp. 10-19.
- Pidgeon, N. F.; Lorenzoni, I.; Poortinga, W. (2008): “Climate change or nuclear power – No thanks! A quantitative study of public perceptions and risk framing in Britain”, in *Global Environmental Change*, vol. 18, no.1, pp. 69-85.
- Rossa-Roccor, V.; Giang, A.; Kershaw, P. (2021): “Framing climate change as a human health issue: enough to tip the scale in climate policy?”, in *The Lancet Planetary Health*, vol. 5, no. 8, pp. 553-559.
- Sadler-Smith, E.; Akstinaite, V. (2022): “Human hubris, anthropogenic climate change, and an environmental ethic of humility”, in *Organization & Environment*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 446-467.

- Salter, J.; Wilkinson, O. (2024): "Faith framing climate: a review of faith actors' definitions and usage of climate change", in *Climate and Development*, vol. 16, no.2, pp. 97-108.
- Schlichting, I. (2013): "Strategic framing of climate change by industry actors: A meta-analysis", in *Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 493-511.
- Sovacool, B. K.; Baum, C.; Low, S. (2023): "The next climate war? Statecraft, security, and weaponization in the geopolitics of a low-carbon future", in *Energy Strategy Reviews*, vol. 45, pp. 101031.
- Szczygłowska, T. (2021): "Recurrent lexis and phraseology in English restaurant reviews: A data-driven analysis", in *Discourse and Interaction*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 105-125.
- Tompkins, E. L.; Adger, W. N.; Boyd, E.; Nicholson-Cole, S.; Weatherhead, K.; Arnell, N. (2010): "Observed adaptation to climate change: UK evidence of transition to a well-adapting society", in *Global Environmental Change*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 627-635.
- Warner, J.; Boas, I. (2019): "Securitization of climate change: How invoking global dangers for instrumental ends can backfire", in *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, vol. 37, no. 8, pp. 1471-1488.
- Williams, L.; Sovacool, B. K. (2019): "The discursive politics of 'fracking': Frames, storylines, and the anticipatory contestation of shale gas development in the United Kingdom", in *Global Environmental Change*, vol. 58, pp. 1-17.
- Willis, R. (2017): "Taming the climate? Corpus analysis of politicians' speech on climate change", in *Environmental Politics*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 212-231.
- Wright, C.; Nyberg, D.; De Cock, C.; Whiteman, G. (2013): "Future imaginings: Organizing in response to climate change", in *Organization*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 647-658.

**C. Internet Sources:**

[www.royal.uk](http://www.royal.uk)

**Oleksandr Kapranov**

**affiliation:** NLA University College Norway

**position:** Associate Professor

**email:** [oleksandr.kapranov@nla.no](mailto:oleksandr.kapranov@nla.no)

**research interests:** academic discourse, academic writing, cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics.

**Selected publications:**

- (2023): "Modal verbs in sustainability discourse by the University of Cambridge and the University of Oxford: Comparing discursive practices", in *Bergen Language and Literature Studies (BELLS)*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1- 18.
- (2023): "Modality in sustainability discourse by Harrods and Liberty: Analysing British cultural icons' discursive practices", in *Cultural Perspectives. Journal for Literary and British Cultural Studies in Romania*, vol. 28, pp. 85-116.
- (2021): "Discursive representations of education for sustainable development in policy documents by English medium instruction schools in Estonia and Norway", in *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education*, vol. 12, no.1, pp. 55-66.
- (2018): "The framing of climate change discourse by Statoil", in *Topics in Linguistics*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 54-68.