

# Climate Change Discourse by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds: A Qualitative Framing Analysis

<sup>1</sup> Oleksandr Kapranov

Accepted: 06.02.2025

Published: 06.03.2025

<https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.0104022>

**Abstract:** Founded in 1889, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) has approximately 1.1 million members in 2025, making it one of the largest wildlife conservation organisations in the United Kingdom (the UK) and in Europe (Caddell, 2025). The RSPB's main goal is to ensure the protection of birds and their environment (Clarke, 2015) by means of conducting awareness campaigns and maintaining nature reserves in the UK. Whilst the RSPB's activities pertain to the topic of environmental protection, they, concurrently, involve measures that are associated with the issue of climate change. Presently, however, there are no published studies that shed light onto the way the RSPB frames the issue of climate change in its discourse. The present paper aims to enhance our knowledge of the framing of climate change discourse by the RSPB. To that end, the paper presents a qualitative framing analysis of the RSPB's annual report 2023-2024. The results of the qualitative framing analysis reveal that climate change discourse is framed by the RSPB as eight qualitatively different types of frames. These findings are discussed in relation to the prior studies on the framing of climate change by nongovernmental organisations (NGOs).

**Keywords;** *Climate change discourse, framing, nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), qualitative framing analysis, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)*

## INTRODUCTION

Climate change has become an issue that affects a wide range of actors that represent all layers of society (Boykoff, 2011; Fløttum, 2018; Kapranov, 2015, 2016a), inclusive of corporate and political bodies (Chen et al., 2023; Harrington, 2023; Kapranov, 2017, 2018a), individuals (Fløttum et al., 2014; Kapranov, 2022, 2023; Nisbet & Newman, 2015), and nongovernmental organisations, such as the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB). Arguably, the RSPB is one of the largest wildlife conservation organisations in the United Kingdom (the UK) and in Europe (Caddell, 2025) with approximately 1.1 million members in 2025. The RSPB's main goal is to ensure the protection of birds and their environment (Clarke, 2015) by means of conducting awareness campaigns and maintaining nature reserves in the UK. Since its inception in February 1889, the RSPB has been actively involved in lobbying and networking amongst, initially, women, and, with time, amongst the influential male and female members of society in order to increase its membership (Clarke, 2004). The RSPB's membership has traditionally been comprised of a list of eminent scientific and aristocratic members,

---

<sup>1</sup> **Kapranov, O.** Associate Professor, NLA University College, Oslo, Norway. Email: [oleksandr.kapranov@nla.no](mailto:oleksandr.kapranov@nla.no).  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9056-3311>

patrons, and supporters (Clarke, 2004), such as the late Queen Elizabeth II and King Charles III, who is the current patron of the RSPB (Lewis-Stempel, 2024).

Against this backdrop, it seems to be pertinent to inquire into the way the RSPB frames its discourse vis-à-vis the issue of climate change, which is a problem that is tangent to the RSPB's activities. However, there seems to be no published research on the framing of climate change discourse by the RSPB. In order to address the current knowledge gap, this paper introduces and discusses a qualitative study that examines how the RSPB frames its climate change discourse in its latest annual report, which is titled "The RSPB's Annual Report 2023-24". In the study, the report is analysed by means of applying a qualitative framing methodology that is proposed and developed by Entman (1993, 2007, 2010). Following Entman (1993, 2007, 2010), frames are deemed to define problems, diagnose their causes, identify moral judgments, and suggest treatments for the problems (Entman, 1993, p. 52). Based upon the premises of Entman's (1993, 2007) framing analysis, the study attempts to answer the following **research question** (RQ): How does the RSPB frame its climate change discourse in its annual report 2023-24? The RQ in the study is grounded in the literature (Allan & Hadden, 2017; Vu et al. 2021), which demonstrates that NGOs' climate change discourses seem to be framed by qualitatively different types of frames that are entangled in a variety of discursive contexts associated with local and trans-local mobilisation, grassroots realpolitik, and group identity (Dinnie et al., 2015; Tjernshaugen & Lee, 2004; Usher, 2013). Arguably, a qualitative framing analysis of the RSPB's annual report could contribute to disentangling a complex discursive relationship (Fetzer, 2014; Kapranov, 2016b) between climate change-related categorisations on the one hand and environmentally-oriented categories on the other hand, which, however, work in unity in order to achieve the common objective of ameliorating and mitigating the human-wildlife coexistence. Anchored in the RQ, the article's content unfolds as follows. First, an outline of the literature on the framing of climate change discourse by NGOs is provided. Second, the present qualitative study is introduced and discussed. Third, the conclusions of the study are presented and summarised.

### **An Outline of the Literature on the Framing of Climate Change Discourse by NGOs**

Given that the RSPB is an NGO, which is officially registered as a charity, it appears relevant to review the literature on the framing of climate change discourse by NGOs. Whereas the literature on this particular research area is copious (Allan & Hadden, 2017; Della Porta & Parks, 2014; Dzhengiz et al., 2021; Enggaard et al., 2023; Kapranov, 2023; Laestadius et al., 2014; Šimunović, Hesser, & Stern, 2018; Tjernshaugen & Lee, 2004; Vu et al., 2021; Zeng et al., 2019), the present outline does not pretend to be exhaustive and comprehensive. Nevertheless, the outline aims at pointing to the major findings reported by the literature. Among one of the foci in the framing of climate change by NGOs, Della Porta and Parks (2014) note that the framing of climate change discourse by a range of international NGOs is executed by the frame Justice. Della Porta and Parks (2014) argue that NGOs nowadays seem to employ the framing of climate change as the frame Green Economy rather reluctantly. Instead, they appear to embrace the framing of Justice, which foregrounds the notions of human rights, social justice, and the ideas of climate justice. Likewise, Allan and Hadden (2017) single out the framing of climate change by numerous NGOs as the frame Justice. Specifically, Allan and Hadden (2017) demonstrate that the framing of climate change through the lens of justice enables NGOs to enhance their influence and mobilise a substantial number of followers. Additionally, the framing of climate change through the prism of frame Justice provides NGOs with heightened media attention.

Furthermore, Allan and Hadden (2017) argue that the frame Justice is extended to the frame Climate Justice. Identically to Della Porta and Parks (2014), and Allan and Hadden (2017), a frame analysis of NGOs' climate change discourse by Šimunović, Hesser, and Stern (2018) reveals that environmental NGOs appear to frame their discourses by the frames Justice and Sustainability, respectively. To an extent, the framing of climate change discourse by the British protest movement Just Stop Oil is also reported to involve references to justice, in particular, climate justice (Kapranov, 2023).

Similarly to the study by Allan and Hadden (2017), a fairly recent research investigation conducted by Vu, Blomberg, Seo, Liu, Shayesteh, and Do (2021) shows that NGOs seem to frame their discourses on climate change via the protest frames. According to Vu, Blomberg, Seo, Liu, Shayesteh, and Do (2021) the protest-related framing of climate change is characterised by such specific frames as Action, Efficacy, and Impact. Moreover, the frame Action is used frequently, whereas the frame Efficacy is less common. Interestingly, Vu, Blomberg, Seo, Liu, Shayesteh, and Do (2021) have found that the frame Action is employed, predominantly, by NGOs located in the post-industrial countries of the Global North, whilst the framing of climate change via the discursive lens of Action is less frequently used by NGOs associated with the Global South.

Tjernshaugen and Lee (2004) maintain that NGOs in Norway, a country that represents the post-industrial Global North, use framing in order to shape the domestic political agenda (Tjernshaugen & Lee, 2004). Specifically, a study by Tjernshaugen and Lee (2004) establishes that the framing of climate change discourse by a number of Norwegian NGOs is employed to influence Norway's foreign policy. Discursively, this is done by means of the frames associated with shaming Norwegian government into adopting policies preferred by the NGOs. It is inferred from the study by Tjernshaugen and Lee (2004) that the Norwegian NGOs' framing of climate change is executed through the lens of the Action frame that is reminiscent of that reported by Vu, Blomberg, Seo, Liu, Shayesteh, and Do (2021). Also, the study by Tjernshaugen and Lee (2004) is echoed by a research publication by Enggaard, Isfeldt, Møller, Carlsen, Albris, and Blok (2023). These authors prove that Scandinavian NGOs, which are based in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, frame their discourses on climate change in a similar manner. It has been established that Scandinavian NGOs utilise the frame Risk in their depiction of the issue of climate change.

In contrast to the NGOs that are associated with the countries of the Global North, a study by Zeng, Dai, and Javed (2019) demonstrates that climate change discourse by Chinese environmental NGOs is framed by promoting advocacy. Furthermore, environmental NGOs in China, a country of the Global South, frame their climate change discourses in unity with the state and media in order to present the so-called frame alignment, which resonates with the official climate change policies. Concurrently, however, Chinese environmental NGOs seem to frame climate change through a critical lens that does not support the framing by the official state-owned media (Zeng et al., 2019).

A rather novel aspect of the framing of climate change discourse is explored in the study by Dzhengiz, Barkemeyer, and Napolitano (2021). These authors investigate emotional framing of NGO press releases. They contend that there is a growing polarisation of sentiment in the NGOs' framing. Particularly, Dzhengiz, Barkemeyer, and Napolitano (2021) assert that NGOs' framing gravitates towards radical positions. In this regard, the authors posit that policymakers should be attentive to the implications of the observed polarisation of NGOs' discourses. These findings are in contrast to a study by Laestadius, Neff, Barry, and Frattaroli (2014), who examine factors influencing NGOs'

decisions to campaign for reduced meat consumption in light of climate change. Specifically, Laestadius, Neff, Barry, and Frattaroli (2014) posit that NGOs show a relatively limited degree of emotional engagement in the aforementioned issue. The lack of engagement and emotional investment in the issue of reduced meat consumption is, reportedly, seen by NGOs as a problem with limited social and political appeal. Consequently, Laestadius, Neff, Barry, and Frattaroli (2014) suggest that the framing of climate change through the lens of reduced meat consumption is not prioritised by many NGOs, which show little incentive to adopt dedicated and ongoing campaigns seeking to reduce meat consumption in light of climate change.

Summarising the literature outline, it seems possible to encapsulate the framing of climate change by (environmental) NGOs as a discursive space that highlights the notions of (i) justice, (ii) protest and protest action, (iii) risk, (iv) alignment with the official media framing, (v) polarisation and radicalisation, (vi) emotional engagement and lack thereof, and (vii) issues that are tangent to the problem of climate change, such as reduced meat consumption. Currently, however, little is known about the manner the RSPB frames its climate change discourse. In the following section of the article, a qualitative framing study is outlined that seeks to provide a deeper insight into this issue.

## **The Present Study**

The present study, as previously mentioned, is based upon a qualitative framing methodology (Entman, 1993, 2003, 2007, 2010; Kapranov, 2016c, 2018b, 2024a), which is employed in order to establish how the RSPB frames its climate change discourse in “The RSPB’s Annual Report 2023-24” (see the RQ in the introductory part of the article). To reiterate, there is no published research on the framing of climate change by the RSPB, which is quite surprising, given that the RSPB’s membership is comprised of a number of high-ranking corporate, political, and societal actors in the UK. Moreover, the official patron of the RSPB is King Charles III, the reigning British monarch. In this regard, it should be mentioned that

His Majesty, The King has announced his patronage of the RSPB following a review of Royal patronages conducted by the Royal Household after His Majesty’s accession to the throne. So, we are immensely honoured that His Majesty has chosen the RSPB to be among his Royal patronages. We look forward to the support of His Majesty in promoting the need to protect and restore both our wildlife and wild spaces.” Welcoming the announcement RSPB Chief Executive Beccy Speight said: “The King has long been an advocate for conservation and the need to protect and restore our natural world both here at home and across the globe. So, we are immensely honoured that His Majesty has chosen the RSPB to be among his Royal patronages. We look forward to the support of His Majesty in promoting the need to protect and restore both our wildlife and wild spaces.” RSPB Chair of Council Kevin Cox added: “His Majesty has been a consistent, active and inspiring champion for action to address climate change and care for our natural world over many decades. We are very honoured that the King will continue the legacy of the late Queen in her support for the RSPB.” (RSPB Annual Report 2023-24, 2023, p. 6)

In this light, it would be valuable to inspect carefully how the issue of climate change is framed by the RSPB in its annual report. It should be noted that the annual report, which is investigated in the study,

is freely available to the public at <https://www.rspb.org.uk/>. The annual report is characterised by the descriptive statistics that are summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1. The Descriptive Statistics of the RSPB's Annual Report 2023-24

#	Report's Details	Description
1	Availability	Freely available at <a href="https://www.rspb.org.uk/about-us/annual-report/annual-report-archive#annual-report-2023-2024">https://www.rspb.org.uk/about-us/annual-report/annual-report-archive#annual-report-2023-2024</a>
2	Full title	The RSPB's Annual Report 2023-24
3	Publication date	Published online on 30 August 2023, updated in September 2024
4	Number of pages	73 pages in the online pdf file
5	Number of words	31 402
6	Report's sections	Welcome; About the RSPB; What we do; Our strategy; People power; Our highlights; People engagement; UK land; Species recovery; Seas; Global land; UK Overseas Territories; Food and farming; Nature positive economy; RSPB capabilities; RSPB greening; Our impact; Forward look Thank you and acknowledgements; Governance; Financial review; Independent auditor's report; Notes to the accounts; Driving positive change for nature; Contacts

As far as the procedure and methodology in the study are concerned, the following should be explained. The RSPB's annual report was accessed and downloaded as a pdf file from <https://www.rspb.org.uk/about-us/annual-report/annual-report-archive#annual-report-2023-2024>. Thereafter, it was converted to a Word file and processed in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 20.0 (IBM, 2011) in order to calculate the descriptive statistics of the report (see Table 1). Afterwards, the report was examined in unity with the theoretical premises of framing analysis proposed by Entman (1993, 2003, 2007, 2010). Based upon Entman (1993, 2003, 2007, 2010), the annual report was analysed qualitatively in order to search for recurring words, phrases and sentences that pertained to the issue of climate change. The search was carried out in the computer program AntConc version 4.0.11 (Anthony, 2022), which was employed to calculate the recurring lexica and the frequently occurring lexical bundles associated with climate change (Kapranov, 2023, 2024a, 2024b). Having completed the quantitative part of the analysis, the annual report was inspected qualitatively in order to arrive at the way climate change was represented by the recurrent lexica and how it was problematised. Importantly, the report was inspected for the presence of the cause/causes of climate change, as well as moral judgements and/or evaluation related to climate change. Finally, the annual report was scrutinised for the solutions and suggestions in relation to the issue of climate change. The results of the qualitative framing analysis are further presented below.

## Results and Discussion

The application of the qualitative framing methodology to the annual report has yielded eight types of frames, which are summarised and illustrated in Table 2. It should be noted that the types of frames in Table 2 are represented in the order they occur in the annual report. Furthermore, the frame types that occur several times in the annual report are referred to only once in Table 2.



Table 2. The Framing of Climate Change in the Annual Report by the RSPB

#	Types of Frames	Examples
1	Nature Loss	“Last autumn, the RSPB led a group of over 60 research and conservation organisations to compile the latest State of Nature report. The findings were stark: because of human activity the UK now has less than half of its biodiversity remaining. The evidence from the last 50 years shows that the intensive way in which we manage our land for farming and the continuing effects of <b>climate change</b> are the two <b>biggest drivers of nature loss</b> [...] <b>Climate change and the loss of nature</b> , can feel so utterly overwhelming when viewed in its entirety” (RSPB Annual Report 2023-24, 2023, p. 6).
2	Bird Species Decline	“In January 2024, Puffins, Kittiwakes, Razorbills and other threatened seabirds were thrown a lifeline, after decades of campaigning finally saw the UK and Scottish Governments close sandeel fisheries in the English waters of the North Sea and all Scottish waters. The change in policy comes after more than 25 years of campaigning by the RSPB and others, which called out the practice as one of the key <b>contributors to seabird decline</b> . Many seabirds, including Puffins, rely on sandeels to feed their chicks. But <b>climate change</b> and overfishing have vastly depleted sandeel populations, having a devastating knock-on effect on seabirds” (RSPB Annual Report 2023-24, 2023, p. 14).
3	Climate Change Mitigation	“The need to protect England’s hedgerows 2024 also saw the launch of our campaign to safeguard hedgerows in England. These form a 500,000 km natural network of habitats for birds and other wildlife, including 130 priority species listed in the England Biodiversity Action Plan, such as Yellowhammers, Linnets and Bullfinches. Healthy hedgerows can also help <b>mitigate against climate change</b> , as they lock up and store carbon. They can also act as natural barriers, soaking up rainwater and preventing flooding. Plus, hedgerows can provide shelter and natural medicine for livestock, and have been proven to reduce windspeed which protects crops” (RSPB Annual Report 2023-24, 2023, p. 16).
4	Biodiversity Loss	“Standing up for nature at COP28. The UN’s climate change conference, COP28, took place in December 2023 in Dubai. Crucially COP28 looked at progress towards the targets to keep the rise in global temperature to 1.5 degrees by 2030 – the Paris Agreement that parties signed up to in 2015. <b>Climate change is one of the key drivers behind biodiversity loss</b> so it is vital that we tackle it to stop wildlife extinctions. The RSPB’s Head of Global Policy Melanie Coath and Senior Policy Officer Alex Mackaness attended COP28, alongside representatives from BirdLife International partners – the global partnership of national conservation organisations of which the RSPB is the UK partner” (RSPB Annual Report 2023-24, 2023, p. 21).
5	A Threat to Seabirds	“This study comes after the latest Seabirds Count census described on page 40. We are continuing to monitor the situation, as well as working

		to tackle the many <b>threats facing seabirds</b> including <b>climate change</b> , marine development and unsustainable fishing to help increase the birds' resilience" (RSPB Annual Report 2023-24, 2023, p. 21).
6	A Threat to Migratory Birds	"All along the flyway, <b>threats such as</b> habitat destruction and degradation, illegal hunting and <b>climate change threaten</b> the future of some of the flyway's most important sites and the birds that rely on them. However the £3 million from the Ecological Restoration Fund will enable the protection of biodiversity hotspots and the rejuvenation of degraded landscapes, increasing efforts in key countries such as Iceland, Ghana and South Africa, and in important landscapes such as the East Coast Wetlands in England and the Gola Rainforest straddling the Liberia and Sierra Leone border. The fund will also benefit migratory songbirds, who move between Europe and West Africa in their billions twice a year. The fund will be used to tackle <b>threats including</b> habitat destruction and degradation, illegal hunting and <b>climate change</b> , and to foster cultural, social and economic opportunities for local communities" (RSPB Annual Report 2023-24, 2023, p. 44).
7	Climate Change Adaptation	"The Greening Programme has established an <b>adaptation</b> working group to coordinate a more holistic RSPB <b>adaptation response</b> (across reserve management, infrastructure and operations). The Group will prepare a report for submission to the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) by end of 2024 describing our level of <b>climate change</b> preparedness, which will help inform the next national Climate Change Risk Assessment. The RSPB undertakes on-the-ground <b>adaptive management</b> on our nature reserves" (RSPB Annual Report 2023-24, 2023, p. 64).
8	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	"We have started the development of an ambitious <b>GHG (greenhouse gas) reduction</b> plan, to provide a clear path for the RSPB to reach a net zero emissions position. This plan will cover every aspect of our operations from strategy, governance and leadership to energy use and travel, purchasing and suppliers. The plan will be operating by early 2025, with continuous adaptive management to ensure we stay on track. We will be transparent and open in publishing the plan and our progress towards targets" (RSPB Annual Report 2023-24, 2023, p. 64).

Let us discuss the findings that are outlined in Table 2 in relation to the existing body of literature. First of all, we can observe that the present findings differ rather drastically from the prior studies on the framing of climate change by environmental NGOs. In contrast to the previous research investigations conducted by Allan and Hadden (2017), Della Porta and Parks (2014), Kapranov (2023), and Šimunović, Hesser, and Stern (2018), the framing of the issue of climate change by the RSPB does not seem to involve any explicit references to the notion of justice in general and climate justice in particular. The absence of the frames that pertain to the notions of human rights, social justice, and the ideas of climate justice in the RSPB's annual report could be accounted by the fact that the RSPB is an mainstream NGO that seeks to increase its membership and, in doing so, aims to evade radicalisation, clearly marked protest leanings, and politically motivated references to the notions such as, for instance, justice, which can be perceived as politically divisive. The aforementioned contention

is reminiscent, partially, of the study conducted by Zeng, Dai, and Javed (2019), who demonstrate that the framing of climate change by NGOs may be executed in alignment with the mainstream framing.

Indeed, the RSPB's framing of climate change is noticeably similar to the mainstream framing of climate change by the British political actors from the Conservative and Labour Parties (Kapranov, 2024a, 2024b) with their focus on climate change mitigation and greenhouse gas reduction. In this regard, the qualitative framing analysis of the RSPB's annual report 2023-24 reveals that the RSPB frames its climate change discourse by the frame Climate Change Mitigation. As illustrated by Table 2 above, this frame involves a clearly formulated strategy associated with the need to protect England's hedgerows as a means of climate change mitigation. Furthermore, the mainstream type of the framing of climate change is manifested by the RSPB's frame Greenhouse Gas Reduction, which is also reported by the literature (Della Porta & Parks, 2014; Kapranov, 2024a, 2024b) as a frame that is typically employed by numerous actors in the UK, such as, for instance, the King, the prime-minister, and high-ranking politicians who represent the Conservative and Labour Parties, respectively. Partially, the frames Climate Change Mitigation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction are evocative of the study by Vu, Blomberg, Seo, Liu, Shayesteh, and Do (2021), who report that NGOs employ a range of climate change-specific frames, such as Efficacy, which may correspond, to a degree, to the measures of climate change mitigation and net zero (i.e., the reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to zero).

Furthermore, the results of the present investigation are in contrast to the study by Tjernshaugen and Lee (2004), who assert that NGOs resort to the framing of climate change in order to shape the domestic political agenda by means of shaming the government into adopting policies preferred by the NGOs. The present findings do not show any possible manifestation of government shaming in relation to the issue of climate change. Moreover, there are no explicit indications of manipulating or spinning the framing of climate change into the politically-biased direction.

However, the findings summarised in Table 2 seem to be lending indirect support to the research publication by Enggaard, Isfeldt, Møller, Carlsen, Albris, and Blok (2023), who demonstrate that NGOs frame the issue of climate change by means of the frame Risk. Assuming that the notions of risk and threat overlap and share such underlying common ideas as harm, vulnerability, and (potential) damage, we can contend that the frames A Threat to Seabirds and A Threat to Migratory Birds are evocative of the frame Risk, which is described by Enggaard, Isfeldt, Møller, Carlsen, Albris, and Blok (2023). Specifically, in the RSPB's annual report the frames A Threat to Seabirds and A Threat to Migratory Birds, respectively, point to climate change as one of the major causes of harm to migratory birds and seabirds alike (see relevant examples in Table 2).

The findings in this study involve another contrasting point to the literature. In particular, the present framing analysis has not revealed any frames that can be described as emotionally charged. Accordingly, this finding is in opposition to the results of the study by Dzhengiz, Barkemeyer, and Napolitano (2021), who posit that climate change discourses by the NGOs may involve an emotional dimension. Also, the dissimilarity of the present study with the literature comes to the fore when we compare our findings with those by Laestadius, Neff, Barry, and Frattaroli (2014), who have established that a number of NGOs frame the issue of climate change through the lens of reduced meat consumption.



Thus far, we can argue that the results of the present framing analysis have revealed that the RSPB does not frame the issue of climate change through the lenses of justice, climate justice, climate change protest, climate change protest actions, polarisation and radicalisation, emotional engagement, and reduced meat consumption. However, it appears to frame climate change in its annual report via the frames that have not been mentioned by the literature, such as the frames Nature Loss, Biodiversity Loss, and Bird Species Decline (see Table 2). These frames unpack a unique discursive perspective on the issue of climate change that is found in the RSPB's discourse.

Importantly, the results of the study indicate that the framing of climate change by the RSPB is similar to that of other environmental NGOs. Namely, the frames Climate Change Mitigation, A Threat to Seabirds, A Threat to Migratory Birds, Climate Change Adaptation, and Greenhouse Gas Reduction resonate with the literature (see, for instance, Kapranov (2024a, 2024b)), which demonstrates that the British mainstream political, corporate, and societal discourses on climate change resort to framing this issue via a range of frames that pertain to the notions of (i) climate change adaptation and mitigation, (ii) risk and threat posed by the negative consequences of climate change, (iii) net zero and CO2 reduction.

## CONCLUSIONS

The paper introduced and discussed a qualitative framing analysis of the annual report by the RSPB. The results of the framing analysis have shown that the issue of climate change in the report is framed by means of the following types of frames: Nature Loss, Bird Species Decline, Climate Change Mitigation, Biodiversity Loss, A Threat to Seabirds, A Threat to Migratory Birds, Climate Change Adaptation, and Greenhouse Gas Reduction. These findings are in contrast to the literature on the framing of climate change by environmental NGOs. Specifically, the results of the present study do not involve such frames as Justice, Climate Change Justice, Climate Change Protest, Emotional Engagement, and Reduction of Meat Consumption. Presumably, the absence of the aforementioned and similar frames is accounted by the RSPB's rhetorical strategy to (i) avoid direct confrontation with the potential members, (ii) present itself in a neutral nonconfrontational light, and (iii) align the framing of climate change with that of the British mainstream political and corporate actors. Furthermore, the RSPB's rather neutral framing of climate change could be explained by the fact that its patron is King Charles III, who is bound to be neutral on the majority of issues.

The findings of the study add to the existing body of literature on the framing of climate change in the UK and show that an environmental NGO, such as the RSPB, frames climate change in a nonconfrontational and neutral way. Furthermore, the results of the study highlight the role of the typical British framing of climate change, which is associated with mitigation and adaptation, greenhouse gas reduction, and net zero.

## Acknowledgements

The author is thankful to the editor and the reviewers for their comments on the article draft.

## Primary sources

## REFERENCES

- Allan, J. I., & Hadden, J. (2017). Exploring the framing power of NGOs in global climate politics. *Environmental Politics*, 26(4), 600–620.
- Anthony, L. (2022). AntConc Version 4.0.11. Tokyo: Waseda University.
- Boykoff, M. T. (2011). *Who Speaks for the Climate?: Making Sense of Media Reporting on Climate Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caddell, R. (2025). ‘Within and without’: EU nature conservation law and the protection of wetlands. In R. C. Gardner, R. Caddell & E. Okuno (eds.) *Wetlands and International Environmental Law* (pp. 319–360). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781802203028.00022>.
- Chen, K., Molder, A. L., Duan, Z., Boulianne, S., Eckart, C., Mallari, P., & Yang, D. (2023). How climate movement actors and news media frame climate change and strike: Evidence from analyzing twitter and news media discourse from 2018 to 2021. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 28(2), 384–413. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19401612221106405>.
- Clarke, R. (2004). *Pioneers of Conservation: The Selborne Society and the Royal SPB*. London: Selborne Society.
- Clarke, R. (2015). Beyond landscape designation: innovative funding, delivery and governance and the UK protected area system. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, 26(2), 172–194. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MEQ-07-2014-0106>.
- Della Porta, D., & Parks, L. (2014). Framing Processes in the Climate Movement: From climate change to climate justice 1. In M. Dietz & H. Garrelts (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of the Climate Change Movement* (pp. 19–30). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203773536>.
- Dinnie, E., Fischer, A., & Huband, S. (2015). Discursive claims to knowledge: the challenge of delivering public policy objectives through new environmental governance arrangements. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 37, 1–9.
- Dzhengiz, T., Barkemeyer, R., & Napolitano, G. (2021). Emotional framing of NGO press releases: Reformative versus radical NGOs. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 30(5), 2468–2488.
- Enggaard, T. R., Hedegaard Isfeldt, A. S., Kvist Møller, A. H., Carlsen, H. B., Albris, K., & Blok, A. (2023). Inter-risk framing contests: the politics of issue attention among Scandinavian climate NGOs during the coronavirus pandemic. *Sociology*, 57(6), 1467–1490. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00380385221150379>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- Entman, R. M. (2003). Cascading activation: Contesting the White House's frame after 9/11. *Political Communication*, 20(4), 415–432.

- Entman, R. M. (2007). Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 163–173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00336.x>
- Entman, R. M. (2010). Media framing biases and political power: Explaining slant in news of Campaign 2008. *Journalism*, 11(4), 389–408.
- IBM. (2011). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 20.0*. New York: IBM.
- Fetzer, A. (2014). Conceptualising discourse. In K. P. Schneider & A. Barron (eds.) *Pragmatics of Discourse* (pp. 35–64). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Fløttum K. (2018). Linguistic analysis in climate change communication. In M. C. Nisbet, M. S. Schäfer, E. Markowitz, J. Thaker, S. S. Ho, & S. O'Neill (eds.) *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Climate Change Communication* (pp. 21–38). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fløttum, K., Gjesdal, A. M., Gjerstad, Ø., Koteyko, N., & Salway, A. (2014). Representations of the future in English language blogs on climate change. *Global Environmental Change*, 29, 213–222.
- Harrington, C. (2023). Climate change as a “threat multiplier”: The construction of climate security by the United Kingdom — 2007–2020. In J.N. Hardt, C. Harrington, F. von Lucke, A. Estève, & N. P. Simpson (eds.) *Climate Security in the Anthropocene*. (pp. 297–318). Cham: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-26014-8\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-26014-8_14).
- Kapranov, O. (2015). Conceptual metaphors in Ukrainian prime ministers’ discourse involving renewables. *Topics in Linguistics*, 16(1), 4–16. <https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2015-0007>.
- Kapranov, O. (2016a). Corpus analysis of discourse markers in corporate reports involving climate change. *EPiC Series in Language and Linguistics*, 1, 216–227.
- Kapranov, O. (2016b). Conceptual metaphors in British Foreign secretary’s Twitter discourse involving Ukraine. *Respectus Philologicus*, 29(34), 75–86. <https://doi.org/10.15388/RESPECTUS.2016.29.34.08>.
- Kapranov, O. (2016c). The framing of Serbia’s EU accession by the British Foreign Office on Twitter. *Tekst i Dyskurs – Text und Diskurs*, 9, 67–80.
- Kapranov, O. (2017). British Petroleum’s corporate discourse involving climate change before and after the Deepwater Horizon oil spill: A cognitive linguistic account. *Selected Papers on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 22, 211–223.
- Kapranov, O. (2018a). Shell’s image of climate change and its representations in the British financial press. In G. E. Garzone & W. Giordano (eds.) *Discourse, Communication and the Enterprise: Where Business Meets Language* (pp. 392–409). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kapranov, O. (2018b). The framing of climate change discourse by Statoil. *Topics in Linguistics*, 19(1), 54–68. <https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2018-0004>.
- Kapranov, O. (2022). The syntax of climate change: Syntactic means in the construction of Greta Thunberg’s community identity on Facebook. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai-Philologia*, 67(4), 15–33. <https://doi.org/10.24193/subbphilol.2022.4.01>.

- Kapranov, O. (2023). Throwing soup at Van Gogh: The framing of art in climate change activism in British mass media. *Discourses on Culture*, 19(1), 175–200. <https://doi.org/10.2478/doc-2023-0008>.
- Kapranov, O. (2024a). Between a burden and green technology: Rishi Sunak's framing of climate change discourse on Facebook and X (Twitter). *Information & Media*, 99, 85–105. <https://doi.org/10.15388/Im.2024.99.5>.
- Kapranov, O. (2024b). An ecolinguistic approach to the framing of King Charles III's climate change-related activities by the leading American and British media. *Philologia*, 22(1), 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.18485/philologia.2024.22.22.3>.
- Lewis-Stempel, J. (2024). *England: A Definitive Natural History of England from "Britain's Finest Living Nature Writer"*. New York: Random House.
- Laestadius, L. I., Neff, R. A., Barry, C. L., & Frattaroli, S. (2014). "We don't tell people what to do": An examination of the factors influencing NGO decisions to campaign for reduced meat consumption in light of climate change. *Global Environmental Change*, 29, 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.08.001>.
- Nisbet, M. C., & Newman, T. P. (2015). Framing, the media, and environmental communication. In M. C. Nisbet & T. P. Newman (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Environment and Communication* (pp. 345–358). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315887586>.
- RSPB Annual Report 2023-24 (2023). *Annual Report*. Accessed 20 May 2025 at <https://www.rspb.org.uk/about-us/annual-report/annual-report-archive#annual-report-2023-2024>
- Šimunović, N., Hesser, F., & Stern, T. (2018). Frame analysis of ENGO conceptualization of sustainable forest management: Environmental justice and neoliberalism at the core of sustainability. *Sustainability*, 10(9), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10093165>.
- Tjernshaugen, A., & Lee, H. C. (2004). *Shaming and Framing: Norwegian Nongovernmental Organizations in the Climate Change Negotiations*. Oslo: CICERO Senter for klimaforskning.
- Usher, M. (2013). Defending and transcending local identity through environmental discourse. *Environmental Politics*, 22(5), 811–831. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2013.765685>.
- Vu, H. T., Blomberg, M., Seo, H., Liu, Y., Shayesteh, F., & Do, H. V. (2021). Social media and environmental activism: Framing climate change on Facebook by global NGOs. *Science Communication*, 43(1), 91–115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547020971644>.
- Zeng, F., Dai, J., & Javed, J. (2019). Frame alignment and environmental advocacy: the influence of NGO strategies on policy outcomes in China. *Environmental Politics*, 28(4), 747–770. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2018.1525805>.