

Responsibility, Economy, and Human Consequences: Generic Climate-Change Frames in Global North and Global South Newspapers Across COP26–COP30

Adnan Shahid

PhD scholar, Centre for Media & Communication Studies (CMCS), University of Gujrat Email: adnanshahid48@gmail.com

Prof. Dr. Zahid Yousaf

Dean Faculty of Arts & Chairperson, Centre for Media and Communication Studies, University of Gujrat Email: zahid.yousaf@uog.edu.pk

Abstract

Climate change is a worldwide issue, and news outlets do not always structure the causes, effects, and solutions of climate change in a similar manner. This paper is a comparative analysis of generic framing of climate change in six United Kingdom-based English newspapers over five consecutive United Nations climate conferences (COP26–COP30, 2021–2025). An example of such study was a quantitative content analysis based on a retrospective longitudinal examination of 4,755 articles on climate change coverage by The New York Times, The Guardian, The Sydney Morning Herald, Dawn, The Nation, and The Times of India. The paper based on 5 generic frames responsibility, conflict, economic consequences, morality and human interest employed by Semetko and Valkenburg evaluated prevalence in frames overall, newspaper-level variation and North-South differences worldwide. The prevailing frame (48.4%), was responsibility, then economic consequences (22.6%), human interest (13.2%), conflict (10.8%), and morality (5.0%). Frame distributions differed significantly across newspapers, $\chi^2(20, N = 4,755) = 280.86, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .122$, and across regions, $\chi^2(4, N = 4,755) = 119.25, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .158$. Responsibility framing was more prominently used in newspapers of Global North, and the economic consequences, human interest, and morality were of a somewhat higher importance in Global South newspapers. The framing of conflicts varied almost equally with regions. The results indicate transnational convergence and regionally patterned interpretive priorities in climate journalism and show the utility in using cross-newspaper and cross-region comparisons together in deductive frame analysis.

Keywords: Climate Change, Media Framing, Global North, Global South, Generic Frames, Responsibility, COP

Introduction

Climate change is also a scientific issue, an issue of policy, as well as an economic issue, and a social responsibility question. To the great majority of the citizens, however, that difficulty and intricacy are not experienced by way of primary scientific report or diplomatic text but by the report of intermediary agencies. News institutions bead encouragement of technical evidence, political conflicts, catastrophes, and financial deals, and policy promises, into familiar pots. Framing is thus a keystone to climate communication since it deals with how specific things are selected and brought to the fore in ways that define problems, cause-effect relationships, moral judgments and remedies (Entman, 1993). The ordinary meaning of climate change is determined not just by the coverage of climate change but also, by what interpretive patterns are recurrently applied to make climate change intelligible.

Comparative climate communication, it has shown, neither is climate news uniform across the globe nor national. A common transnational news agenda is generated by international events like Conferences of the Parties (COPs), but depending on the national systems of media, the editorial cultures, political institutions, and economic priorities, as well as the level of climate vulnerability, the same issue may be interpreted differently (Schmidt et al., 2013; Lück et al., 2018; Vu et al., 2019). This collision versus dissimilarity is especially crucial by comparing newspapers found in the Global North and Global South. These wide groupings are not to be regarded as internally homogenous blocs, but give a more useful comparative heuristic on account of the fact that they also represent the major asymmetries in industrialization, historical emissions, technological capacity, climate finance, adaptation resources and vulnerability.

The literature on climate journalism has tended to focus on less developed countries, with the western news systems (primarily the United States and Europe) being the focal points (Billett, 2010; Gurwitt et al., 2017; Rahman, 2018; Schaefer and Schlichting, 2014). Scholarship on South Asian media has, in turn, grown unevenly. The range of concepts used in framing, the timeframe, and units of analysis also differ greatly across existing studies; hence, it is not that easy to cross-regionally compare them directly. Part of this issue can be resolved by a deductive system based on generic news frames since it introduces the same elements of operations to various newspapers and national situations (de Vreese, 2005; Dirikx and Gelders, 2010). In the current research, five generic frames based on the works of Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) are utilised, which they call responsibility, conflict, economic consequences, morality, and human interest.

These frames report unique and yet recurring journalistic manner of framing public issues. Responsibility framing focuses on those actors that resulted in a problem or ought to address it. Conflict framing prefigures a point of disagreement, rivalry or opposing stances. Using economic-consequences framing, emphasis is placed on financial costs, benefits, losses, and investments, jobs, or competitiveness. Human-interest framing makes personal an issue by dealing with experienced lives and emotional impact. Morality framing assesses the question based on ethical, religious or normative. When applied to climate change, these frames can demonstrate whether

newspapers frame climate politics as a problem of governance, a problem of actors and actors, an economic problem, as a human problem, or as an ethical duty.

The recent years of five consecutive COP periods 2021-2025 are particularly useful in terms of such analysis. COPs are the focus of scientific evidence, diplomacy, climate finance, mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage, energy politics and civil-society mobilization in the recurring international events. The comparison of framing in similar high-salience conditions is made possible by utilizing repeated, standardized event windows and would not be reliant on a single conference. The current article then poses three questions: What are the predominant generic frames used in climate-change reporting in the entire corpus? Are there any significant differences in the use of generic frames in the six newspapers? and do Global North-Global South newspapers have dissimilar distributions of frames? Responding to these questions with a corpus of 4,755 articles, the study will help to elucidate which interpretations of climate are widely shared and regionally diverse.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

The theory of framing is concerned with the structure of meaning. In one of the most influential formulations (Entman 1993) framing entails choice of things perceived and making them more prominent in a communicating text. This is to say that journalism is not merely a transmission of facts. News stories provide interpretive clues by which the audiences make sense of complex issues through patterns of emphasis, omission, causal attribution, characterization and definition of solutions. The climate change is particularly well placed to framing analysis as it is scientifically complex, unequally distributed geographically, in the past, and politically disputed. Only one article cannot capture all its causal links, the populations that have been impacted, the responsibilities of the institutions, and the potential solutions. Journalists have to choose between a wide range of potential areas of focus.

The distinction between frame specific (issue-specific) and generic frames is useful in framing research. Issue-specific frames are tied to the content of a given topic whereby generic frames are abstract enough to be applicable in issues and settings (de Vreese, 2005). One of the benefits of generic frames is providing a comparative advantage since the same ideas can be judged in various countries, media sources, and times. The 5 frame typology introduced by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) has emerged to be one of the most popular deductive methods of political communication. Its power is that it recognizes repetition journalistic forms instead of relying solely on vocabulary to identify them. It applies to climate coverage, in which one phrase, including but not limited to: cost, responsibility, crisis, etc., cannot be used on its own to frame the issue, without paying attention to the structure of the article.

One such important frame is the responsibility frame, which is relevant to climate communication. Climate change poses challenges on both causal responsibility and remedial responsibility: Who caused the problem and who is able or obliged to act now? The role of collective responsibility in covering climate has been exemplified by Olausson (2009) and research in various media systems has proven that governments, corporations, international institutions, and citizens may be placed as

cause, agent of action or target of responsibility. Responsibility may be particularly pertinent at COP meetings, as agreements may concern emissions promises, money promises, past credits, encouragement of adaptation, and adherence to policy promises over and over again.

Conflict has been a major theme in climate journalism but its definition has evolved with time. Previous research on the topic of the U.S climate coverage records the impact of journalistic balance norms and how this may raise the level of disagreement and give a false impression of scientific debate (Boykoff and Boykoff, 2004). In later literature, it has been observed that the polarization between science and scepticism is already becoming a thing of the past, with disputes of policy, ideology, energy, costs, and international bargaining replacing these (Brueggemann and Engesser, 2017). COPs are constitutively negotiation space and thus conflict may manifest as conflicts between states, political parties, industries, activists or policy blocs. However, conflict is not the most prevalent frame across all places, and to ascertain whether it is localized or transnational, comparative analysis is required.

Another common aspect of climate communication is related to economic implications. The narratives of climate action can be told as a cost, an investment, an opportunity, a competitiveness problem, a threat to jobs, or as a development mechanism. These forms of economic framing apply in industrialized and developing nations, but the motivation policy issues may vary. Economic discourses in Global Norths can focus on energy transition, technological investment, price of carbon, competitiveness in industry, or regulation costs. The general framing can encompass development limitations, farm destruction, adaptation funding, infrastructure destruction, and compensation requests in Global South situations. The review of the Indian press by Billett (2010) revealed the interconnection between climate change and national development and international equity, a point which demonstrates why a generic economic frame can have varying substantive implications in different geographic locations.

Human-interest framing personalizes climate change. It is particularly noticeable in situations in which the coverage addresses floods, heat waves, drought, displacement, agriculture, health, or disrupted livelihoods. An abstract and long-term problem can be personalized in human narratives, but it can also conceptualize individual misery in isolation of structural exposition. The examination of the climate communication under developing conditions has observed multiple times the significance of vulnerability and consequences that are experienced locally (Nasir et al., 2018; Rahman, 2018). Conversely, those newspapers that had more institutional and scientific access might be more prone to relating climate events to policy and governance. The question, however, is not whether one part of the body is more or less human or another part more or less institutional, but whether the frame use is different as a proportion between regions.

The general news research often tends to have the least prevalence of morality as a generic frame mainly because professional standards enjoin journalists to ascribe overt moral evaluations to others instead of overtly do so themselves (Semetko and Valkenburg, 2000). Climate change, however, has high levels of ethics:

intergenerational justice, unequal vulnerability, historical responsibility, duties to future generations, and equity of climate finance. These themes can give rise to moral framing without use of religious language. The varying salience of morality may therefore indicate how the climate commitments are correlated with the national experiences of susceptibility and virtue.

Comparative studies give grounds of similarities and differences that should be expected between media systems. In a study of 27 countries, Schmidt et al. (2013) reported that there was a wide range of cross-national differences regarding the media coverage of climate change. Vu et al. (2019) also demonstrated that domestic news priorities nationalize global climate issues. Lück et al. (2018) stated that the presence of nationally colored narratives can be combined with transnational climate frames. In the same vein, studies that compare India and the United States (Gurwitt et al., 2017), U.S. and Chinese newspaper (Xie, 2015) and various European national contexts (Dirikx and Gelders, 2010) propose that journalism exists between a global and a local interpretive framework.

Such literature encourages regional parallels of comparison but alerts against overdetermined anticipations. There is no single model that Global North outlets share and so do global south outlets. The national political culture, editorial traditions, audience, market structure, and climate exposure among the three newspapers of each group are dissimilar. The usefulness of the regional comparison is the challenge that wide trends are present in spite of that internal diversity. The reporting of newspaper-specifics eventually with regional aggregates is hence significant. When responsibility, say, is overpowering in all or most of the newspaper, but much more prevalent in one part than in another, its salience should be stressed as relative, as present or not present.

The current research study is added to this literature in three aspects. Firstly, it compares a bulk of corpus, but on six newspapers, not on a comparison within one country. Second, it exploits five sequential COP periods, as opposed to a single summit, that minimizes a chance that a single event resolves the findings. Third, it reports overall, newspaper-level, regional and frame-specific tests so that one can tell the difference between broad convergence and certain sources of divergence.

Method

Research Design and Sample

A longitudinal quantitative content analysis was a comparative, retrospective, longitudinal study design. The analytical period consisted of five consecutive COPs: COP26 (2021), COP27 (2022), COP28 (2023), COP29 (2024), and COP30 (2025). To address the study of each conference, the standardized 30-day analytical window was considered, which included 15 days preceding the conference and 15 days following the conference. This was to be designed to include anticipatory news like diplomatic prospects, policy conflicts, scientific alerts and activism and post conference coverage of agreements, disagreements, commitments and responses. It is an event based time frame but not a chronicling of every day between 2021 and 2025.

A total of six English-language newspapers were chosen. The Global North trio resulted in The New York Times (United States), The Guardian (United Kingdom), and The Sydney Morning Herald (Australia). In the thesis dataset Global South group includes the countries of Dawn (Pakistan), The Nation, and The Times of India (India). Articles were considered eligible if they (1) were published on one of the select outlets within a given COP window; (2) were news stories, not editorials or opinion pieces, advertisements or features; (3) considered climate change as a substantive issue; and (4) had enough textual material to frame the story. The unit of analysis was the particular article, its headline, lead, and body text.

The screened and verified analytical corpus had 4,755 articles. The Guardian led 1,484, The Times of India 1,011, The Sydney Morning Herald 734, Dawn 651, The Nation 578 and The New York Times 297. The Global North outlets had 2,515 articles and Global South had 2,240.

Coding and Reliability

The coding tool was inductive, and founded on existing framing literature. The five generic messages were accountability, contrast, economic impacts, morality, and the human interest (Semetko and Valkenburg, 2000). The substantive textual evidence, as opposed to widely separated keywords, was used to make coding decisions. The larger thesis tool allowed the frame variables to be coded using absent, present, and dominant values; in the analyses described below, category totals are obtained using the verified generic-frame tables with articles characterized by dominant generic frame.

Each variable was defined in a structured codebook, which provided operational rules. Two trained coders projected two articles with the aim of coded by them independently. The evaluation of intercoder reliability was done using Cohen SP (kappa) circularity that adjusts the observed agreement with the expected accuracy on a probability of agreement (Cohen, 1960). The reliability test resulted in $\kappa = .80$, which is a satisfactory degree of consistency to conduct a study. Controversies were then analyzed against the codebook to enable that the category rules were uniformly applied to the rest of the corpus.

Statistical Analysis

Percentages, cross-tabulations, Pearson chi-square tests, and effect sizes were used to analyze them. General frequency frequencies were computed initially. A chi-square test of frame distribution of newspaper $\times$ generic-frame was conducted across the six outlets with Cramer V indicating the strength of the association. A chi-square test ($x \times$ generic-frame) was used to compare Global North and Global South newspapers. Lastly, frame-by-frame 2×2 comparisons identified which generic frames had a contribution to regional differences. The level of statistical significance was considered at $p < .05$ and the effects sizes were used as gauges of substantive association instead of being substitutes to the underlying percentages. Analytical dimensions have only been reported in this article whose thesis has populated and cross-checked number tables; issue-specific frames, and source-diversity findings fall

outside presentation in the current article since number tables were not full in the provided dataset.

Results

The total Distribution of Generic Frames

The prevailing generic frame within the corpus was responsibility with 2,302 articles representing this case(48.4%). Economic consequences appeared as the dominant frame in 1,075 articles (22.6%), human interest in 628 (13.2%), conflict in 512 (10.8%), and morality in 238 (5.0%). In this way nearly half the number of all coded stories was mainly arranged on the lines of attribution of responsibility or identification of the action actors who ought to perform. The second one was of particular economic framing that still had a smaller, but significant, percentage of coverage, and human-interest and conflict frames took a smaller, yet not insignificant, portion of that coverage. Ethics were a relative rarity.

The ranking is significant as it demonstrates that COP as a climate journalism was not organized to predominantly take the form of a political struggle. The conferences are negotiation events, but a combination of responsibility and economic implications has contributed to over seven out of ten articles. This implies that the most popular journalistic inquiries were not the person winning an argument but rather who was culpable of or putting damage on or creating or necessitating climate change or climate action.

Table 1: Distribution of Dominant Generic Frames in the Full Corpus

Generic frame	n	%	Rank
Responsibility	2,302	48.4	1
Economic consequences	1,075	22.6	2
Human interest	628	13.2	3
Conflict	512	10.8	4
Morality	238	5.0	5
Total	4,755	100.0	

Note. Percentages are based on the verified 4,755-article corpus.

Newspaper-Level Variation

The six outlets had the similar pattern of responsibility, and was also varied in terms of the extent to which they depended on the other frames. The Guardian bore the greatest burden in framing with 58% and The New York Times (54) and The Sydney Morning Herald (49). Responsibility is also top on the Global South outlets, albeit with lesser shares: 47 percent in The Nation, 41 percent in Dawn, and 37 percent in The Times of India.

The Nation (29%), The Times of India (27%), and The Sydney Morning Herald (27%), led others particularly on economic consequences. The Times of India (21%), and Dawn (16), were most likely to have human-interest framing in contrast to 7% in

the New York Times. Only in Dawn and The Sydney Morning Herald morality was 9 and 7 percent, in The Guardian—2. In the outlets, conflict was restricted to a relatively low Likert scale of between 7 and 14 percent, with 8% in The Sydney Morning Herald and 14 in Dawn.

These newspaper differences were statistically significant, $\chi^2(20, N = 4,755) = 280.86$, $p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .122$. The effect size suggests a small association: outlet is important, but it is not of a simple or exclusive consequence in determining framing. The five frames were found in the newspaper sample, and in all six were responsibility dominant, but the proportional balance was sufficiently differentiated to determine significant cross-newspaper variance.

Table 2: Dominant Generic Frames by Newspaper

Frame	NYT	Guardian	SMH	Dawn	Nation	Times of India
Responsibility	54%	58%	49%	41%	47%	37%
Conflict	9%	13%	7%	14%	11%	9%
Economic consequences	23%	15%	27%	21%	29%	27%
Morality	5%	2%	7%	9%	4%	6%
Human interest	7%	11%	10%	16%	9%	21%

Note. NYT = The New York Times; SMH = The Sydney Morning Herald. Percentages are within newspaper, as reported in the thesis tables; rounding may prevent sums from equaling exactly 100%.

Regional Differences

Responsibility at regional level was 55.3% of Global North coverage and 40.7% of Global South coverage. The Global South paid more relative attention to economic implications (25.8% and 19.8%), human sympathy (16.5% and 10.3%), and morality (6.3% and 3.9%). Conflict was practically the same: 10.8% in Global North and 10.7% in Global South. The overall association between region and generic frame was significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 4,755) = 119.25$, $p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .158$.

Frame-specific comparisons spelt out the origins of regional association. Responsibility produced the largest difference, $\chi^2 = 100.49$, $p < .001$, $\phi = .145$. Human interest also differed significantly, $\chi^2 = 39.41$, $p < .001$, $\phi = .091$, as did economic consequences, $\chi^2 = 24.72$, $p < .001$, $\phi = .072$, and morality, $\chi^2 = 14.81$, $p < .001$, $\phi = .056$. Conflict was the exception: $\chi^2 = 0.01$, $p = .911$, $\phi = .002$. This trend indicates that the Global North/Global South dichotomy cannot be equally applied to any generic frame. The biggest division is related to responsibility, whereas conflict demonstrates near total convergence on a regional scale.

Table 3: Generic Frames by Region and Frame-Specific Tests

Frame	Global North %	Global South %	χ^2	p	ϕ
Responsibility	55.3	40.7	100.49	< .001	.145
Conflict	10.8	10.7	0.01	.911	.002
Economic consequences	19.8	25.8	24.72	< .001	.072
Morality	3.9	6.3	14.81	< .001	.056
Human interest	10.3	16.5	39.41	< .001	.091

Note. Overall region $\times$ generic-frame association: $\chi^2(4, N = 4,755) = 119.25, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .158$.

Discussion

Findings indicate that the climate-news climate is marked with transnational convergence coupled with regional differentiation. The dominance of responsibility is the most evident point of convergence. All the newspapers, irrespective of the significant national-context disparity and corpus size, were more prone to use the responsibility as any other generic frame. This carries the notion that the issue of climate change is regularly turned into an issue of agency: who caused the problem, who is to act, who did not act, and who is in a position of offering a solution. That frame is suitable to the institutional nature of COP coverage since the dynamics of international climate politics are structured around promises, goals, money, action, and competing demands to the role of obligation.

The prevalence of responsibility also supports the causal and treatment interpretation as argued by the framing theory. Entman (1993) opined that frames are capable of defining problems, diagnosing causes, and making evaluations and proposing remedies. These functions are repeatedly activated when climate is being reported in COPs. A narrative can attribute a duty to governments to negotiate emission cuts, to corporations to industrious conduct, to worldwide institutions to finance, or to prosperous states to historic emissions. In cases where the particular target is different, the organizing logic is still the accountability one. That similar logic can be used to understand why the responsibility can prevail between countries with vastly different vulnerability and policy capacity.

The responsibility discrepancy between the region is however quite huge. Fifty-five point three percent of articles in Global North newspapers fell under the category of responsibility, whereas 40.7% in Global South newspapers fell under the same category. Another possible interpretation, in line with previous comparative literature, is that Global North outlets have a higher chance of being located in densely institutionalized climate governance, scientific expertise, regulation, and technological policy environments. These kinds of environments offer repetitive news pegs concerning the governmental targets, corporate promises, regulation and energy shifts and international obligations. Such understanding does not imply the lack of responsibility in Global South journalism; it is still the biggest frame of Global South

journalism. Instead, Global South newspapers spread out their climate news in more economic, human and moral facets.

The higher economic impact, which prevails in Global South, is theoretically significant as well. Close relations between climate policy and climate effects are associated with development, livelihoods, infrastructure, agriculture, access to energy and financial capabilities. Billett (2010) demonstrated that Indian climate talk could not be discussed without development and equity, whereas Gurwitt et al. (2017) revealed that the localization of global climate-related issues was influenced by national context. In the current corpus, 25.8% of articles in the Global South share economic consequences with Global North 19.8%. The statistical significance is lesser than the responsibility gap. This implies that material burdens and development stakes are prioritized relatively and not absolutely different economic discourses.

Human interest framing is no exception. Global South outlets reference it in 16.5% of their articles, as opposed to 10.3% in Global North outlets. This is possible as it can be an expression of immediate climate vulnerability, such as livelihoods and communities at risk of floods, heat, food insecurity, displacement and other impacts. The Pakistani and Indian experiences of most visible climate-related disasters have allowed regional journalism perhaps better incentives to relate climate change to personal or local experience. The significance and limitations of climate reporting in South Asian news contexts (as reported by Nasir et al., 2018, and Rahman, 2018) are significant because one can tap into tangible effects that can be a strong point of entry about the climate narrative.

This does not have to mean that human-interest journalism is weak analytically compared to institutional reporting. It is possible to personalize more distant climate processes to make them socially significant. The question is, whether human experience is related to larger scientific and policy account. Human-interest framing may either enhance insight, framing structural vulnerability, or minimize the intricate causes to single tragedy. The current generic-frame analysis cannot solve that difference by itself and defines a key regional trend that should be thoroughly examined qualitatively.

The least prevalent frame in general, but more obvious in the Global South is morality. This finding is in line with the focal position of fairness, climate justice, inadequate accountability, and the intergenerational responsibility in Global South climate politics. Significantly, morality does not have to be religious. It can manifest itself in terms of what rich nations owed vulnerable groups, whether loss-and-damage contracts are just, or what liability present generations to their future are. Its comparatively low frequency also bodes with the observation by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) who note that the moral is usually not as much a part of the less traditional news since journalists may be hesitant to present the actual normative prescriptions per se.

The most valuable antidote to a simplistic regional theory is conflict. It has an approximation of the same rate in the two regions and the frame specific test is insignificant. The result shows that there are Journalism conventions that cross national and regional lines. Political disagreement, diplomatic bargaining, finance

disagreement, and the rivalry of policy positions is common in COP negotiations and conflict is often a shared professional resource. Simultaneously, the total proportions of conflict of 10.8% are less than responsibility or economic consequences. The finding thus puts into doubt assumptions that climate summits are basically a story of political battles. In this corpus, there is conflict but not hegemonic.

The newspaper-level test also warns us against Global North and Global South being homogeneous terms. The Sydney Morning Herald has, in comparison with the other outlets of the Global North, a relatively high share on economic-consequences as well as on morality share. The Nation gives responsibility more emphasis than the other Global South newspapers. The Times of India has the largest human-interest share whereas Dawn has the greatest conflict share in the sample. The differences align with the comparative media studies that have identified that both nationally colored frames and transnational frames co-exist (Luck et al., 2018). Regional types not only imbibe general trends, outlet-specific editorial practices and home circumstances are nonetheless significant.

The small effect sizes are informative as well. A large corpus should be easier to gain statistical significance, and Cramer V and phi values aid in avoiding overstatement. Newspaper $\times$ frame ($V = .122$) and region $\times$ frame ($V = .158$) are significant yet not strong. The climate journalism in these outlets have a significant similar repertoire. The most powerful frame-specific effect, responsibility ($= .145$), still suggests the differentiation in a field with a considerably broad overlap. In this way, however, the empirical image is not one of global homogeneity, neither of absolute North-South division.

The region trend also implies within the conceptualization of comparative framing. Instead of analytically opposing the Global North and Global South, the outcomes suggest that a shared professional repertoire is refracted through various material and political contexts. All six newspapers have responsibilities, conflict, and economic effects, morality, and human interest to consider, but the likelihood of any of them to emerge as the prevailing organizing frame varies according to outlets and locations. This interpretation aligns with the notion that the globalized politics of climate form collective news objects whereas the salience is formed by national institutions and social experiences. It also implies that regional comparison as a search of clearly distinct categories should not be used in the future. However, a more fruitful way to look is on how the shared categories are weighted, combined, and substantively populated. This would be a way of capturing journalistic convergence as well as the conditions of unequal experience and regulation of climate change.

The findings reported also contribute to the study of climate framing since they demonstrate the ability of a standardized generic typology to recognize both layers simultaneously. There are criticism of generic frames which thinks that they are too broad to render the substantive richness of the climate talk. That weakness is a fact, and more depth can be given by issue-specific or qualitative analysis. However, the current results prominently reflect the relative value of generic frames: since the identical categories are used in six outlets and five COP periods the analysis could find out in which journalistic structures align and in which relative focus shifts. The

strategy thus serves as a complement, and not a substitute to more contextual climate framing studies.

Practical Implications

To climate journalists, responsibility framing is an opportunity and threat. Responsibility is crucial, and the word accountability may incorporate different queries into a single story. There is no interchangeability between emissions in the past, present, financial ability, regulatory responsibility, corporate responsibility and personal behavior. Publication of a report which distinctly distinguishes these dimensions can enhance public awareness and mitigate the propensity to attribute undifferentiated blame.

Connecting economic and human-interest stories to structural explanation can also be of benefit to global South newsrooms. When audiences are only told about climate effects in terms of loss, disaster, or personal suffering, they might get graphic accounts, is the mitigation, adaptation, finance, governance, and scientific attribution of climate impacts is understood well. In contrast, Global North newsrooms in which the focus on institutional responsibility is high need to be attentive to lived consequences to avoid the disconnection between the policy reporting and the impacted populations. For cross-regional climate journalism to be most effective, institutional responsibility, economic interests, human experiences, and justice should be seen as complementary frames instead of being considered mutually exclusive.

Limitations

The findings can be characterized by a number of limitations. The sample of English-language newspapers is limited to six and would not be able to reflect all the news media represented in the countries and regions under consideration. The television, radio, social media, platforms that use online-only climate, and local-language media do not enter the analysis. The study does not use a five-year continuous coverage but resorts to 30-day windows around COP26-COP30 hence the results are high salience occasion periods. The deductive design enhances comparability and may fail to identify emergent frames not included in the predefined categories. There is also a difference in article counts between the newspapers, with The Guardian and The New York Times being significantly outnumbered; the percentage based comparison alleviates but not eliminates the effects of the early imbalance. Lastly, the quantitative design establishes content patterns, not audience impacts and is unable to establish how readers understood or were impacted by the frames.

Another limit is intentional: although the original framework of the thesis contained frames of issues and sourcing diversity, numerical tables available to represent these dimensions were not complete. These are not listed or deduced here. Limiting the article to verified generic-frame data guarantees empirical transparency and does not give rise to unsubstantiated results.

Conclusion

Among 4,755 climate-change news items on five consecutive COPs, responsibility had become the generic frame of climate journalism. The overall transnational propensity to frame climate change in terms of accountability and action is evident in its dominance in all six newspapers. But there was no even distribution of distribution of frames regionally. In Global North newspapers, responsibility was brought out more strongly, whereas the Global South took a significantly more important part in allocating attention to the economic impact, human interest, and morale. There was a near similarity of conflict in regions such that conflict is not necessarily based on a North-South basis and thus, not all journalistic frames adhere to that.

The main point of the research can be thus qualified comparative conclusion: climate journalism is an international affair with a national bias. Frames are based on a shared repertoire of frame, whereas the conditions at the national and regional level affect the relative prominence of those frames. Further studies ought to expand this design to local-language media, and ongoing time frames, and should pool both quantitative mapping and qualitative analysis of what, in specific national contexts, is meant by responsibility, economy, and human interest.

References

- Babbie, E. R. (2004). *The practice of social research* (10th ed.). Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Billett, S. (2010). Dividing climate change: Global warming in the Indian mass media. *Climatic Change*, 99(1–2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-009-9605-3>
- Boykoff, M. T. (2011). *Who speaks for the climate? Making sense of media reporting on climate change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Boykoff, M. T., & Boykoff, J. M. (2004). Balance as bias: Global warming and the US prestige press. *Global Environmental Change*, 14(2), 125–136.
- Brossard, D., Shanahan, J., & McComas, K. (2004). Are issue-cycles culturally constructed? A comparison of French and American coverage of global climate change. *Mass Communication & Society*, 7(3), 359–377. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327825mcs0703_6
- Brüggemann, M., & Engesser, S. (2017). Beyond false balance: How interpretive journalism shapes media coverage of climate change. *Global Environmental Change*, 42, 58–67.
- Carvalho, A. (2007). Ideological cultures and media discourses on scientific knowledge: Re-reading news on climate change. *Public Understanding of Science*, 16(2), 223–243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662506066775>
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1), 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000104>
- de Vreese, C. H. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information Design Journal + Document Design*, 13(1), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.1075/idjdd.13.1.06vre>
- Dirikx, A., & Gelders, D. (2010). To frame is to explain: A deductive frame-analysis of Dutch and French climate change coverage during the annual UN

- Conferences of the Parties. Public Understanding of Science, 19(6), 732–742.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662509352054>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Gurwitt, S., Malkki, K., & Mitra, M. (2017). Culturing the climate: A comparative study of climate change media coverage of India and the United States. *International Communication Gazette*, 79(2), 175–202.
- Kenix, L. J. (2008). Framing science: Climate change in the mainstream and alternative news of New Zealand. *Political Science*, 60(1), 117–132.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/003231870806000108>
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Lück, J., Wessler, H., Wozniak, A., & Lycarião, D. (2018). Counterbalancing global media frames with nationally colored narratives: A comparative study of news narratives and news framing in the climate change coverage of five countries. *Journalism*, 19(12), 1635–1656.
- Matthes, J. (2009). What's in a frame? A content analysis of media framing studies in the world's leading communication journals, 1990–2005. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 86(2), 349–367.
- Matthes, J., & Kohring, M. (2008). The content analysis of media frames: Toward improving reliability and validity. *Journal of Communication*, 58(2), 258–279.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00384.x>
- Nasir, Z. A., Akram, M., & Haq, N. U. (2018). Climate change coverage in Pakistan's English-language newspapers. *Journal of Media Studies*, 33(1), 93–113.
- Olausson, U. (2009). Global warming global responsibility? Media frames of collective action and scientific certainty. *Public Understanding of Science*, 18(4), 421–436.
- Rahman, M. S. (2018). Climate change and media in Bangladesh: A case study on national dailies. *Journal of Content, Community & Communication*, 7(3), 30–38.
- Schäfer, M. S., & Schlichting, I. (2014). Media representations of climate change: A meta-analysis of the research field. *Environmental Communication*, 8(2), 142–160.
- Schmidt, A., Ivanova, A., & Schäfer, M. S. (2013). Media attention for climate change around the world: A comparative analysis of newspaper coverage in 27 countries. *Global Environmental Change*, 23(5), 1233–1248.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.07.020>
- Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news. *Journal of Communication*, 50(2), 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2000.tb02843.x>
- Vu, H. T., Liu, Y., & Tran, D. V. (2019). Nationalizing a global phenomenon: A study of how the press in 45 countries and territories portrays climate change.

Social Science Quarterly, 100(3), 1475–1489.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12599>

Xie, L. (2015). The story of two big chimneys: A frame analysis of climate change in US and Chinese newspapers. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 44(2), 151–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2015.1015605>