This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/240268/

Deposited on: 29 April 2021

Drilling for fissures and exploiting common ground in the discourse of oil production: Part II of an enhanced Eco-Discourse Analysis

Abstract: This is the second part of a two-part article which proposes an enhanced Positive Discourse Analysis to eco-discourses after weighing the (dis)advantages of mainstream Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Positive Discourse Analysis (PDA). Part I explored the theoretical grounding for an enhanced PDA, introduced the research method and then, based on the adapted analytic framework of Stibbe (2016), undertook a critical analysis of the discourses of Shell Oil Company (SOC). In Part II, under the same analytic framework, Greenpeace USA discourses are analysed and compared to the SOC discourses. The emphasis in Part II is on the exploration of potential fissures in the discourses across difference and the possible common grounds upon which to design alternative discourses that are empathetic, comprehensible and legitimate to a coalition of social forces. Practically, it finds that the two groups use similar discourse strategies, such as salience and framing, but with different orientations. Methodologically, it argues that corpus-aided comparative discourse analysis, with a focus on discourse semantics, will facilitate the identification of 'greenwashing' strategies that strengthen and stabilize current hegemonic social order while also pointing to avenues of alternative discourses which exploit the inherent contradictions, or fissures, within such an order. Theoretically, the paper suggests that within an enhanced Positive Discourse Analysis (PDA) approach it is also important to seek out points of convergence between progressive positions and to articulate these within a hybrid, counter-hegemonic discourse that maximizes its potential for uptake while destabilizing the prevailing discourses at precisely the fissure points identified.

Key words: enhanced positive discourse analysis; discourse across difference; fissure; discourse semantics; collaborative discourse

1. Introduction

Stibbe (2016) classifies three types of eco-discourses according to his ecosophy: destructive, ambivalent and beneficial discourse. Discourses are considered destructive that encourage ecologically harmful activities, while beneficial discourses are those that foster ecological thinking. Those that fall between them are classified as ambivalent discourses. Echoing Martin (2004/2012), Stibbe (2012; 2018) emphasizes the importance of seeking positive 'beneficial' discourse although he also recognizes the necessity of critique. The problem with Stibbe's and Martin's Positive Discourse Analysis (PDA) is that 'it remains unclear how to make the constructive work effective beyond the promotion of texts or discursive features positively evaluated by the analyst and their approach does not consider the specific social conditions affecting the uptake of positive discourses (Bartlett 2018).

In the first part of this two-part article, we made the argument for an enhanced Positive Discourse Analysis. Such an enhanced PDA supports Martin's (1986/2012; 2004/2012) yin-yang approach to discourse analysis, with the twin goals of deconstructing destructive disourses and designing beneficial disourses. However, rather than promoting beneficial discourses on the basis of their ideological message alone, an enhanced PDA takes a more pragmatic approach in seeking out those areas of productive tension that break down the insulation (Bernstein 2000) between hegemonic and innovative discourses and allow for the development of localized hybrid discourses in which seemingly antagonistic participants can collaborate as a first step in wider-reaching change (Bartlett

2012). Such an enhanced PDA follows the analytical schema as follows: ①identification of a problematic issue; ②analysis of 'opposing' discourses; ③identifying tensions and areas of commonality; ④discussion of conditions of possibility for assimilation of discourses (Bartlett 2012: 219). In the first part of this two-part article, we destructed the dominant and destructive discourses of Shell Oil Company (SOC). In this second part we point to the tensions between the SOC discourses and those of the Greenpeace USA (GPU), which we classify as ambivalent discourses, in line with Stibbe's (2012) ecosophy, on the basis of their overtly politicized content. Beyond this contrastive analyses, we emphasise the need to identify, on the one hand, the potential fissures within the SOC discourse, in its own terms or in relation to the wider discourses of industrial capitalism, and, on the other hand, the potential for common ground across antagonistic discourses on which alternative beneficial discourses can be constructed. Given limitations of space, this exploration will be indicative and largely theoretical, with future work in this direction suggested in the conclusion.

We begin Part II with a corpus-based analysis of GPU discourse by means of the same analytical framework, adapted from Stibbe (2016) as was used to analyse the SOC discourse. For information about the data and research procedure, readers are advised to refer to Part I of this article.

2. Analysis and discussion
2.1 Keyword analysis of GPU corpus
Moving from SOC discourse to GPU discourse, in contrast to the economics-oriented keyword list in SOC's discourse, Table 9 shows that GPU highlights ecological concerns with abundant references to geographical terms and environmental concerns. For example, while the SOC corpus references only a single geographical name, *Nigeria*, GPU attach much importance to geological terms like *arctic, polar, sea*, *ocean*. In addition, the climate change and condition of sea ice have been positioned as top priorities on GPU's keyword agenda.

Rank	Keyword	Freq.	Keyness	Rank	Keyword	Freq.	Keyness
1	arctic	3320	4339.138	26	president	467	346.867
2	Greenpeace	1358	2130.626	27	just	455	341.812
3	drilling	1594	1535.266	28	ocean	337	339.307
4	climate	1222	866.668	29	BP	300	331.969
5	oil	3237	796.254	30	protest	210	331.832
6	you	963	784.968	31	stop	283	324.004
7	Obama	524	769.551	32	shells	280	323.93
8	activists	445	703.167	33	Alaska	517	307.487
9	ALEC	429	677.885	34	campaign	271	302.616
10	ice	519	662.712	35	movement	229	290.897
11	spill	729	599.947	36	what	614	290.338
12	the	20608	592.065	37	Seattle	190	288.939
13	drill	561	589.616	38	change	730	279.978
14	Exxon	340	515.116	39	disaster	220	272.491
15	fossil	512	472.074	40	against	319	240.606
16	that	3552	466.135	41	action	403	240.349
17	it	2365	465.044	42	know	252	240.112
18	caption	290	458.244	43	why	259	240.033

19	like	687	439.429	44	administration	198	239.987
20	polar	280	430.379	45	tar	150	237.023
21	sea	658	414.55	46	Russian	165	234.255
22	rig	337	389.305	47	my	298	231.96
23	here	348	372.777	48	keystone	146	230.702
24	but	983	367.175	49	not	1031	224.499
25	would	639	359.398	50	guard	168	220.525

Table 9 Top 50 keywords in GPU corpus

The high frequency of *protest* in the GPU corpus indicates an overt, oppositional attitude toward SOC's business practices. Moreover, high-profile *you* and the presence of *ALEC* (American Legislative Exchange Council) as well as references of *Obama, president, administration*, suggested the participation of other actors. The high frequency of the question terms *what* and *why* also suggest that the GPU discourse will serve to interrogate the causes and effects of the prevailing situation.

Additionally, activities that have been presented as abstract terms such as '*program, project, projects, production*' in the SOC corpus are identified in concrete terms such as *drilling, spill, drill, rig* in GPU corpus, which emphasise the material reality and impact of oil drilling practices. Apart from the reference to Shell, GPU also draws attention to energy giants like Exxon, BP, Gazprom. The reference of the energy giants and the mention of the oil spill could serve to remind the audience of the ecological damage caused by the companies.

Overall, while SOC pays great attention to economic gains and performance of energy projects, GPU concerns much about the ecological conditions and is trying to draw the publics' attention to Shell's oil drilling practice while, at the same time, appealing for third parties, and especially government administration, to play an active part in environmental protection. Contrasting the two keyword results, it is apparent that SOC applauds the oil drilling while GPU is in an overt opposition, especially towards the arctic drilling.

2.2 Discourse semantic analysis of GPU discourse

To conduct qualitative discourse semantic analysis of GPU discourse, we first identify words that could trigger the analysis. As *energy* is ranked in the 20th place in the SOC's keyword list, a comparatively equal subject in GPU's corpus is found in the 20th item, *polar*. Likewise, *spill* is, on the whole, inclusive of the condition of all the affected in the environmental dispute and representative of major concerns in GPU's discourse. Accordingly, *spill* is also targeted as the trigger word. Eventually, 280 and 729 concordance results have been found respectively for *polar* and *spill* in GPU's corpus. Careful study for each line in the concordance results has found three major strategies in GPU's discourse, namely salience patterns, framing and facticity patterns, which are in accordance to nature, SOC identities and oil spill.

I. Salience patterns in GPU discourse
i. *Salience pattern of individual creature in GPU discourse*
As is shown in Table 10, in contrast to the scant mention of wildlife in SOC discourse, the number and range of creatures that appear in GPU's discourse is sizeable, ranging from various birds to all kinds of animals aground and lives in sea. The characteristic feature in this regard is the specificity in wording. For instance, while SOC resorts to the superordinate, *whales*, GPU use more specific

hyponyms, like *bowhead whales, beluga whales, narwhals, Pacific Ocean whales, gray whales*, intending to highlight individualities of different species of the whale.

Another feature in salience of the individuality is vitality. Specific descriptions, like *green, hawksbill, and loggerhead sea turtles* and *crunchy crabs*, vitalize images of sea turtle and crab and encourage people to respect and cherish them as natural friends.

Tag description	Examples	Frequency
birds	snowy owl, albatross, sea birds, albatross, seabirds, terns	28
animals aground	caribou, deer, Reindeer, moose, white fox, polar fox, snow fox, Arctic foxes, polar bears, cubs, otters, sea otters, seals, ringed seal (Phoca hispida), ice seals, sea lions, sea turtles, walrus,	280
lives in sea	whales, bowhead whales, beluga whales, narwhals, Pacific Ocean whales, sharks, dolphins, jellyfish, Giant Pacific octopus, manta rays, fish, corals, Gersemia rubiformis coral, sea raspberry, sea grass, sponges, coral reefs, ancient trees,	298
beautiful	unique, rare, iconic, beloved, magical, irreplaceable, the most incredible, fantastic, incredible, amazing, majestic, unique and beautiful, diverse	122
vitality	crunchy crabs; green, hawksbill, and loggerhead sea turtles	2
senser	their home melts beneath them, homeless, wanders, curious, sad, who call the Beaufort Sea home, ocean wanderers contending with shrinking habitat, lose their hunting grounds, inspecting the rig,	41
actor	ringed seals break the ice with their heads to make a breathing hole which they keep open with their sharp claws. The polar bear will watch the hole (like a hawk) and grab the seal at the opportune time.	2
wildlife and their role in ecosystem	polar bears are known as a keystone species, the apex of the ecosystem; the African elephant and wolves, polar bears play an irreplaceable role in the health of the Arctic.	2

Table 10 Semantic cluster concerning marine lives in GPU corpus

In addition, transitivity further enhances the salience of the individual. GPU uses sensible items like *curious, inspecting, wanderer* and *contending with shrinking habitat* to describe these creatures, positioning them as Sensers in mental process (Halliday 2014). In the meantime, these creatures are also positioned as initiating Actors in material process by way of presenting them as subjects for the course of action, like *break the ice with their heads to make a breathing hole which they keep open with their sharp claws*. Describing such creatures as Sensers and Actors construes these creatures as sensible and rational and as having developed specific habits in response to their particular functional niches, thus pointing to the impropriety of moving whole populations, which is suggested as un-problematical by SOC.

As Sensers, animals are so curious about the strange foreign objects (SOC's oil rig) that they scale and inspect them. In their individual lives, they are wanderers and passionate lovers of life.

Sometimes, they feel *sad*. Other times, they struggle to stay alive, *contending with the shrinking habitat*. As actors, they know how to use all the available tools to satisfy themselves with all kinds of needs. For instance, in order to acquire oxygen, they struggle *with their heads, with their sharp claws*. They are endowed with extraordinary abilities to observe, to seek chances and to make decisions, entirely a rational actor.

Except for the specificity, vitality and transitivity, GPU also uses a cluster of positive adjectives to praise the beautiful lives, examples like *unique, rare, iconic, beloved, magical, irreplaceable, etc*. In this way, GPU is trying to remind people of these treasure lives. Meanwhile, GPU also emphasizes the irreplaceable roles that have been played by each species in ecological stability. It is trying to tell people that the damage to each nature lives can be destructive to the ecosystem, and all the creatures are sacred and inviolable.

ii. Salience pattern of habitat in GPU discourse

In order to highlight the beauty and purity of these habitats, positive noun phrases like *untouched wonder, incomparable beauty, stunning landscape* and appraisal items *pristine, untainted, remote, calm* (shown in Table 11) are used. Moreover, these habitats are compared to *home* and *haven*, which mean a great deal to these creatures. Modifiers like *sensitive, fragile, ice dependent*, in contrast, index the ecological degradation faced by these habitats. By making salient the beauty, the peace of these habitats, the important roles of these species and the impending crisis, GPU intends to trigger people's awareness of habitats' protection.

Tag description	Examples	Frequency
places	Alaskan coast, Chukchi Sea, the Chukchi Sea states, Prudhoe Bay in the Beaufort Sea, the Bering Sea, shores of the Beaufort Sea, Alaska's Beaufort Sea, Kodiak Island, the Gulf of Mexico	1178
fragile	sensitive, fragile, uniquely vulnerable, ice dependent, protected, vulnerable, endangered, in grave danger	268
home, habitat, wonder	habitat, critical habitat, Home to, the world's largest denning ground, an endless sparkling expanse, haven of ancient biodiversity; pockets of nature: woods, wetlands, fields, and ponds	81
beautiful, untainted	untouched wonder, incomparable beauty, stunning landscape, beautiful, virgin purity, pristine, untainted, remote, calm	238

Table 11 Semantic cluster concerning habitats in GPU corpus

iii. *Salience pattern of sea ice in GPU discourse*

As is shown in Table 12, GPU uses expressions like *essential, polar bears cannot survive without sea ice* to emphasize the important roles played by sea ice in the ecological stability and climate regulation. Clusters of expressions for melting ice draw people's attention to the fact that the shrinking polar ice cap is faced with an even worse condition. Worries of polar bears' disappearing habitats and concerns of lowland inhabitants' living crisis call for people's urgent protection of sea ice.

A distinct feature consists in references to ice. In this regard, GPU uses geographical position as the pre-modifiers for terms of sea ice, with examples like *polar ice caps*, *polar ice*, *Arctic sea* ice

minimum, expressing concerns for local geographical environment. In contrast, SOC's relevant references of sea ice largely focused on the supervision and control of the ice movement as well as the exploration facilities, like ice management strategies, ice floe movement and ice vessel. Here, the oil company regards the existence of sea ice as an impediment of the oil exploration. Based on the attention to the ice floe movement, necessary precautionary measures can be taken to prevent the sea ice from damaging the oil rigs or hindering the exploration, which are essentially for the smooth implementation of energy exploration projects. In this way, distinct purposes of the two parties can be read from the difference in the wording of the reference.

Tag description	Examples	Frequency
references of ice	sea ice, polar ice caps, Arctic sea ice, polar ice, melting Arctic, polar ice levels, melting glaciers, Arctic melting	39
role of sea ice	essential, regulation of our global climate, Polar bears cannot survive without sea ice; polar bears raise their young, to travel and to hunt for seals; completely dependent on the Arctic sea ice; keeps the planet cool by reflecting sunlight; global air conditioner	21
melting ice	melting, 75% reduction, loss, retreats, shrinks, further melting, diminishing, fragile	251
record low	extreme conditions, at record lows, the lowest ever, urgency, entering a death spiral, grave warning, polar emergency	36
present perfect tense	has retreated, has reached, has declined, are retreating	9
speed	dramatically, rapidly, rapid, enhanced	35
scientists	the National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC); the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association; UN weather agency; the European Space Agency; the National Snow & Ice Data Center	12

Table 12 Semantic cluster concerning sea ice in GPU corpus

In addition, GPU highlights the importance of sea ice by comparing it to a *global air conditioner*. High facticity expressions without modals like *keeps the planet cool*, degree adverbs like *completely dependent on the Arctic sea ice* and double negation like *cannot survive without sea ice* as well as positive appraisals like *essential* are used to highlight the statement that sea ice is important for polar bears and climate regulation. Present perfect tense collocated with historic low records of sea ice, present progressive tense and the diminishing ice convey the urgent state of the sea ice. Degree adverbs carrying meanings of speedy changes and adjectives like *rapid* and *enhanced* further emphasize the urgency of the ice condition. The authoritative tests and predictions of scientists enhance the reliability of the message, reminding people of the urgent ice protection.

Overall, the confluence of these salience patterns highlights the important role and the vulnerable state of sea ice, which enhances people's awareness of sea ice protection.

II. Facticity patterns in GPU discourse
i. Facticity pattern of energy projects in GPU discourse

In order to justify the statement that energy projects shouldn't be allowed in the Arctic region, GPU uses facticity strategies to emphasize the disastrous destruction of these projects and express their doubts of SOC's responsive ability to the possible oil spills.

As is shown in Table 13, as well as the references to wildlife mentioned above, there are numerous references for the ecosystem and local inhabitants, like *Arctic ecosystems, marine ecosystem, fragile area, communities, Alaska Native peoples, Indigenous Peoples, four million people who live above the Arctic Circle* and etc. GPU wants to draw public attention to destructive impacts that the oil drilling project may impose on the marine life, the local and the ecosystem. Specification of direct damages collected in the cluster of disturbance and the following description of oil spill's disastrous influence give salience to the degree of the damage. Modifiers like *disastrous, catastrophic, uncalculated, irreparable and unmanageable* express the horrification of the oil spill. These modifiers, combined with negative references of oil spill incidents like *nightmare, disaster, threat* and *mess* tell the public that the environmental destruction caused by oil spill is beyond human's control.

The experts' affirmation of the impossible cleanup of the spilled oil and the categorical negation expressions like *virtually impossible, impossible, no way, no technology or know-how, no*

Tag description	Examples	Frequency
drilling and plan	giant oil rigs, project operations, Drilling activities, icebreaking, seismic testing, reckless plans, fracking, expanding tar sands pipelines, underwater fossil fuel extraction	85
disturbance	noise and light pollution, seismic noise, loud disturbances, harass, alter their feeding or migration patterns, plastic, endangering workers and Alaskan wildlife, the degradation of the waters of Alaska	35
ecosystem	marine ecosystem, environment, Arctic, Arctic ecosystems, environmental, fragile area, unique ecosystem, unique environment	186
people	communities, Alaska Native peoples, Indigenous Peoples, four million people who live above the Arctic Circle, local populations, indigenous people of Alaska, people, frontline communities	254
negative references	Nightmare, disaster, threat, humanitarian crisis, worst-case scenario, mess, warning to humanity	343
harm	Damage, impacts, loss, destruction, impact, suffering	431
appraisal: unsolvable & expression of affect	Disastrous, catastrophic, toxic, uncalculated, horrible, awful, irreparable, horrific, significant, substantial, huge, massive, unmanageable, deadly	379
inevitability	inevitability, inevitable, not a question, waiting to happen, the very real risk, one in five, 75 percent chance	54

impossibility (cleanup)	virtually impossible, no way, no technology or know-how, no solution or method, never proven, irrevocable, myth	121

Tag description	Examples	Frequency
authority	retired Coast Guard Admiral Roger Rufe, Friends of the Earth Climate Campaigner Marissa Knodel, experts, BOEM itself	48
negative appraisal	rosy predictions, convenient fantasy, epic ineffectiveness	3
inadequate	Toothless, failed basic testing, Concrete steps may be missing, do little to assuage these concerns, cannot meet the required safety standards	6
oppose	permanently ban, prevent, unacceptable, a million reasons not to industrialize this untouched wonder	92
Exxon Valdez oil spill	Exxons Mayflower spill, Exxon Valdez oil spill, the Gulf oil disaster, BP spill in the Gulf of Mexico, Enbridge disaster in the Kalamazoo River	26
stifle reporting, downplay the damage	discharge, has stifled reporting, downplayed the damage and public health issues, shut down reporting and information, threatening journalists with arrest, misrepresented the extent of the contamination	18
reminder	toxic legacy, harsh reminder, reminder	17
contaminated homeland	the residents of Mayflower must now live in a contaminated environment, many families will never be able to go back to their homes	2
stewardship	protect, protecting, save, rescuing	482
government	Obama administration	457
others	the Coast Guard, Friends of the Earth Climate Campaigner environmentally-minded Americans,	51
reader, you	You can choose to be one of five animals. We're calling on those in power to work together to protect the Arctic; I hope that you can relate to this outrage	3

Table 13 Semantic cluster concerning oil spill in GPU corpus

solution or method convey the message that it is still not possible to entirely clean up oil spills. Negative appraisals for emergency response and charges of its impracticality highlight the inadequacy of SOC's response plans. Suspicions of SOC's responsive ability are transmitted.

In addition, negative phrases like *has stifled reporting, downplayed the damage and public health issues, threatening journalists with arrest, misrepresented the extent of the contamination* reveal the irresponsible and evil actions that have been taken in response to oil spills by relevant oil companies. These living facts are served to be another source for treating responses to oil spills with suspicion. Detailed presentations of the current situation in the polluted area as well as the

application of active voice, taken together, frame the oil spill as a harsh reminder, adding suspicious factors to the energy project. By way of reminding the Exxon Valdez oil spill incident, the environmental group calls on reader, government and environmentalists to boycott energy projects and devote themselves into environmental campaigns.

ii. Facticity pattern of fossil fuel and natural gas in GPU discourse

　　Facticity patterns of fossil fuel and natural gas are also found in the GPU corpus. As is presented in Table 14, GPU uses detailed behavior descriptions like *burning fossil fuels* and active voice to specify the actor and the process of an action, salience the environmental destruction of the fossil fuel combustion, calling on the public to boycott the exploration, and the use of fossil fuels.

Tag description	Examples	Frequency
negative appraisal for fossil fuels	dangerous, dirty, risky, lethal, highly risky	6
negative subordinates for fossil fuels	have colonized every corner of our Earth, have brought us to the brink of disaster, greed	3
fossil fuel addiction	addiction, addicted to, become hypnotized, society's fossil fuel addiction, dark cultural addiction, the death in a barrel of oil	28
irony	madness, bitter irony, tragically ironic twist, vicious circle	15
challenge of SOC's fossil fuel statement	But let's examine the premise - that in 2050 humans will still rely on fossil fuels for around two thirds of their energy. This prediction is based on a future energy scenario that Shell itself describes as scramble. **The scramble scenario** is one of two options, **a pessimistic one in which we do very little to reduce our addiction to fossil fuels**, and the planet slides towards a radically different climate. **The International Energy Agency- one of the most respected energy organizations on the planet** - estimates that still using this much fossil fuel in 2050 would lead to around **4℃ of global warming**. And these guys are on the **conservative end of energy analysis**. The scientists behind the map also describe Hundreds of millions of people at additional risk of **hunger**... **significantly less water available** to 1 billion people... **forced migration** will be **inevitable**. Shells video seeks to assure you that Shell has your back covered. Shell is just doing the responsible thing by charging into the Arctic to find the oil that society will inevitably consume. **Problem is**, **the only thing** that is	excerpts

inevitable about Shell's strategy is **catastrophic climate change**.

If you're **Shell**, this scenario means **obscene profit** for a couple more decades. For **the rest of us - including the fragile and beautiful Arctic region** – it's a **very dark future** indeed.

Table 14 Semantic cluster concerning fossil fuels in GPU corpus

In addition, GPU also responds to the claims made by SOC, *in 2050 humans will still rely on fossil fuels for around two thirds of their energy.* It is pointed out that this statement is based on the presupposition that people would not reduce the use of fossil fuels, and this presupposition is merely a negative thing in SOC's scenario. The oil company intends to drill more profits from fossil fuel supply. Thus, it takes the negative stance to draw more appeals to the use of fossil fuels. GPU points out that the International Energy Agency has said that if the presupposition becomes a fact, the global temperature would increase 4℃, which would result in irrevocable results. Thus, the environmental group strongly and directly opposes the future fossil energy demand prediction made by the oil company, trying to guide the public to refuse the use of fossil fuels.

In the detailed discourse organization, the environmental group places *scramble* as the pre-modifier of the *scenario*, emphasizing the uncertainty of SOC's prediction. Meanwhile, the authority of the International Energy Agency is presented by superlative expressions like *the most respected on the planet*. In this way, the International Energy Agency's prediction appears to be more authoritative. Clusters of negative results of the resulted warming-up construct an uncontrollable situation. *Will be inevitable*, the categorical future tense affirms that these disasters will break out once the warming-up happens. The environmental group intends to remind people that refusal to the use of fossil fuels is a must.

III. Framings pattern in GPU discourse

Standing in direct opposition to SOC's oil exploration practices, the environmental group compares the oil company to negative characters like bully, briber, liar, lobbyist, money worshiper, gambler, drug dealer and wizard (shown in Table 15).

Specifically, SOC are reported to 'bribe politicians', 'lobby regulators', 'manipulate climate change policies', silence righteous reporters and keep Arctic destruction out of sight and mind. Moreover, the environmental group points out that SOC is looking to capitalize the melting ice and trying to drill more climate-wrecking oil. The strongest revelation is that the oil company is trying to get the public hooked on the fossil fuel addiction so as to draw more profits from the business.

On the whole, these appalling accusations exposed the oil giant's manipulation of policies and oil spill news reports, intending to call for more public participation in guarding against SOC's business practice. Moreover, it is set to remind people to reject the addiction to fossil fuel consumption.

Tag description	Examples	Frequency

references of oil companies	reckless oil giant, Shell, Gazprom, oil companies, They, industry, BP, Shell, oil companies, The oil industry, the American Petroleum Institute, multinational oil company	277
negative subordinates for oil companies	spoil, encouraged society's fossil fuel addiction, putting Arctic wildlife at risk; unique sea raspberry corals, an important part of the delicate Arctic ecosystem that Shell plans to drill. Gazprom is putting the fragile Arctic environment at risk; managed to destroy a containment dome, chasing after hard-to-reach oil	114
policies, citizen, opponent	energy laws, regulators, politicians, climate change policies, America, citizen, all of you who disagree with it	63
shell take advantages of ice melting	looking to capitalize, looking to profit from, want to take advantage of the destruction of sea ice, see melting sea ice as an opportunity; see... not as a warning, but as a business opportunity; drive for profit at all costs, drill for even more climate-wrecking oil, see an opportunity to move in and search for more oil	30

Table 15 Semantic cluster concerning framings of SOC in GPU corpus

3. Identifying fissures and seeking potential common grounds in discourses across difference
3.1 Identifying the fissures in the dominant discourses

Above, we have identified the problematic issue and analysed the opposing discourses. Based on the comparative analyses, we could identify the tensions in the two competing discourses. Overall, it is found that, Shell Oil Company advocates continued energy exploration on the basis of persistent demand for fossil fuels and economic gain ...., while Greenpeace USA is opposed to oil gas exploitation for worries about the ecological destruction. In order to win more supports for their own stance, both of the oil company and the environmental group are trying to increase the stake of their discourse.

Specifically, SOC uses facticity pattern to justify the energy demand, to downplay the oil spill, while GPU applies it to highlight the threat of the underlying oil spill, to oppose the exploration for fossil fuel and natural gas. One sharper contrasting point lies in the application of framing. SOC presents itself with framings of various positive identities, such as security identity, philanthropist identity and innovative technology giant. Conversely, GPU reports the oil company with all kinds of negative substitutes, tagging the oil company with interest-oriented egocentrism. Additionally, while SOC intends to erase the nature life and the culprit of the fossil fuel combustion, GPU highlights the marine life and their habitats with various salience patterns.

While certain discourses are beneficial to environmental protection, destructive discourses can, on the contrary, exacerbate the urgent ecological crisis. By using 'greenwashing' strategies, SOC seeks to naturalize the need for energy exploration. These strategies, if not unmasked, will pose threats to the ecology, as they will be taken to be an excuse for unlimited energy consumption. Moreover, the erasure of the individuality of the marine life can will endanger more species as it

reifies marine life as an obstacle to be overcome . On the contrary, discourses with salience to the individuality of natural life create affiliations with audiences that emphasise respect for living creatures' rights and those who advocate more protection for ecology. In GPU's discourse, specificity, vitality and roles of senser and actor are applied to the description of individual creatures. Positive appraisals and metaphors are utilized to highlight nature life's habitats. In contrast to erasure patterns applied by SOC, GPU's salience patterns can encourage ecological protections from the public. In addition, specifying agency of climate change can raise people's awareness of the ecological influence exerted by the energy consumption.

By comparing the dominant industrialist discourses against the environmental discourses, we can also identify tensions between the industrialist discourse and other elements of the dominant social order, tensions which may represent fissures within the dominant discourse and the prevailing certainties it promotes. Possible areas of tension can be seen in the suggestion that economic growth and technological development are not necessarily the ways forward and can be counterproductive for society even within the terms of capitalist order of extraction and exploitation. More specifically, human development does not have to be achieved at the sacrifice of animal beings but can be achieved in harmony with nature. Animal beings are not to be materialized; they deserve a way of life not to be subjugated to human beings. And, more tellingly, fossil fuels may be dangerous and destructive to the extent that they undermine the economic stability and future potential of the prevailing economic system.   These are the aspects of the industrial discourses that could serve to fissure the hegemonic social (industrial) order. However, in order to create a viable counter-hegemonic alternative, researchers not only need to expose the problems in the 'discourses we don't like', nor even to offer up alternative 'positive' discourses, but also to interrogate why the 'discourses we like' have not been generally taken up as viable alternatives and to consider the means by which they can be reformulated and accommodated within a coalition of alternative voices that, between them, represent a coherent and powerful opposition. From this perspective, we might say, for instance, that while the GPU discourse offers us 'positive' strategies and ideals, as with Great Thunberg's antagonistic discourses, it inadvertently reinforces the human-nature divide in failing to attend to ordinary people's need for economic security and the desire to provide for their families.   In adopting such an antagonistic stance, the GPU discourse can easily be caricatured by the hegemonic order as 'anti-human' and 'anti-science' and as viewing people as the enemy of nature rather than as part of nature.

In our comparative analysis above, it was found that SOC also emphasized the importance of resilience and sustainability and their used of evaluative lexis, like *high-performance, non-toxic, reliable,* also recognize the importance of cleanness and high efficiency of the new energy and future energy structure adjustment. This aspect of sustainability is a potential fissure within the hegemonic industrial discourses and provides common ground with GPU.

3.2 Seeking the possible common grounds in discourse across difference
In arguing for a positive or interventionist orientation to discourse analysis, Bartlett (2018: 144) emphasizes the 'design of alternative practice based on current social conditions and linguistic practices in a specific context'. However, to design (Kress 2000) alternative practices or discourses, we need to consider what is contradictory between opposing discourses and how we can reconcile the contradiction. Successfully communicating environmental problems and prompting corresponding actions of environmental protection hinge as much on how representations of

environment could win over audience on one's own side and those undecided as well as the audience or the groups on the opposing sides. To persuade the audience on both sides to act in accordance, strategies are important.

Communication between hegemonic and renovatory discourses can be compared to mutual understanding in intercultural discourse (Kramsch and Boner 2010; Bartlett 2018). In intercultural communication, there are possibilities for different communities working with different conceptions of key points while appearing on the surface to be using the same terms to refer to these. Rather than being critical of the other party's problems, we need to think of how to solve the problems. A 'blaming' approach will contribute little to mutual understanding and a harmonious sustainable world. If the opposing sides (the energy exploitation group and the energy preservation group) insist on their stance and own assumptions without any attempt to make compromises, there will be little hope for them to be reconcile to each other. Neither side will win over the other side nor all the audience with their own ideological standing[1]. Therefore, there will be little likelihood to break the insulation. If we just focus on the problems without reflecting on how to solve them, we will not go far in protecting the environment. Likewise, although promoting positive texts is important as it points to the possibility of alternative beneficial discourse, this promotion will amount to little if these positive texts do not create empathy with the target audience. Only when they relate to the community or institutional voice of potential collaborators and connect with the practices and beliefs that have shaped that voice could they achieve effect. Proceeding from the postfoundational perspective, since a focus on either the good side or the bad side alone will not solve the problem, a potential way out is to explore how fault lines within a destructive discourse can be exploited as the basis for a collaborative discourse.

As is shown in Table 5, SOC sought to project its philanthropic identity by 'providing funding' and 'helping' local people. This philanthropic aspect is a potential fault line or fissure in the dominant industrial discourse. However, revealing this tension remains   a strictly critical approach if analysts stop at showing how the SOC discourse is internally contradictory; an enhanced PDA approach should go beyond this and seek areas where they can appropriate some ideas in the SOC discourse – one form of common ground –in appealing to the economic benefits and social wellbeing of non-fossil fuels and accommodates them into an alternative energy discourse. For example, a collaborative discourse that connects entrepreneurship with philanthropy would create common ground between environmentalists like GPU and activists for social issues. On the GPU side, an alternative discourse that emphasizes the simultaneous reduction of emissions and the maintenance of lifestyles and economic security through the wholesale development of green industry may win over those who are not moved to action by the plight of polar bears. Such collaborative discourses would be empathetic, comprehensible and legitimate within both social

---

[1] It could very reasonably be argued that such a situation would not represent a problem for the existing hegemonic bloc, who profit from the status quo. One possible scenario, however, is that enhanced PDA can be used to design a counter-discourse that unites a powerful alliance of social activists in opposition to the existing bloc and that this discourses creates fissures within the dominant bloc, with the result that progressive elements within the dominant bloc are amenable to collaborating with the formerly antagonistic bloc. Such a process would therefore comprise an antagonistic discourse as well as collaborative discourse (cf. Bartlett 2012) across two phases – external to the hegemonic discourse in the first phase and cross-cutting with it in the second.

groups simultaneously and maximize their potential for uptake.

Although the fissures identified in the present case may be potential and tiny, they point to the fragility of an industrial model which is generally held to be invulnerable. This enhanced PDA, a postfoundational approach, focuses on solutions rather than problems and rather than celebrating resistance as resistance, demonstrates that discourse can be simultaneously competitive and collaborative, and even that competitive features can be subsumed within a collaborative whole (Bartlett 2018). The result of this collaboration is 'a third space', which Bartlett draws from Bhabha (1994; also see Bartlett 2018) and where the hegemonic discourses across difference could come together to forge something new and where both sides could declare ideological differences while negotiating alternative perspectives.

Based on the fissures identified in the dominant discourses, this 'third space' for the present case concerning the environment protection could borrow the practice of banning smoking: just as all cigarette packages and cigarette advertisements are required to include warning labels depicting the negative health consequences of smoking, could all industrial and promotional discourses be required to remind the audience of the potential environmental damage? Or could the industrial and promotional discourses be improved to encourage 'respectful use' of animals, plants and nature (Plumwood 2012: 81)? Likewise, could all environmental protection discourses, the 'discourse we like', take into consideration people's right to survive? Such new and hybrid discourses styles will be more comprehensible, empathetic and legitimate across ideological divides. They will open the existing fissure(s) wider and stand better chance of ultimately persuading and winning over support and thus influencing the audience's thinking and their ensuing acts. The black-and-white solution to environmental issues as adopted by the young Swedish climate activist, Greta Thunberg, may not create much substantial behavioral change among the populace as it is considered to be too idealistic and therefore unrealistic. Neither complete optimism nor total pessimism helps to address the problems facing us. Similarly, neither a 'blaming' or a 'positive' approach alone will achieve substantial effect in changing the audience's understanding of the pressing issue and in protecting the ecological system because they both assume a 'hypodermic approach' to the transmission of ideology (O'Halloran 2003). Both proponents believe that by well crafting the messages, the audience will naturally absorb messages 'like passive sponges' (Norris 2000: 36). They neglect the strategic interactions between the opposing groups (discourses) and the fact that audience may actively deconstruct what they read. To address the transmission problem, we need to look for both commonalities across the discourses of differences and the fault lines in the discourse of the dominant groups that can be exploited. To put it another way, we need to seek the fissure between the conflictual discourses with the view of designing a collaborative discourse and attach importance to embracing 'variable, idiosyncratic uptake of text and discourse by audience' (Luke 2002: 101).

4. Conclusion

By adapting the analytic framework of Stibbe (2016), this two-part paper makes a corpus-aided comparative eco-discourse analysis of discourses by two groups with opposing interests (SOC and GUA), focusing on their discourse semantic patterns. It has moved beyond traditional keyword analysis to a more comprehensive analysis of discourse semantics. It has identified the discourse semantic patterns inherent in the messages of the competing entities and showcased how these patterns index conflicting ideologies and identities and may yield destructive or beneficial effects. It reveals that both groups use similar strategies such as salience and framing but with different

orientations to (de)legitimate energy exploitation. This present study has both deconstructed hidden ideology and discourse strategies in the hegemonic destructive discourse, which are not self-evident to casual readers and constructed what positive discourse can be like. Such a corpus-aided comparative discourse semantic analysis will facilitate the identification of 'greenwashing' strategies, that is, of how destructive discourse 'conceals environmentally harmfully actions with the rhetoric of environmental friendliness to entice and manipulate the consumer' (Plec and Pettenger 2012: 464) and of avenues for shaping alternative discourses, both of which equally raise people's critical language awareness of ecological practices.

Methodologically, our analysis demonstrates how a comparative ecological discourse analysis can make visible the dynamic ambiguities in discursive practices which constitute social change. Additionally, like Macgilchrist and Praet (2013), our study indicates how conceptualizing the discursive field as open and indeterminate makes possible analysis not only of those changes which strengthen and stabilize the dominant hegemonic formations (the 'greenwashing' strategies) but also of those which could destabilize and fissure such formations (the GPU's 'positive' strategies). Theoretically, this study contributes to a postfoundational approach to discourse and social change which moves away from *critique*, i.e. investigating how language and other semiosis forms serve to stabilize 'new capitalism' and instead, focuses on fissures and those moments of dislocation by adopting a comparative approach to investigate tensions and ambivalences between competing discourses and exploring conflicts over meaning in discursive practices. These various elements of discourse analytical practice combine within an enhanced PDA approach to discourse across difference and together 'form a cairn for positive and interventionist orientations to discourse' (Bartlett 2018:144).

However, while this study has demonstrated the advantages of a synergy of deconstructive and constructive approaches, it does not put away its deficiencies. There is room for future improvements and further research. This paper has focused more on the differences/contrasts between the competing discourses and identified an opposition. Due to space constraints and corpus types, for the last two stages of enhanced PDA, we have just hinted at possible fissures and common ground. As the common ground is more likely in the discourse of a third grouping that is anti-hegemonic and anti-fossil fuel but that appropriates the message of social and economic benefits that SOC has been using and that is missing in GPU, future work could develop other methods not only to identify the fault lines along the discourse-space but also to identify specific pathways and mechanisms for converting such analysis into design. This would mean trying to create a discourse where sustainability of livelihoods and standards of living is a common ground and where the long-term harm of fossil fuels to all interests is the fissure in the hegemonic discourse. A discourse that showed, for example, that green energy could create new jobs while protecting the environment might be one that is taken up and so an example of positive design.

Additionally, design or reconstruction of discourse often involves 'translating' existing discourses into locally acceptable terms and narratives, taking into account the social conditions and linguistic practices of the locale, so that scholars must continue to identify the social factors that create the conditions within which counter discourses are assimilated into and legitimated within existing discourse practices and so are enable to take hold and speared (Bartlett 2018).

Finally, it should also be noted that not all texts are equal and that some text types travel much faster. A CDA or PDA analyst needs to ponder over why destructive discourses are more influential and more widely consumed and to reflect on the power factors and channels of communication with

the view of accelerating the spread of positive discourse (instead of just a certain text) and the wider uptake of positive messages.

Notes:

1. http://www.shell.com
2. http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/?s=shell

References (to be corrected)

Bartlett, Tom. 2012. *Hybrid Voices and Collaborative Change: Contextualising Positive Discourse Analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Bartlett, Tom. 2018. Positive Discourse Analysis. In: *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*, John Flowerdew and John E. Richardson (eds), 133-47. London: Routledge.

Bartlett, Tom. 2019. Scaling the Incommensurate: Discourses of Sustainability in the Western Isles of Scotland. In: *Critical Policy Discourse Analysis*, Nicolina Montessori et al. (eds), 242–263. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Bernstein, Brasil. 2000. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

Halliday, M. A. K. and C. M. Matthiessen. 2014. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. (4th edition.). London: Routledge.

Kramsch, Claire and Elizabeth Boner. 2010. Shadows of Discourse: Intercultural Communication in Global Contexts. In: *The Handbook of Globalization*, Nikolas Coupland (ed), Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.

Luke, Allan. 2002. Beyond Science and Ideology Critique: Developments in Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22: 96-110.

Macgilchrist, Felicitas. 2016. Fissures in the Discourse-scape: Critique, Rationality and Validity in Post-foundational Approaches to CDS. Discourse & Society 27(3) 262–277.

Martin, James R. 2004/2012. Positive Discourse Analysis: Solidarity and Change. In: *Collected Works of J.R. Martin*, Zhenhua Wang (ed), 278-98. Shanghai: Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press.

Martin, James R. 1986/2012. Grammaticalizing Ecology: The Politics of Baby Seals and Kangaroos. *Collected Works of James R. Martin*, Zhenhua Wang (ed), 7-49. Shanghai: Shanghai Jiao Tong University.

Norris, Pippa. 2000. *A Virtuous Circle: Political Communications in Postindustrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Halloran, Kieran. 2003. *Critical Discourse Analysis and Language Cognition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Plec, Emily and Mary Pettenger. 2012. Greenwashing Consumption: The Didactic Framing of ExxonMobil's Energy Solutions. *Journal of Environmental Communication* 6 (4): 459-476

Stevens, Paul. 2012. Towards an Ecosociology. *Sociology* 46(4): 579-95.

Stibbe, Arran. 2014. An Ecolinguistic Approach to Critical Discourse Studies. *Critical Discourse Studies* 11(1):117-28.

Stibbe, Arran. 2016. *Ecolinguistics : Language, Ecology and the Stories We Live by*. New York: Routledge.

Stibbe, Arran. 2018. Critical Discourse Analysis and Ecology. In: *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*, John Flowerdew and John E. Richardson (eds), 497-509. London: Routledge.