# Discourse Analysis of Two Online Environmental Communication Campaigns

## ADEMOSU, Ifedolapo

Department of Mass Communication
Caleb University, Imota, Lagos State

## Abstract

Humanity's dependence on the environment as a source of raw materials for various aspects of survival has affected the planet (Omoshue and Ashadu, 2016). Reversing the direction and state of the environment requires the cooperation of all stakeholders most of whom can much easily be reached via media content. Environmental campaigns are one of the many tools used to reach audiences irrespective of location and distance. These campaigns are sometimes developed as a fit to their cultural contexts and at other times to reach a global audience. As such, this study guided by the framing theory analysed two campaigns - one Nigerian and the other with a global outlook, purposively selected to evaluate the discourse tools employed in designing the communication content. From the analysis, it was deduced that the two campaigns did employ tools of discourse – the rank scale act which focused on the functions that the sentences in the campaigns performed, cohesion and cohesive devices to ensure the messages made sense and to build a relationship amongst the concepts discussed.

**Keywords:** Discourse Analysis, Language, Environmental Communication, Framing, Media Campaign

## Introduction

Humans draw resource from the environment in which they live and so a stable and habitable atmosphere/environment is crucial for prolonged human life (Omoshue & Ashadu, 2016). Humanity thrives only when the environment thrives, and a destruction of the environment means negative consequences for the inhabitants of this planet. Despite the importance of the environment, the last few decades have witnessed a gradual and, in some cases, fast destruction of the environment as we know it.

The most talked about environmental issue has been climate change especially in view of the effects that have been witnessed and experienced across the globe. Climate change is affecting everyone at mid to extreme levels – changing weather patterns including incessant flooding, rising sea levels and more extreme weather events like the heat wave melting street tar in India. Greenhouse emissions from human activities are on the rise and fuelling climate change on a negative bent.

Without corrective actions, it is projected that world temperatures will rise, and areas of the world will warm even more. The poor and the vulnerable will suffer the most from the changes going on (United Nations, 2017).

Notwithstanding the discussions that seem to focus predominantly on climate change, the environmental issues are interconnected. Climate change is a by-product of other environmental problems that have not been addressed or have been on the receiving end of inadequate focus/policies over the years. The 2016 Report by the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) indicates that environmental devastation is occurring at a rapid pace and requires governments to take affirmative action in order to slow down and ultimately reverse the damage being done to the planet.

The 2016 Report gave signposts of the many environmental threats overwhelming many countries. In almost all Continents and regions, there are issues of population growth, rapid urbanisation and increased consumption levels, increased waste generation, issues of poor waste disposal, desertification, land degradation especially following on the heels of massive flooding which have caused erosion of soil in many countries and climate change which has caused severe scarcity of water in many countries. These of course have come with attendant side effects, which include but are not restricted to food scarcity and health issues caused by air and water pollution.

The environmental problem is more critical in African countries that have a myriad of problems to deal with, alongside poor governance which has led to several major issues being left unattended. The result is a continuous spiral of problems in land degradation, air pollution from industrial waste and car exhaust systems as well as the poor and inadequate provision of sanitation and safe drinking water.

From the UNEP sponsored research, there are at least 600,000 premature deaths yearly in Africa due to indoor air pollution. The Continent's reliance on biomass (getting energy by burning wood and other organic matter) for cooking, lighting and heating means that 90 percent of the region's population is exposed to this health threat. The problem is that Biomass releases carbon emissions (pollutants which are dangerous to health). It comes from things that once lived: wood products, dried vegetation, crop residues, aquatic plants and even garbage. It is also known as 'Natural Material. Even though the proportion of population with access to clean water has increased and grown from 64 percent in 2005 to 68 percent in 2012, absolute numbers of people without safe drinking water remain high.

In addition, more than half of sub-Saharan Africa's population lack access to improved sanitation, compared to 90 percent coverage in North Africa. The African megacities - Cairo, Kinshasa and Lagos, and emerging megacities such as Dar es Salaam, Johannesburg and Luanda, are challenged with poor management of sanitation services due to inadequate and deteriorating infrastructure resulting from underinvestment.

The Continent and even Nigeria has an opportunity to use its young population to drive the changes it requires especially after it has put in place requisite policies and frameworks that will ensure that the country's industrial sector reduces it carbon emissions, and all citizens can make climate-friendly choices which can contribute towards the development of the Continent's infrastructure, accelerate industrialisation (in a sustainable manner), increase energy and food production, and promote sustainable natural resource governance.

A growing population and a rise in the demand for firewood will mean that forest cover in Africa is likely to continue shrinking, declining to less than 600 million hectares by 2050. Over cultivation, inefficient irrigation practices, overgrazing, the overexploitation of resources, uncontrolled mining activities and climate change will further degrade land in Africa, the UNEP Report states. This will lead to reduced agricultural productivity, reduced food security, which can increase migration and spread diseases, the destruction of infrastructure, such as roads and bridges, and high rates of poverty (UNEP, 2016).

The Paris Agreement of 2016 was one of many steps towards ensuring that the issues affecting climate change are addressed collectively but especially individually at the country level. The Agreement had 196 countries and saw each country fixing their own goals/policy changes and or contributions towards addressing and mitigating the effect of climate change (Global Conservancy, 2016; UN, 2016). This was the situation before United States under President Donald Trump pulled US out of the Agreement, thus, setting its expectations backwards.

The process of tackling these issues are also being driven by the United Nations on the platform of the Sustainable Development Goals – they have inspired governments and civil societies to work together to slow down what has become one of the most expensive costs of doing business and extracting wealth from the earth. The attainment of these SDGs especially the ones that concern the environment require a working partnership based on an agreement of the vital importance of the environment and what it represents to everyone.

In discussing the policies and agreements reached, the underlying message is clear – the environment is important. Milstein, Pileggi and Morgan (2017, ed.) believe that place (the environment) matters both physically and symbolically. While the meaning of place physically differs from the meaning symbolically, at least on an individual level, they are albeit related. It is therefore crucial to spell out the meanings as applies to all stakeholders in other to ensure that there is an agreement at all levels. This is the only way to foster unity and cooperation in achieving set goals that concern place or as focused on in this paper – the environment. This is where communication, specifically environmental communication plays the mediating role. It renders in words, the perception of place that all individuals need to arrive at an agreement that will enable cooperation in fostering a sustainable environment.

Communication is essential to life. It encapsulates the history and contexts of people and societies as well as how all of these relates to the environment as well as influences the individual and collective view of what the environment represents. Communication builds and enhances relationships as it serves as the bridge across contexts and viewpoints of the environment. It enables people establish common viewpoints and frames of what place is. In a world where there are issues of various types and at global, national and regional and even community proportions, all competing against the same types of interests – national, regional, community and even individual interests, communication is critical to building the right frames that will help to address those issues collectively. Communication is used to create points of agreements and to communicate steps to be taken to reach the desired change at the various levels.

Environmental communication is essential for behaviour change strategies in environmental studies. The environment has become one of the major issues on the global stage requiring global agreement and participation to tackle the issues. In studying the environment and what it requires, we represent the meaning it has for us with words. Those words in turn paint a picture of those places for others to see and experience. Environmental communication as a field is balanced on two core assumptions:

1. the ways we communicate powerfully shapes our ecological perceptions and that
2. those perceptions inform how we act with/in the human world (Milstein, 2009 cited in Milstein *et al*., 2017, p. 2).

Communication then becomes a powerful social process which not only reflects individual and collective views of the environment but serves to "construct, produce, and naturalise" specific ecological relationships and realities. Wood (2018, pp. 3-5) agrees with the aforementioned viewpoint when she describes communication as a "system" but she goes on further to explain that communication has two levels of meaning – the content aspect and the relationship aspect and each has implications for the interpretation of the message communicated.

The challenge for environmental communication globally and even in Nigeria then lies in constructing all the viewpoints of "place" at a collective and individual level taking into cognizance the meaning the authors of the environmental messages want to convey as well as the relationship they have with the intended recipients. As mentioned earlier, the interests at play where "place" is concerned span economic, cultural and political (power) interests and so requires a mediation that enables all parties arrive at a consensus that can drive sustainable change.

Language is the tool of communication and it is represented by symbols to project meaning to establish the exchange of information (Osisanwo, 2003). It is the perfect tool to render the environment in such a way that it captures all the viewpoints of the interests at play for the purpose of fostering an agreed and sustained course of action to save the environment. Language is the tool used to render our world to us

(painting images of our world) and one that all stakeholders can agree with (Milstein, Pileggi and Morgan, 2017). In the same vein, it could have disastrous consequences if the image painted causes the varying interests to emerge. Communication campaigns are part of the tools used to communicate "rendered images" of what place means to humanity to persuade those with dissenting views, and habits to a more sustainable manner of life.

## Statement of the Problem

The environment is on a continuous spiral and most projects and activities designed to tackle the issues have either not achieved widespread success or failed to checkmate the environmental challenges within countries and across the globe. Part of the challenge has been getting people to have the same focus towards tackling the issues and this requires the skilful use of language to reach a wide audience. A few campaigns have been developed internationally, with a few done locally within Nigeria and sponsored by the state, organisations, groups and individuals. The campaigns run in Nigeria aired for a while particularly on radio but stopped after some months. Yet the environment is still i n peril.

This dissects the effectiveness issue into two – reach of those campaigns and secondly the content of those campaigns whether globally or in Nigeria. So far none of the campaigns run in Nigeria have been a full-scale campaign and not much evaluation has been done to ascertain the impact. As such, it is important to consider the discourse tools employed to frame the issues in some of the campaigns deployed to members of the public. The efficacy of those tools determines the result – whether positive or negative in shaping mind-sets and driving behaviour change.

In the light of the aforementioned capabilities of communication (language and words), and the sensitivity of "place" and the value it holds in determining how people react to the environment, it is crucial to evaluate the discourse of environmental communication campaigns and how language is used to emphasise the contexts and frames of "place".

## Objective

This study aimed to:
1. identify the discourse tools used in the local and foreign campaigns and
2. ascertain how the discourse tools were used in emphasising the important contexts or message passed to viewers/listeners.

## Research Questions

1. What were the discourse tools used in the local and foreign campaigns?
2. How were the tools (language function) used in emphasising the important contexts or message passed to viewers/listeners?

# CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
## Language and Discourse

Language is crucial to the process of communication; it represents symbols and codes used to capture meaning by different cultures and tribes and expressed whether in written or oral terms in other to establish the exchange of information (Osisanwo, 2008). These symbols represent ideas and concepts universally agreed on by members of that community. As Barker and Salasinksi (2003) explain, writers have argued that "language is the central means and medium by which we understand the world and construct culture". It is important to the process of constructing environmental issues especially given the myriad of interests and levels of interests at play. It is a tool that encapsulates all these viewpoints into a state of agreement that ensures that sustainability becomes the core focus of all stakeholders.

It is in the process of communicating with language that discourse is established. What then is discourse? Discourse, on the one hand, can be considered as the process of real-life verbal communication in which attention is paid to the systemic characteristics of language, the degree of spontaneity and completeness, thematic coherence and clarity for other people (Kenzhekanova, 2015). While Osisanwo (citing Brown and Yule, 1983) describes it simply as "language in use", the Cambridge Online Dictionary describes it as "communication in speech or writing".

Another author describes discourse as "a continuous stretch of (especially spoken) language larger than a sentence, often constituting a coherent unit such as a sermon, argument, joke, or narrative" (Crystal, 1992, p. 25 cited in Bilal, 2012). It can also include concepts such as "language above or beyond the sentence, language as meaning in interaction, and language in situational and cultural context" (Trappes-Lomax, n.d.). All these definitions hint at the close relationship discourse [language in use] has with the norms and values of different societies or the process by which these norms and values are produced.

This means that language was crafted for the sole purpose of communicating and creating shared meaning within two or more peoples, amongst groups and so on. In analysing this concept further, certain factors shape discourse, and this includes but is not limited to "the number of participants and the relationship that exists between them". Building on Crystal's views it therefore means that language and discourse cannot be evaluated or analysed in isolation from the *context of the participants* in that discourse. In other words, context is very crucial in the analysis of any discourse.

Discourse serves different but specific functions in different contexts. Since discourse is language in use, it therefore pre-supposes that it serves certain functions as explained by Osisanwo (2008, p. 10) and these are *Transactional and Interactional*. Where interactional language function aspires to maintain a relationship between the individuals or among group members and it achieves this through the careful selection of tools applicable to the features of language in use. The transactional function on the other hand explores how humans use linguistic tools to communicate the information

and knowledge they have and their abilities. The main intent of the transactional function is to disseminate a message to audiences. These two functions can be performed through either spoken or written language.

Irrespective of the language function being performed, there are certain features that qualify a conversation or written text to be called discourse. Bilal *et al.* (2012) describe seven features that make discourse a discourse. They are:

1. **Cohesion**: grammatical and logical relationship between parts of a sentence essential for its interpretation.
2. **Coherence**: the order of statements relates one another by sense.
3. **Intentionality**: the message must be conveyed deliberately and consciously.
4. **Acceptability**: indicates that the communicative product needs to be satisfactory and the audience approves it.
5. **Informativeness**: some new information must be included in the discourse.
6. **Situationality**: circumstances in which the remark is made are important.
7. **Intertextuality**: reference to the world outside the text or the interpreters' schemata.

Discourse dovetails into many fields or draws perspective from many fields, therefore, this paper will be examined from a linguistic perspective. Additionally, some of the above-mentioned features and the rank scale were employed in the analysis of the discourse focus of this paper.

## Discourse and the Environment

Hansen and Cox (2015) believe that the intricacy of environmental issues is founded on their connection to virtually all aspects of human life – material, financial, economic and political. This makes it imperative for scholars and researchers to employ diverse means to make sense of the environment and the attendant issues as well as address the areas of concern. Discourse spans many approaches but particularly investigates how language is used to socially construct an invested, partial and always subjective understanding of the environment.

In emphasising the importance of discourse, Norton (2005, p.87) states that on matters of the environment, the way forward beyond ideology (individual value sets) to co-operative action is to develop a more neutral and yet expressive language that allows the formulation of problems in more or less terms that are easily understood by the intended audience. The goal of environmental discourse is therefore the development and adoption as well as implementation of cooperative solutions. Discourse has purpose which infers that each structure within environmental campaigns is packaged with an intended purpose which becomes a failure when it divides rather than unites.

In pointing out the weaknesses of discourse, Alexander (2009) states that every environmental story and in this case, campaign carries a "spin". In other words, each environmental discourse more often than not is telling the audience what the creators

of those messages want them to hear with the intention of persuading them to their viewpoint as opposed to giving them critical information – the truth on the state of the environment as it were. This presupposes that each environmental campaign or discourse is embedded with the "codes of environmental values" of the sender of the message which may or may not be beneficial to the larger ring of stakeholders.

As such, there is a need to balance between linguistic discourse which is focused on the use of language to structure meaning and critical discourse to discern the underlying power plays at work in different environmental situations. For this work, some level of inference (to a minute degree) was made to highlight the underlying power plays in the analysed discourse.

## Theoretical Framework

The framing theory drives this work. Narrative structures are needed to organise discourse in communicative texts or transcriptions of electronic communication irrespective of the functions they serve (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015, p.423). This is where frames and or the framing theory play a role. It defines how a message or concept is presented to the audience in such a way as to influence the choices people make about how to process that information. Frames organise or structure message meanings (Baran & Davis, 2015). Frames have been used predominantly to assess news or media content. However, it was used to discuss this structure of the content of the environmental campaigns. Frames are important because audiences also evaluate messages through their own frames developed over their lifetime from exposure to institutions and systems with their own cultural meaning and definitions to different concepts such as the environment.

Putting frames to campaign content therefore helps to focus the audiences on specific aspects of the issue(s) in consideration. Ardèvol-Abreu defines framing as the process of highlighting certain aspects of reality, so that a problem is defined, its causes are identified, and appropriate solutions and actions are proposed. Techniques of framing as detailed by Fairhurst and Sarr in 1996 include:

1. **Metaphor**: To frame a conceptual idea through comparison to something else.
2. **Stories (Myths, Legends)**: To frame a topic via narrative in a vivid and memorable way.
3. **Tradition (Rituals, Ceremonies)**: Cultural mores that imbue significance in the mundane, closely tied to artefacts.
4. **Slogan, Jargon, and Catchphrase**: To frame an object with a catchy phrase to make it more memorable and relate-able.

The campaigns repetition of specific words that are catchy and easy to remember also fit into this specific frame.

1. **Artefact**: Objects with intrinsic symbolic value – a visual/cultural phenomenon that holds more meaning than the object itself.
2. **Contrast**: To describe an object in terms of what it is not.

3. **Spin**: To present a concept in such ways as to convey a value judgement (positive or negative) that might not be immediately apparent; to create an inherent bias.

These framing tools serve as the structure through which the selected campaigns were evaluated. A number of the tools under the lexical devices fit aptly under the metaphoric frame, specifically the re-iteration tools of synonym/near synonym which were used to compare and lay emphasis on situations and concepts such as "reduce, reuse, recycle". The 3Rs campaign slogan – Reduce, Reuse, and Recycle is a perfect expression of this frame.

The Olamide campaign did not have any slogan that could serve as a take-away slogan for audiences but it did put a spin (a negative one) on the habit of blaming everyone and everything for the crime of littering the environment.

In analysing the weak aspects of frames, McQuail (2010), explains that frames usually reflect the goals of their sources and should also reflect changing realities concerning the issue of discussion. He also points out that the most powerful frames may well be invisible or so transparently obvious that it is overlooked.

## Research Method

Two environmental campaigns were examined via Bilal *et al.*"s features of what makes discourse. The campaigns were purposively selected with the following features in mind:

1. It is an environmental advert (audio, video, animation) trying to pass across a message.
3. It was posted on social media, specifically a video sharing site – in this instance YouTube
4. One was global in orientation and the other Nigerian in nature.
5. Each would resonate with young adults in the climes in which they were produced.

The selected adverts were then evaluated based on the following features:

**Cohesion:** grammatical and logical relationship between parts of a sentence essential for its interpretation.

**Coherence:** the order by which statements relate to one another by sense.

**Intentionality:** the message must be conveyed deliberately and consciously.

**Acceptability**: indicates that the communicative product needs to be satisfactory and the audience approves it. This would be explained for this purpose in terms of the number of views via social media and in future research, a survey can be carried out to evaluate the effectiveness and resonance of the campaigns especially the Nigerian ad with the audience.

## Analysis: The Campaigns

**Table 1: Campaign 1: 3 R's DSTV Advert**

| Text | Line/Discourse Tool |
|---|---|
| It's *our* world(a) and if *you* love it (b) | 1 (a)Near synonym (b)Substitution (C)Collocation– part/whole (d)Co-coordinating conjunction |
| Listen up there's something you need to know. | 2 |
| This is not going to last forever | 3 Reference (anaphora) to line 1 (our world) |
| And(b) how we live makes a difference for tomorrow(a) | 4 (a)Collocation (b)Coordinating conjunction |
| The more we've got to realize | 5 |
| We've only got one paradise. | 6 Near synonym |
| Reduce, Reuse, Recycle | 7 |
| We throw it all away | 8 |
| It's time to make a change. | 9 Noun collocation |
| Reduce, Reuse, Recycle | 10 |
| If we want to keep our planet alive | 11 Near synonym |
| We've got to start... today. | 12 (a)Collocation (b)ellipsis |

## Rank scale

Although the campaign does not lend itself to be described as a conversation between two people, the tone suggested that the author of the message was talking to someone. As such, the rank scale was used to analyse the content of this campaign. The focus of our analysis on the scale was the act which is the lowest unit in the discourse. The first line of the campaign is an "informative act" and a "directive act".

"It's *our* **world** (informative act)

and if *you* love **it**…(elicitation act)

…Listen up there's something you need to know." (directive act)

The **informative act** wants the audience to be aware that "it's everyone's world" and not just a few people.

The "if you love it" is **an elicitation act**. It seeks to get a response from the recipient. Although this act is usually reserved for questions, it can also apply in this instance as the authors of the campaign are intent on getting the attention of their audience…as evident in the next sentence…which is a **directive act.**

"…Listen up there's something you need to know." It is requesting that the audience who „love their environment' take a specific action – in this instance "listen".

## Cohesion

Halliday and Hassan (1976 and cited in Onadeko and Dairo, 2008) state that it involves the use of cohesive devices to build a relationship between the items that make up or build a text or discourse. These items are held together as a unit and show connectedness which adds to the creation of shared meaning. There are two approaches according to Osisanwo (2008) and they include the use of grammatical devices and lexical devices.

## Lexical Devices

Lexical devices use the features of the words themselves to build and create that relationship. There are several cohesive devices and the transcribed campaign will be examined for their use and the noted ones highlighted. The entire campaign uses cohesive devices to hold the message together in several places. Re-iteration is the first device to be examined. It is the repetition of a lexical item or a near synonym in the context of reference and in this case – the environment. The discourse employs **Re-iteration** in the form of…

> **(a)** **Repetition** of the words… "**Reduce, Reuse, Recycle**" in lines 7 and 10. The words are used to create emphasis of the underlying message or ideology the authors of the campaign want their audience to take away from the advert.
> **(b)** **Near synonym:** The word "**world**" is used in line 1 and then "**paradise**" in line and "**planet**" in line 11 which all refer to the same thing – „the location where humanity resides'.

The campaign makes use of ©**Collocation** from the grammatical standpoint that is a (i) noun collocation in line 9 – "**make a change**". This is an attempt to spur the audience to act, to make a move contrary to what is ordinarily their habitual way of life and usually bad for the environment. There is also the lexical collocation –(ii) **reverse complementary** in lines 4 and 12:

"…and how we live makes a difference for **tomorrow**."
"We've got to start **today**!"
Today and tomorrow are *Complementaries.*

**(iii)** The advert also employs the **part/whole collocation** to establish two things – first that the world belongs to us all and secondly that the individuals have a role to play in it.

It's *our* **world(a)** and if *you* love **it (b)**
"**you**" is a part of the whole **"our".**

## Grammatical Devices

This focuses on how sentence elements are used to create connectedness throughout the campaign. In line 3 the campaign makes use of the first grammatical device – (a) **Reference.** This according to Osisanwo has to do with the retrieval of information to create meaning. There are two types, but this discourse employs the type that is

textual. The anaphora reference retrieves information from a preceding text to create meaning for the audience. It is simply stating that the world as audience know it is under threat of extinction if current habits or behavioural patterns continue as is.

**"This** is not going to last forever" - This makes a reference (anaphora) to the statement in line 1 (specifically our world).

(b) The advert also employs **substitution**.

This can be seen in lines in line 1.

"It's our **world** and if you love **it"**

The word "world" was substituted with "it".

( c) There is an element of **ellipsis.** This refers to the deletion of a word or phrase in a sentence but without losing the intended meaning.

"We've got to start **today**."

The question then becomes start what – the deleted/omitted phrase comes from line 10.

"…(to make a change)…"

…which if added to the words in line 12 give the fuller picture of what is intended.

"We've got to start (to make a change) **today**."

   (d) It also includes the **coordinating conjunction.**

   "It's our world **and** if you love it"

     The coordinating conjunction "and" builds a relationship between ownership of the world and the feelings of the individual for that world in the actions that need to be taken.  It is also employed in lines 4 to build on the statement in line 3 which is powerful enough to show the role or responsibility of individuals or the collective in determining the fate of our environment.

   line 3, "This is not going to last forever" (the warning!)

    line 4, "**And(b)** how we live makes a difference for tomorrow" (explaining that the content of this message determines the fortune of the world as stated in line 3).

**Coherence**

Osisanwo (2008) describes coherence in simple terms – the ability of a text to make sense to the audience whereas cohesion is focused on building relationship using lexical and grammatical devices to create meaning. This can be achieved either using sematic relations or cognitive processes (shared knowledge) of the terminology or information on environmental issues.

     The first device of coherence employed in the campaign is the **(a)Cause and effect approach.** Under this approach, the (i) **condition – consequence** is used. It is used not in the same sentence but in two sentences. The first sentence is the consequence while the second sentence is the condition for achieving that state of the environment.

"..If we want to keep our planet alive…" (**consequence**)

"we've got to start (*to make a change*) …today" (**condition).**

   **(ii)**The other device used is the **Means-Purpose** in line 4.

"And how we live **… (Means)**
…makes a difference for tomorrow**"… (purpose).**

  The campaign also makes use of **(b) Contiguity in time and space** – specifically **the chronological sequence.** "Reduce, Reuse, Recycle…", which occurs twice in the environmental campaign. First audiences are encouraged to reduce their waste, then reuse some of the waste – things like nylon bags, plastics and finally to recycle in other words convert some of the used items for new purposes – so a paint bucket can become a flower pot or what Nigerian business people do – use it to sell consumables. The admonishment which happens to be the core of this campaign states its case in a chronological manner.

**Intentionality**

From the number of cohesive and coherent devices used, the message for waste reduction is passed loud and clear especially with the re-iteration of the words "REDUCE, REUSE, RECYCLE" combined with the visuals of the campaign. The message"s audience is being passed a message "reduce waste" and being told how to go about it.

**Table 2: Campaign 2: OLAMIDE – STEM**

| Text | Line/Discourse Tool |
| --- | --- |
| Who do we blame for all the wrong we do to the environment? | 1 |
| Well I say we blame the **trash** collector for being a day late. | 2 Synonym/near synonym |
| So we throw our **dirt** in the gutter! | 3 Synonym/near synonym |
| I say we blame the rain for not carrying our **waste** away. | 4 Synonym/near synonym |
| I say we blame the gutter for not being too deep or too wide to swallow our dirt that we throw in every day. | 5 |
| I say we blame the **trees** for taking up space, so we cut **them** down and build our houses | 6 Substitution |
| I say we even just blame the **air** for just being **there**. | 7 Alliteration |
| Blame the trash collector, blame the gutter, blame the trees but not ourselves for not doing enough to take care of our environment. | 8 |
| Ki lon sele gangan? (What"s happening? or what exactly is going on here?) | 9 Noun collocation |

**Rank Scale**

This advert takes on the form of a conversation albeit a one sided one so the rank scale specifically the act was used to analyse the campaign message. The act is the lowest unit in the discourse. The first line of the campaign starts with an "**elicitation act**" basically a question demanding an answer – within each member of the audience.

"Who do we blame for all the wrong we do to the environment? – (**elicitation act**)

In asking this question, the author of this message wants members of society to reflect on the current state of the environment. The audience are also expected to ruminate on the habits or behaviours that have gotten the environment into its current state. The rest of the campaign shuttles between the **directive act** phrased with a tinge of sarcasm when the preceding sentence and the first sentence is evaluated in relation to it. For example, " …Well, I say we blame the trash collector for being a day late..." "so we throw our dirt in the gutter!"

The author takes this stance throughout the rest of the campaign as well in order to provoke the audience to constant thought on their role in what the environment is today.

**Cohesion: Lexical Devices**

This campaign employs **Re-iteration.**

(a)**Repetition** is well used throughout the campaign - the word "***blame***" is used on all the lines except line 3 and the phrase "***I say we blame the..***" in lines 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

(b)The next tool the author employs in the campaign is the **synonym, near synonym**. The authors use this to *emphasize the issue* in focus in this particular campaign – waste disposal.

Lines 2, 3 and 4 all describe the same issue but in different but similar ways.

"…we blame the **trash**…"

"…we throw our **dirt** in…"

"…for not carrying our **waste** away…"

**Grammatical devices**

This focuses on how sentence elements are used to create connectedness throughout the campaign. In line 6, the campaign makes use of the first grammatical device – (a) **substitution.** "I say we blame the **trees** for taking up space, so we cut **them** down and build our houses…"

"**Them**" is a substitute for "**trees**" in the next part of the sentence. This ascribes some form of importance (humanity) to the trees.

**Coherence**

(a)**Cause and effect approach.** Under this approach, the (i) **Reason – Result** is used.

"I say we blame the trash collector for being a day late…" (**reason...**)

"…so we throw our dirt in the gutter…" (**result**)

The author describes the reasons people give for the outcome - what they do.

(ii) **Means – Result**

The author also employs the means and result tool where the actions implemented by people to achieve their desires is put on display.

"…I say we blame the **trees** for taking up space, so we cut **them** down and build our houses…"

People create space by cutting down trees. They achieve their result – space by "cutting down trees" which is bad for the environment.

## Intentionality

From the type of cohesive and coherent devices used, the message for ***waste disposal*** echoes throughout the campaign such that the only reference it makes to tree cutting stands aloof in comparison to the rest of the message. The audience is being told that throwing dirt on the road is bad and whatever the state of our environment is presently, we are to blame.

## Discussion

The two campaigns depicted what Bilal (2012) and Osisanwo (2008) described as meaning coded into a conversation and as language used to convey meaning which in the instance of the two campaigns was the need for audiences to treat their environment right and for their own benefit. The first campaign particularly focused on three concepts – which resonate with the environment from which it originated - South Africa. The song 3Rs – reduce, reuse and recycle was written by Michael Bester, Colin Vincent and Andrew Baird of Orangutang music, who have had foreign influences from countries such as the United States and United Kingdom, places where these ideas are the norm. They are terminologies that have been used in the West and become a norm and it can be inferred that there was a mixture of norms and values with that of the song writers. South Africa is also a mixture of foreigners and Africans.

The Nigerian environmental campaign on the other hand focused on an attitude cum action that is possibly quite common within the Nigerian society and that is the levelling of blames on someone or something. The combination of bad governance over the years, and the high level of criticism of successive governments based on performance, paints the picture that the society has gotten quite apt at deciding where the responsibility for protecting the environment should rest – with everybody else. It can therefore be inferred that this accounted for the recurrence of the word „blame' through most of the campaign.

Additionally, each of these campaigns were lucid, logical and consistent in the build-up of their respective arguments. As Kenzhekanova (2015) posits, discourse whether in conversation or text format should be coherent and make sense to the audience the campaign is focused on. In his explanation of discourse, he stated that completeness, coherence and clarity are important features of language in use. The

conversation for the first campaign showed completeness as it manages to successfully communicate the thematic direction it wants audiences to pursue – environmental responsibility through the reduction of waste generated, possible reuse of items or their packaging and finally recycling of some of the materials at the end of their use cycle and this would include plastic bottles, nylons, waste paper etc. It was extremely clear that the main idea the authors of the song wanted audiences to extract from the message were three action words – reduce (waste), reuse (as many items such as nylon, cardboard boxes etc) and recycle (items such as packs, containers etc).

The Nigerian campaign was coherent as well in that the central message was about how Nigerians blame everyone but themselves for the way their environment has turned out, the various forms of which the singer Olamide highlighted in his campaign. However, it lacked the completeness component in that after showing audiences what it was they did, it did not include in any form what the correct action should be – taking responsibility for all the problem areas identified.

In examining two further features of discourse identified by Bilal (2012) that is informativeness and intertextuality, there is a serious gap between the approach and performance of the two campaigns as well. The 3Rs campaign was informative, beyond the action points which it kept reiterating through the use of tools such as repetition, it also included information that pointed to the need for urgent action to be taken on the matter and why through repetition but phrased differently – first in the "this is not going to last forever" indicative of an expiry date if humanity continue on their current trajectory, and "how we live makes a difference for tomorrow" meaning today's actions determine what happens to the outcome for the environment tomorrow. It also included the sense of urgency in the phrases, "if we want to keep our planet alive" "we „ve got to start…Today". This represent additional information given to the audience beyond the actions required to save the environment and planet.

The Nigerian campaign on the other hand focused solely on all the things people refuse to take responsibility for with regards to the environment. There is no mention of the current consequences or future consequences if the blame game remains the order of the day.

Intertextuality, another feature of discourse also helped to highlight further gaps between the two campaigns. The 3Rs campaign makes inferences that the whole point of acting goes beyond the audience's immediate environment as is evident in their use of "our world", "planet" and "paradise". They infer that the environment goes beyond what is in the text using the above descriptive words. The Nigerian campaign in no way makes any references beyond that of the individual's immediate choices and thus did not show any connection to the larger world outside of the individual.

Discourse is an essential component of any conversation or text as averred by Norton (2005, p.87); he explains that in order to foster collaborations that cause audiences to see themselves as partners in protecting the environment, the message source must use language that is decluttered and easy to understand. The 3Rs

campaign was very uncluttered, and the message easy to understand. The language was so simple, even children could sing along. The Olamide campaign (the Nigerian campaign) on the other hand was more complicated, the audience would need to read the lyrics or listen repeatedly to get the core message because it was not straight forward. Moreover, it is not a campaign that is easy to memorize or sing along to. This could be because it came in a rap format and the language tools employed was very minimal.

Repetition was not a predominant feature of the Nigerian campaign as the only word that re-occurred throughout the conversation was the word „blame'. This would therefore be the main word that the readers or audiences take out of the Nigerian campaign as opposed to „reduce, reuse and recycle' which was a constant feature of the 3Rs campaign which also used the 3Rs to showcase the solutions they believed everyone should embrace and which would protect the planet. The use of „our' at the beginning of the 3Rs campaign already established that saving the environment should be a joint and collaborative project.

The main frames used in these campaigns were distinct in the 3Rs and Olamide Campaigns. While for the 3Rs, three concepts were used – reduce, reuse and recycle to represent a „positive attitude formation' frame, the Nigerian campaign used a „negative attitude of blame' to frame the campaign. Like Baran & Davis (2015) affirm, frames are important because audiences also evaluate messages through their own frames developed over their lifetimes from exposure to institutions and systems with their own cultural meaning and definitions to different concepts such as the environment. Therefore, the two frames were likely based on an understanding of their environment and highlighted the reality of the different environments they were developed in.

This aligns with Ardèvol-Abreu's comment that framing helps to emphasise specific aspects of reality they want people to focus on. It is therefore probable that the Nigerian campaign wanted audiences to have a mirror reflection of their attitude towards the environment, how they have refused to take responsibility for any of their actions.

The two campaigns employed discourse tools in framing their message. However, the 3Rs campaign employed more tools than the Olamide campaign thus alluding to an intentional crafting of the message and infusion of frames to achieve a desired purpose. The tools employed and used in the analysis of the two campaigns were the Rank scale – at the act level (the lowest of the scale), cohesion and coherence.

From the analysis, it is apparent that the foreign advert employed subtler but equally impactful discourse tools – lexical devices included repetition, near synonyms and collation while the grammatical devices included reference, substitution, ellipsis and co-ordinating conjunction to frame its message. The focus was on the act they wanted their audience to take-away – reduce the use of unrecyclable materials, when you do use them, reuse them where possible and when done, recycle their containers.

The Nigerian advert on the other hand, had a confrontational and slightly sarcastic approach to framing the message. There was not one main message that could be pulled out as the "action" required from the audience. Their lexical device tool was the use of repetition for the word blame and near synonym while for the grammatical devices, substitution was the only one used.

## Conclusion

As highlighted at the beginning of the paper, the environment has become a front-liner in global discourse specifically the climate change aspects with the increased rate of global warming and rising heat waves across the globe. This therefore calls for sustained efforts towards changing people's atti tude towards the environment.

The campaigns analysed in this study were the attempts and contribution of two organisations towards the global fight to preserve the environment. The campaigns analysed in this study speak to the probability that the message sources were intentional in their process or the messages hurriedly pulled together. The analysis and discussion indicate that the 3Rs campaign was more intentional in their use of language in their environmental campaign compared to the Nigerian campaign.

There is need for Nigerian message sources to be more deliberate in the selection of tools and the use of those same tools for designing environmental messages. Audiences need to have actionable change points from such campaigns.

It is also recommended that further research be conducted on audiences response to those two campaigns to identify further points of improvement for greater impact.

## References

Alexander, R. (2009). Framing discourse on the environment: a critical discourse approach (39 – 46). New York, USA: Routledge.

Ardèvol-Abreu, A. (2015). Framing theory in communication research in Spain: origins, development and current situation". *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*. 70, 423-450. http://www.revistalatinacs.org/070/paper/1053/23en.html DOI: 10.4185/RLCS-2015-1053en.

Baran, S. J. & Davis, D. K. (2015). *Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future (7ᵗʰ ed.)*. USA: Cengage Learning.

Barker, C. & Salasinksi, D. (2003). *Cultural studies and discourse analysis: A dialogue on language and identity*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Bilal, H. A. *et al* (2012). Critical discourse analysis of political TV talk shows of Pakistani media. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4 (3), doi:10.5296/ijl.v4i3.2263 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i3.2263

Crystal, D. (2011). *Introduction to language*. London, UK: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Hansen, A. & Cox, R. (2015). *The Routledge handbook of environment and communication (ed.)*. London, UK: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Kenzhekanova, K. K. (2015). Linguistic features of political discourse. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 6 (6),

McQuail, D. (2010). *McQuail's Mass communication theory*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Milstein, T., Pileggi, M. & Morgan E. L. (2017). *Environmental communication pedagogy and practice (ed.)*.  New York, USA: Routledge.

Norton, B. G. (2005). *Sustainability: a philosophy of adaptive ecosystem management.* Chicago, USA: The University of Chicago Press.

Osisanwo, W. (2008). *Introduction to discourse analysis and pragmatics*. Lagos, Nigeria: Femolus-Fetop Publishers.

The Nature Conservancy (2016). State of the environment 2016. USA.Retrieved from: https://thought-leadership-production.s3.amazonaws.com/2016/02/03/21/33/35/3fde99c0-2cd6-46bf-862f-1d7b9efdd6e9/SOTE_Interactive.pdf

Trappes-Lomax, H. (n.d). *Discourse analysis.* NY: Sage

Tanskanen, S. K. (2006). Collaborating towards coherence: Lexical cohesion in English discourse. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.

UNEP (May 19, 2016). Rate of environmental damage increasing across planet but still time to reverse worst impacts. Retrieved from: http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2016/05/rate-of-environmental-damage-increasing-across-planet-but-still-time-to-reverse-worst-impacts/

United Nations (2017). Climate change affects everyone. Retrieved from: http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/climatechange/

Woods, J. T. (2018). *Communication in our lives (8th Ed)*. USA: Cengage Learning.