

Representation of the US Government in US Winter Storm Discourse: A Corpus-Based Ecocritical Analysis

Tariq Amin¹, Prof. Dr. Wasima Shahzad²

¹PhD Scholar, Department of English, Air University Islamabad.
Email address: tariq.ktk.733@gmail.com

²Professor, Department of English, Air University Islamabad.
Email address: wasima.shehzad@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study analyses the portrayal of the United States government in the US Winter Storm discourse produced about the winter storm that hit US in 2022. The study particularly focuses on how the diverse actions of the government and its institutions are represented through salience and erasure and how are the particular representations of the government beneficial, destructive, or otherwise for the ecology and the ecological systems. The study employs corpus linguistic approach to analyse the data. The data were collected from the news stories on the 2022 US winter storm. The news stories were combined into a corpus which was named as Corpus of US Winter storm Discourse. Using the corpus linguistics tool AntConc, a list of the keywords was generated. 3 keywords were selected out of the keyword list and their concordance lines were investigated in detail. Stibbe (2021) stories framework was used as the theoretical framework of the study. The study found that the news channels highlight the positive actions of the government, such as public advisories, resource mobilization, and emergency declarations, to position the government as a proactive crisis protector and manager. The news channels emphasise these actions by repeatedly referring to government actors, such as departments, officials, minister, and governor etc., enhancing their centrality and visibility in the discourse. On the contrary, the study also found that the failures and negligence of the government, such as inadequate preparedness and late emergency reactions, are totally erased from the discourse. These failures are linguistically minimized and represented as the general disaster consequences. Such a representation of the government strengthens a highly environmentally destructive narrative in which the government is protected from responsibility and accountability. It minimises the chances of improvement on the part of the government as the government is not criticised in the news discourse, which generally leads to thoughts on improvement. The study calls for the search for new stories and discourses that may promote environmentally beneficial thinking patterns and actions by the government and the general public.

Keywords: Winter storm, government, representation, positive, negative, environment

1. Introduction

Weather extremes have become more and more characteristic of the modern environmental and political reality, especially in the context of climate change and its growing effects on societies on the planet. It has been scientifically proven that climate change has increased the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, such as winter storms, floods, hurricanes, and heatwaves, and imposed unparalleled pressure on state institutions and governance structures (Banholzer et al., 2014). Governments become the focal actors of preparedness, response, communication, and recovery in these types of scenarios, and their activities and institutional presence are very noticeable in the public discourse during disasters. Consequently, the discourse of disaster has emerged as a pivotal point of analysis of the manner in which governmental power, accountability and legitimacy are discursively assembled and bargained.

In disaster situations, discourse about disasters is central to the creation and promotion of information about the situation, institutional effectiveness, and government responsibility. Past research has pointed out that crisis and emergency conditions are more likely to preempt official discourse, especially which comes out of governmental entities that are often established as authoritative authorities in terms of information and direction (Coombs, 2011; Heath, 2011). Disaster discourse by the government often focuses on coordination, control, and reassurance, and creates a story of competence and leadership that may sway people and their trust. Simultaneously, the discourse of disaster is not only an account of what happened; it represents the social actors and institutions in a selective manner, using evaluative language, as well as in a patterned way of inclusion and exclusion (Cox, 2012; Cox & Depoe, 2015).

Environmental communication and disaster research have indicated that the general ideological and political environments influence the ways in which institutional actors are represented. In contrast, the discursive focus on structural weaknesses, slowness in response and policy failures may be relatively less pronounced when compared to governments portrayed as protectors and crisis managers (Gough & Shackley, 2001; Norton & Grecu, 2015). These tendencies of representation are especially acute in the case of environmental crises, where the allocation of responsibility between natural forces and human systems of governance may be ambiguous. Ecocritically, such representations are important since they define the way human-environment relations are interpreted, which tends to favour institutional power at the expense of environmental responsibility and failure of governance (Cox, 2012).

Although the research on disaster discourse has been increasing, most of the existing literature has been on the functional elements of discourse, including crisis communication strategies, risk communication models, and the role of digital platforms in emergencies (Houston et al., 2015; Panagiotopoulos et al., 2016; Veil et al., 2008).

Although these studies are very useful in understanding how information flows in the event of disaster, they are inclined to place more emphasis on communicative effectiveness rather than critical analysis of representation. This means that there is still little empirical research that directly examines the representation of governments in disaster discourse, especially using massive textual evidences. Additionally, most of the studies, which touch upon the issue of representation, tend to look at media practise or public reaction, not the discursive work of government institutions as social actors in disaster discourse.

Moreover, there are still limited corpus-based approaches to disaster discourse that are applied to ecocritical analysis of government representation. Corpus linguistics provides effective methodological approaches to recognising recurrent patterns, lexical preferences, and representational predispositions in large volumes of data, which allows researchers to go beyond the anecdotal observation to systematic and reproducible analysis (Gandomi & Haider, 2015). Coupled with the ecocritical views, corpus-based analysis enables a subtle study of linguistic construction and normalisation of institutional power, responsibility, and environmental relations in the context of disaster. Nevertheless, very little research has been done to implement this mixed method to the process of government representation in winter storm discourse, especially in the United States.

To fill this gap, the present study analyses how government and its institutions are represented in the discourse on US Winter Storms using a corpus-based ecocritical approach. This paper explores the way in which governmental activities and the role of the institutions are pre-emptively represented in a corpus of news stories about the winter storms, the way in which the authority and competence are discursively produced, and how some elements of governance are back grounded or omitted. Instead of considering the communication strategies or media performance, the study concentrates solely on the issue of representation, attempting to identify the prevailing discursive patterns according to which the government institutions are represented during environmental crises.

2. Literature Review

The current body of literature concerning disasters and environmental crises has always highlighted that extreme weather events are not only physical but also socially and discursively constructed. The studies of climate change and natural disasters have shown that the growing severity and frequency of extreme weather patterns has increased the saliency of governance frameworks and institutional reactions in the face of crises (Bindoff et al., 2013). In these contexts, the governments and their institutions usually take a centre stage in any public discourse because they are linked to preparedness, response, coordination as well as risk management. Disaster-related discourse therefore

often prefigure the presence of government and thus are an important place to analyse the representation of the government and its institutions.

Research on environmental discourse has emphasised that environmental crisis discourse is significant in forming the meaning, values, and perceptions of authority among the people. In their studies, Cox (2012) and Cox and Depoe (2015) contend that environmental discourse is not merely a way of passing information but is active in the construction of social realities by giving privilege to some actors, some narratives, and some interpretations. In this view, the representation of the government in the disaster discourse are not the reflections of the reality, but are disproportionately framed by means of selective emphasis, evaluative language, and discursive framing. These representations have the capacity of naturalising specific conceptualizations of institutional competence, responsibility, and legitimacy and excluding alternative conceptualizations.

Studies on crisis and emergency discourse also indicate that the governmental institutions are often portrayed as the authoritative and credible actors in the case of emergencies. Initial studies by Reynolds and Seeger (2005) and Veil et al. (2008) indicate that the crisis discourse tends to make government agencies the main providers of guidance and assurance. Correspondingly, Coombs (2011) and Heath (2011) observe that official voices are likely to be magnified in crisis situations, which strengthen institutional authority and expertise. Although the main subject of such studies is discourse processes, we also find that the implicit reference is made to representational patterns where governments are seen as managers, coordinators, and protectors in times of crisis.

Simultaneously, researchers have observed that the discourse of disasters can hide or minimise institutional constraints and failures. According to Gough and Shackley (2001), environmental and climate-related discourse tend to be respectable in their narratives to maintain institutional credibility especially where there is political sensitivity. This trend may lead to the depiction of control and responsibility and downplay structural weaknesses or shortcomings in policies. These trends are particularly applicable in case of a disaster, where the causality and responsibility can be debatable.

In spite of the fact that a growing body of research studies disasters as they relate to communication technologies and digital platforms, a significant part of it focuses more on functionality than on representation. The research on social media and disasters has been dedicated to information sharing, communication, and citizen involvement in the emergency (Houston et al., 2015; Takahashi et al., 2015). Although the studies do not ignore the role of governmental actors, they seldom involve themselves in a prolonged examination of the linguistic and discursive presence of governments in the disaster

discourse. Consequently, the issues of institutional representation, power formation, and omission have not been sufficiently addressed.

Content analysis and corpus-based approaches are the tools that can be utilised methodologically to fill this gap. Bardin (1996) and Wimmer and Dominick (1996) state that systematic textual analysis enables the researcher to identify patterns, predominant themes that might not be apparent by qualitative observation alone. Further improvement of data analytics and massive textual analysis allows the researchers to analyse the representation in large datasets, improving the analytical rigour and replicability (Gandomi & Haider, 2015). Applying corpus-based approaches to disaster discourse offers an empirical basis of investigating the ways government is recursively situated, assessed, and normalised in textual practises.

In spite of these methodological developments, a very few researchers have studied explicitly corpus based analysis with ecocritical approaches to analysing how government is represented in winter storm discourse, specifically in the US context. Ecocritical methods highlight the relations between language, political power, and environmental knowledge with an interest in the positioning of institutional actors in the human-environment relations (Cox, 2012). An ecocritical corpus-based approach provides a subtle perspective through which the discursive construction of government can be analysed in the context of extreme weather events by foregrounding representation, as opposed to either communication effectiveness or media practises.

3. Research Methodology

The study is based on qualitative approach. The data has been collected from two US news channels, namely FOX News and CNN. These two news channels have been selected based on their reach and watch by the audience. As we know that there are different programs and aspects of the news channels, the researchers have selected only news stories published by the news channels. Only those news stories have been selected that were about the US Snowstorm that hit US back in December 2022. One month data starting from the start of the disaster till 30 days has been collected.

The news stories collected have been combined into a corpus and named as Corpus of US Winter Storm Discourse (CUSWISD). The detail of the corpus are given as under.

Table 1.

Details of the Corpus of US Winter Storm Discourse (CUSWISD)

Natural	Country	News	Time Frame	Number of	Number of
---------	---------	------	------------	-----------	-----------

Disaster		Channel		News Stories	Words
Winter Storm	United States of America	FOX News	December 18, 2022 to January 12, 2022	85	23,361
		CNN	December 18, 2022 to January 12, 2022	102	114,186
			Total	187	137,547

The data have been analysed using the corpus linguistics tool, named AntConc. The data were uploaded to the software and a list of keywords was generated. After that, out of the total keyword list, only three keywords that were closely related to the government were selected. The keywords selected are *department*, *governor*, and *minister*. The selected keywords were then analysed in their contexts in the light of the objectives of the study and the theoretical framework of the study. Stibbe's (2021) stories framework was used as the theoretical framework of the study.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

This section presents the analysis of the representation of government in the discourse about 2022 US Winter Storms. It shows how the news channels have made the positive actions of the government salient and how they have erased the government from the negative actions. As discussed above, the data used in this analysis is a corpus of news reports on the 2022 US winter storm, which was named as Corpus of US Winter Storm Discourse. The theoretical framework applied to the analysis is the Stories Framework by Stibbe (2021). By analyzing concordance lines the study establishes patterns in terms of foregrounding government actions and backgrounding the failures of institutions. This two-sided process of salience and erasure is what influences the opinions of people about the governmental responsibility and efficiency in case of a severe weather. These themes are discussed in the subsections below with an insight into the hegemonic narratives that are made by the media. The following section presents the different ways through which the news channels have represented the government in their coverage of the winter storm that occurred in the United States back in 2022.

4.1 Salience of the Government through Positive Institutional Actions

The analysis shows that the news channels represent the government in the US Winter Storm discourse with the salience of positive institutional actions, which creates a largely negative narrative in the sense of Stibbe (2021). This salience is attained by the news channels through the repetitive foregrounding of the government agency in the measures of preparedness, emergency declaration, and safety of people. For instance:

- (1) *“The governor declared a state of emergency across the state on Thursday ahead of the holiday storm”;*
- (2) *“New York Gov. Kathy Hochul declared a state of emergency and issued a traffic ban on part of Interstate 90”.*

In both the examples above, the government is portrayed as the foresightful and directive, and material processes like *proclaimed* and *issued* are used to focus on the proactive intervention. With this kind of repetition, the discourse creates a positive narrative whereby the US government actions are linked to responsibility, control, and protection.

The salience of positive actions by the different institutions of the government is also supported by the representations of resource mobilisation and crisis management. This can be seen in the following examples from the CUSWISD:

- (3) *“We brought in mutual aid from other parts of the state... We’ve deployed individuals– the utility crews have come but also making sure that we have all the vehicles we need,” the governor told reporters;*
- (4) *“The governor deploys National Guard to Erie County as Buffalo faces ‘life-threatening’ conditions”.*

These instances show that the government is actively involved in different type of positive coordination and rescue activities. Such examples reinforce the representation of the government as a good crisis manager. Correspondingly, in addition to that, the departments are symbolised as custodians of common good in the form of official advisories, including:

- (5) *“Stay home. Do not travel. Most state highways... are now CLOSED,”* issued by the Minnesota Department of Transportation.

Together, these salient representations give rise to an advantageous institutional narrative in which government activity is preempted as protective and essential, other aspects of governance become less noticeable.

4.2 Erasure of the Government in Relation to Negative Actions

Together with the salience of positive institutional actions, the US Winter Storm discourse also indicates a systematic erasure of the role of the government in negative actions or outcomes. The work of this erasure is done by linguistic means of backgrounding governmental agency, especially where loss of life, disturbance, or damage is being reported by the selected news channels. Instead of outright blaming the

governmental institutions, the negative outcomes are often described as natural effects of extreme weather, which is equivalent to what Stibbe (2021) terms erasure in the discourse.

Such a trend can be seen with the coverage of storm related deaths and service failures. For example:

- (6) *“Two people died in separate incidents Friday night when emergency medical personnel could not get to their homes in time for medical emergencies, county officials said.”*

In this case, failure of the emergency services to react is referred to, but no governmental body is directly blamed. The grammatical structure is changed to the situation instead of the choice or readiness, and it practically withdraws the institutional accountability. Equally, there is another concordance line in the corpus which says:

- (7) *“At least two people have died as a result of the winter storm, Erie County officials announced Saturday morning.”*

In this example, the winter storm is held completely responsible and creates the event as a natural inevitable phenomenon and eliminates governmental intervention or lack thereof.

Erasure is also supported by the use of vague attribution and passive framing as in:

- (8) *“Emergency vehicles were unable to reach residents,”* reported in reference to fatalities in Erie County.

The lack of a clearly defined actor who is to clear the roads, provide access in case of an emergency, or maintain infrastructure is also part of a destructive discursive pattern (Stibbe, 2021), where the systemic governmental problems are hidden. Taken together, these instances demonstrate how the negative consequences are disconnected linguistically in governmental institutions, and hence a more positive image of the government is still preserved where failures and other weaknesses are relegated to the periphery. The erasure of the government in negative actions and processes and construction of such a positive image of the government may invoke negative attitude among the public and the government as they would stay satisfied and would not take measures to avoid future extreme events.

4.3 Erasure of Government Failures

Although the negative impacts of the 2022 US winter storm are often mentioned, the discourse shows a direct erasure of the governmental failures through the lack of direct pointing out the institutional failures. Rather than attributing the deficiencies of governance, like the absence of preparedness, the lateness of response, or the unsufficiency of infrastructures, the discourse puts consequences on the foreground and causality on the background. Instead of attributing the blame to the government for its negligence, the discourse valorise and appreciate the government for its later activities. This tendency is consistent with Stibbe (2021) concept of erasure, in which negative details of a narrative are systematically concealed, and the prevailing positive images of influential players are not lost.

This deletion is especially noticeable in the news of deaths associated with service failure. For example:

- (9) *“Two people died in separate incidents Friday night when emergency medical personnel could not get to their homes in time for medical emergencies, county officials said.”*

The failure of emergency access is explicitly mentioned, but the sentence does not name any party to blame, thus making the outcome circumstantial but not systemic. Equally, on the other concordance line, it is stated:

- (10) *“County officials have confirmed three storm-related deaths so far. Two people died in separate incidents Friday night when emergency medical personnel could not get to their homes in time.”*

In this case, the lack of institutional accountability is reinforced through the repetition of the same structure, making the service failure a normalised element of extreme weather.

The government failure is also erased where in descriptions of large scale disruption, there is no attribution of responsibility. This can be seen in:

- (3) *“A ‘couple hundred’ people are probably still trapped in their vehicles in Erie County, officials told CNN.”*

Not even a mention of road management, emergency planning, or delayed intervention is made despite the severity of the situation. It is concentrated on the state of being trapped and not on the reasons why such conditions existed. In this way, the

discourse creates a destructive narrative (Stibbe, 2021) where institutional failures are made invisible, removing chances to critically analyse the issue of governance and accountability in the time of environmental crisis.

4.4 Representation of Government as a Saviour and Protector

The government is recurrently portrayed as a saviour and protector in the discourse of the US Winter Storm, especially via stories that preempt rescue, care and protection of the vulnerable communities. This pattern of representation is congruent with what Stibbe (2021) refers to as a destructive storey, where institutional actors are being built as moral and protective powers that act in the interest of the public. This is done linguistically by material processes that focus on rescue, assistance, and protection.

Among the brightest illustrations of such a saviour representation is the protection of vulnerable populations, particularly the homeless. According to a CNN concordance line:

- (11) *“Officials are also launching the Code Blue initiative, which is designed to get homeless people off the streets when the temperature drops to dangerous levels.”*

In this case, the government is placed as proactively intervening to save lives, where the term is meant to move the homeless out of the streets to foreground care and humanitarian concern. It is all about protection and wider structural problems of vulnerability are out of the frame.

The saviour narrative is also supported by the images of emergency rescue and military support. This we see in the following example from the corpus:

- (12) *“The governor deploys National Guard to Erie County as Buffalo faces ‘life-threatening’ conditions.”*

The government is represented by the use of the National Guard as a strong saviour who acts decisively in the face of danger. The words life-threatening conditions enhance the magnitude of the crisis, hence increasing the salvific role of the state.

Protective government activity at the local level is also emphasised in the emergency response and law enforcement interventions. For instance:

- (13) *“Officials shut down Interstate 64 in both directions... due to multiple collisions.”*

Though this is framed as a restriction, the act discursively serves the purpose of protection with focus on preventing further harm. Taken together, these illustrations build a narrative of a powerful saviour-protector in which the government is portrayed as

protecting citizens against harm, which supports a morally positive institutional image. Instead of blaming the government, the discourse construct it to be a savior, which can have significant destructive implications for the government, as it may lead people believe that the government is not responsible for any damage and may, as a result, stop asking for improvement in the system.

4.5 Representation of Government as a Crisis Manager

In the US Winter Storm discourse, the government is also prominently represented as a crisis manager, emphasizing coordination, planning, and control over emergency situations. This representation foregrounds managerial competence and institutional order, contributing to a destructive story (Stibbe, 2021) in which the government appears capable of organizing large-scale responses to environmental crises. Linguistically, this is achieved through material and verbal processes that highlight planning, deployment, and continuous assessment.

This managerial representation is evident in references to strategic planning and inter-agency coordination. For example:

- (14) *“City officials are getting briefed twice daily from the National Weather Service and using that guidance to plan their strategy,”* as reported in a CNN concordance line. Here, the emphasis on *briefed*, *guidance*, and *plan their strategy* constructs government actors as informed and rational decision-makers, reinforcing an image of control amid uncertainty.

Crisis management is further highlighted through the mobilization and coordination of resources across jurisdictions. This is visible in the example:

- (15) *“We brought in mutual aid from other parts of the state... making sure that we have all the vehicles we need, the governor told reporters.”*

This example from CUSWISD foregrounds logistical organization and preparedness, presenting crisis response as a managed and systematic process rather than a reactive one. The language of coordination strengthens the perception of institutional efficiency.

Finally, the representation of ongoing assessment and adaptive management also contributes to this crisis-manager narrative. A concordance line notes:

- (16) *“Officials will continually assess conditions to determine when I-90 and I-29 can be reopened safely.”*

The phrase *continually assess* emphasizes vigilance and responsibility, portraying the government as actively monitoring and controlling the situation. Collectively, these

examples construct a discourse in which the government is framed as a competent crisis manager, reinforcing a beneficial institutional story that prioritizes order, coordination, and authority during the winter storm.

4.6 Institutional Visibility and Discursive Centrality of Government.

The government and its different institutions and their representative are constantly central to the discussion of the 2022 US Winter Storm, which supports their hegemonic status in crisis management. The discourse builds a core picture of the government as the key player in dealing with the storm and its consequences through repetitive mentions of governmental institutions like governors, officials, ministers, and departments. This centrality is supported by the linguistic techniques, especially the repetition of subject position and the delegation of authority to government institutions that is also associated with the idea of salience by Stibbe (2021).

For example:

(17) *"The governor declared a state of emergency across the state on Thursday ahead of the holiday storm."*

(18) *"New York Gov. Kathy Hochul deployed the National Guard to Erie County as Buffalo faces 'life-threatening' conditions."*

The examples above make the governor the focal point in crisis intervention and so they become the key player in the events that unfold in the storm. On the same note, other government agencies like transport departments are also portrayed as handling logistics and infrastructure:

(19) *"Officials will continually assess conditions to determine when I-90 and I-29 can be reopened safely."*

These representations create a core story of control and agency, in which government is portrayed as the main agent of action, power, and decision making in the crisis. This discursive centrality of government makes the vision of governmental authority as the key process of managing extreme weather a natural one, and forms the way people understand governmental roles and responsibilities during times of crisis.

4.7 Disaster Naturalisation by Government Discourses

The crisis is commonly presented in 2022 US Winter Storm discourse as a natural or unavoidable situation, which is a way of naturalizing the event and downplaying the importance of government in reducing its effects. This has been in line with the idea of

destructive stories by Stibbe (2021), in which the negative consequences of governance are framed in a way that indicates they are not within human reach, therefore, making it impossible to reflect critically on the governance or institutional accountability. The winter storm is not only portrayed as a weather phenomenon that is extreme, but also as an act of nature that invariably causes disruptions and systems are not held to accountability.

For example:

- (20) *“Two people died in separate incidents Friday night when emergency medical personnel could not get to their homes in time for medical emergencies, county officials said.”*

It is emphasised that the emergency services were not able to respond, which is presented as the circumstantial consequence of the storm, and not a governance or preparedness failure. Passive construction lacks the direct responsibility and instead the storm itself is the main cause of damage.

Equally, there are other vivid examples of the presentation of the disaster as a natural consequence of extreme weather:

- (21) *“At least two people have died as a result of the winter storm, Erie County officials announced Saturday morning.”*

In this example from the CUSWISD, the storm itself is seen as the only source of death, which diminishes the responsibility of any government in planning, response or mitigation.

Moreover, one of the local government representatives writes on this matter:

- (22) *“Officials will continually assess conditions to determine when I-90 and I-29 can be reopened safely.”*

Although this example conveys a continuing action, it implicitly describes the closing of the roads as inevitable because of the intensity of the storm, and not inability of preemptive measures or infrastructure.

These examples make the discourse naturalise the catastrophe by making the storm a power that cannot be controlled which removes the possibility of a critical examination of the government responses and strengthens the notion that such phenomena are chaotic in nature.

5. Conclusion

This research study has investigated how the US government has been represented in the discourse of 2022 US Winter Storm with the attention paid to the salience and erasure of government actions and failings. It has also analysed how the particular representation of the government is friendly, damaging, or otherwise for the nature and the environment. The research has revealed the main discursive patterns that create a mostly advantageous discourse on government institutions in crisis situations through the corpus-based analysis. The positive governmental efforts, including emergency proclamations, mobilisation of resources, and advisories to the people, make the government appear as an active crisis handler and saviour. These favourable images are supported by the discursive foregrounding of governmental actors, including governors, officials, and government departments. This salience positioning places the US government in the centre of the discourse as the main agent of the safety of people and crisis intervention.

Simultaneously, the study has also shown how the government failures and negative actions are systematically removed out of the discourse. Negative consequences, including delayed emergency response and unpreparedness are often presented as the unavoidable outcomes of severe weather conditions instead of failures in governance through the use of linguistic tools, including passivisation, nominalization, and vague attribution (Benson, Twigg, & Myers, 2001). Such erasure is consistent with the notion of destructive stories by Stibbe (2021), whereby the negative consequences are normalised and conveyed as inevitable. The discourse also contributes to the advantageous storyline by reducing the scope of responsibility, which prevents the possibility of thinking about governmental institutions as the causes of the crisis.

The results of the current research are consistent with the larger literature on disaster discourse and environmental governance that identifies the significance of discourse in defining how people conceptualise the role of authority and responsibility in crisis situations (Cox, 2012; Coombs, 2011). The hegemonic construction of the government that is seen in the study through the institutional visibility and centrality of government is where state institutions are discursively naturalised as the locus of power in periods of crisis (Cox & Depoe, 2015). This emergency governance is normalised, which highlights how the discourse of disaster constructs a sense of what people know about governmental authority and institutional authority, usually to the exclusion of other forms of resilience and agency in communities (Gough & Shackley, 2001).

The particular representation of the US government in the 2022 US winter storm discourse as mentioned above can be highly destructive for the environment, as instead of ascribing blame to the government for its negligence and systematic failures, the

discourse represents it to be a savior, guardian, and manager. Such as representation may lead the audience and the government to believe that the government is not responsible for the disaster, thereby minimizing the chances of criticism on the government by the public. This discourse, therefore, needs to be discouraged and shall not be promoted. We need to search for such discourse that encourage and foster the chances of improvement in the systems and environment.

References

- Banholzer, S., Kossin, J., & Donner, S. (2014). The impact of climate change on natural disasters. In S. Banholzer, J. Kossin, & S. Donner (Eds.). *Reducing disaster: Early warning systems for climate change* (pp. 21–49). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Bardin, L. (1996). *El análisis de contenido (Content analysis)* (T. C. Suárez). Madrid: Akal. (Original in English, 1980).
- Benson, C., Twigg, J., & Myers, M. (2001). NGO initiatives in risk reduction: An overview. *Disasters*, 25(3), 199–215. doi:10.1111/1467-7717.00172
- Coombs, W. T. (2011). Parameters for crisis communication. In W. T. Coombs & S. J. Holladay (Eds.), *The handbook of crisis communication* (pp. 17–53). United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cox, R. (2012). *Environmental communication and the public sphere* (3rd ed.). Washington D. C.: SAGE.
- Cox, R., & Depoe, S. (2015). Emergence and growth of the field of environmental communication. In A. Hansen & R. Cox (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of environment and communications* (pp. 13–25). New York: Routledge.
- Gandomi, A., & Haider, M. (2015). Beyond the hype: Big data concepts, methods, and analytics. *International Journal of Information Management*, 35(2), 137–144. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2014.10.007
- Gough, C., & Shackley, S. (2001). The respectable politics of climate change: the epistemic communities and NGOs. *International Affairs*, 77(2), 329–346. doi:10.1111/1468-2346.00195
- Heath, R. L. (2011). Crisis communication: Defining the beast and de-marginalizing key publics. In W. T. Coombs & S. J. Holladay (Eds.), *The handbook of crisis communication* (pp. 1–14). United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons.
- Houston, J. B., Hawthorne, J., Perreault, M. F., Park, E. H., Goldstein, M., Halliwell, M. R., ... Griffith, S. A. (2015). Social media and disasters: A functional framework for social media use in disaster planning, response, and research. *Disasters*, 39(1), 1–22. doi:10.1111/disa.12092

- Norton, T., & Grecu, N. (2015). Publics, communication campaigns, and persuasive communication. In A. Hansen, & R. Cox (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of environment and communications* (pp. 354–367). New York: Routledge.
- Panagiotopoulos, P., Barnett, J., Bigdeli, A. Z., & Sams, S. (2016). Social media in emergency management: Twitter as a tool for communicating risks to the public. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 111, 86–96. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2016.06.010
- Reynolds, B., & Seeger, M. W. (2005). Crisis and emergency risk communication as an integrative model. *Journal of Health Communication*, 10(1), 43–55. doi:10.1080/10810730590904571
- Stibbe, A. (2021). *Stories for change: Narratives and the role of discourse in sustainability communication*. Routledge.
- Takahashi, B., Tandoc, E. C., Jr., & Carmichael, C. (2015). Communicating on Twitter during a disaster: An analysis of tweets during Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 50, 392–398. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.04.020
- Veil, S. R., Reynolds, B., Sellnow, T. L., & Seeger, M. W. (2008). Crisis & Emergency Risk Communication as a theoretical framework for research and practice. *Health Promotion Practice*, 9(4), 26–34. doi:10.1177/1524839908322113
- Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (1996). *La investigación científica de los medios de comunicación: una introducción a sus métodos (Scientific Research in mass media: an introduction to its methods)*. Barcelona: Bosch.