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**Abstract.** This article presents a qualitative study of the Royal Dutch/Shell Group’s (further - Shell) corporate image building in relation to climate change and how this image is represented in the British financial press. The material of the study involves the official 2014 Shell’s annual report (further - AR) and online coverages of Shell’s climate change-related activities by the leading British financial newspapers, *The Economist* and *The Financial Times* (further – *The FT*). Shell’s image of climate change is investigated by means of identification of conceptual metaphors viewed through the lenses of the methodological apparatus of cognitive linguistics. Conceptual metaphors identified in the 2014 AR are subsequently juxtaposed with conceptual metaphors associated with Shell’s climate-change activities in *The Economist* and in *The FT*. The results reveal that Shell’s 2014 AR involves the following conceptual metaphors associated with climate change: ‘Climate Change as a Journey’, ‘Climate Change as a Battle’, ‘Shell as a Responsible Citizen’, ‘Shell as a Caring Corporation’, ‘Climate Change as Growth’, and ‘Climate Change as Money’. In contrast with these conceptual metaphors, *The Economist* represents Shell’s climate change activities in 2014 via ‘Shell as an Immoral Corporation’ and ‘Shell as a Sinner’. *The FT* frames Shell’s climate change agenda in 2014 by means of conceptual metaphors ‘Climate Change as Growth’, ‘Climate Change as a Journey’, and ‘Climate Change as Money’ respectively. The discrepancies between Shell’s self-image of climate change and its representations by *The Economist* and *The FT* are further presented and discussed in the article.
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**1. Introduction**

This article involves a qualitative analysis of Shell’s corporate image building in the domain of climate change. Shell’s corporate image building in relation to climate change is investigated from the vantage point of cognitive linguistics by means of conceptual metaphor analysis. Acknowledging previous literature (Livesey, 2001; Livesey & Kearins, 2002), this publication offers a novel research facet by focusing on Shell’s framing of its climate change discourse in the 2014 AR and on *The Economist’s* and *The FT’s* reporting about Shell’s climate change-related activities within the timeframe of 2014.

The present article is structured as follows: First, previous research involving conceptual metaphors in Shell’s climate change discourse will be outlined. Second, previous studies of press coverages of Shell’s environmental and climate change-related activities will be presented. Third, conceptual metaphors associated with climate change will be identified in Shell’s 2014 AR and subsequently juxtaposed with the to-be-identified conceptual metaphors associated with Shell’s environmental activities reported by *The Economist* and *The FT* respectively.

**1.1. Previous Research Involving Conceptual Metaphors in Shell’s Climate Change Discourse**

In this research, Shell’s climate change discourse is analysed through the apparatus of cognitive linguistics. The grounding of language in discourse and social interaction is central to cognitive linguistic paradigm (Lakoff, 2006). A socio-cognitive turn in discourse studies involves a contention that discourse is embedded in cognitive, social and cultural contexts, which are constructed from a certain perspective and by a particular set of practices (Hajer, 1995:44). Discursive contexts are theorised to be construed and framed by mental representations, for instance, conceptual metaphors (Eubanks, 2005; Kapranov, 2015).

Conceptual metaphor is regarded as a basic element in cognitive systems, being central to language in general and to the domains of semantics and pragmatics in particular (Lakoff, 1993:204). Conceptual metaphors involve correspondences between different and unrelated conceptual domains, where a cross-domain mapping is established between the source and the target domain. Lakoff (1993:184) posits that conceptual metaphors are ‘*characterized by a huge system of thousands of cross-domain mappings, and this system is made use of in novel metaphor*.’ Hence, conceptual metaphors involve multiple mappings from one domain onto another in a variety of discursive contexts, *inter alia* corporate discourse.

Shell’s corporate discourse involving climate change is deemed to be framed via conceptual metaphor ‘Shell as a Caring Corporation (Livesey, 2002). Shell’s image of a caring corporation presupposes ‘*showing that the company had values of head and heart*’ (Livesey, 2002:123) in the matters of environmental sustainability, social responsibility and climate change. Shell’s metaphoric self-image of a caring corporation is a part of the corporate strategy to maintain visibil­ity and responsibility of its public image. Analogous to other fossil fuels corporations, the public perception of Shell’s corporate image is a significant factor in defining the company’s identity. Shell frames its climate change discourse via ‘Shell as a Caring Corporation’ to address the public’s concern with Shell’s environmental practices (Livesey, 2002).

The concept of care can be understood as Shell’s self-reflexive and self-critical practices. Shell has factored in the negative public response to previously occurred environmental accidents and has introduced discursive practices associated with the concepts of care and sustainable development into its corporate discourse. Following the Brent Spar accident in 1995, Shell’s discourse addresses sustainable development in conjunction the issues of climate change, waste management, and renewable energy (Livesey, 2002). Subsequently, Shell adopts proactive climate strategies and declares commitment to climate change mitigation (Koteyko, 2012:25).

Shell’s corporate self-image framed as conceptual metaphor ‘Shell as a Caring Corporation’ is concurrent with Shell’s metaphoric self-portrayal as a caring citizen. As indicated by previous research (Livesey, 2002), conceptual metaphor ‘Shell as a Citizen’ is extensively employed in Shell’s discourse. Shell’s corporate citizenship is evident from the company’s agenda to address climate change as a socially responsible solution to environmental issues. Shell’s public image of a good climate-change-concerned citizen is facilitated and reinforced by metaphoric imagery of care, thus resulting in the construal of Shell as both a responsible and a caring citizen. Livesey (2002) indicates that the concepts of transparency and care are employed in Shell’s corporate discourse to frame Shell as a trustworthy, law-abiding citizen who is committed to sustainable developmentand is concerned with the issues of climate change.

**1.2.** **Previous Research Involving Conceptual Metaphors Associated with Shell’s Climate Change-Related Activities Reported by the British Press**

There is a substantial body of previous studies involving conceptual metaphors associated with Shell’s climate change-related and environmental activities in the British press (Bakir, 2006; Jensen, 2003; Koteyko, 2012). Previous research (Jensen, 2003) indicates that one of the conceptual metaphors associated with Shell’s environmental and climate change practices involves conceptual metaphor ‘Citizen as a Political Consumer’ construed by the British press. Conceptual metaphor ‘Citizen as a Political Consumer’ has eventuated in conjunction with the Brent Spar accident. In response to the accident, ordinary citizens in several European countries (the UK, the Netherlands, Denmark and Germany) have succeeded in forcing Shell to relinquish its plans to sink the Brent Spar oil platform in the North Atlantic by means of consumer boycott. Jensen (2003) suggests that the British press creates a discursive space where metaphor ‘Citizen as a Political Consumer’ construes an individual, a citizen who exerts changes upon Shell as a multinational corporation by means of his/her buying choices.

Seen as a public response to the Brent Spar incident, conceptual metaphor ‘Citizen as a Political Consumer’ is indicative of the role of the British press in raising the awareness of climate change (Carvalho, 2010).The British press discourse is assumed to construe the realities of environmental politics by framing them as polyphonic narratives which involve such actors as the government, the general public and research community. The British press reports about the issues of climate change in a publicly authorised voice (Carvalho, 2010:172) by means of referring to scientific research, political debates and ethical considerations (Dahl & Fløttum, 2014). It is inferred from previous research findings that the press as the authorised voice exerts an important influence over the public perception of climate change (Boykoff & Boykoff, 2007; Crist, 2007). Research suggests that the press informs the general public about scientific and political aspects of climate change by a variety of conceptual metaphors (Koteyko, 2012).

Previous literature suggests that Shell’s environmental agenda, inclusive of the issue of climate change, is construed by the press via conceptual metaphor ‘War’ (Jensen, 2003). Specifically, Shell’s plans to submerge the Brent Spar platform in the Atlantic are portrayed in a negative tone by the press as a threat to the environment and the consumers (Kruse, 2001). The portrayal is centred on conceptual metaphors ‘War’, ‘Dominance’ and ‘Shell as a Polluting Giant’ (Bakir, 2006). Jensen (2003:76) indicates that the press represents Shell as an environmental perpetrator who wages a war on the environment, whilst Greenpeace enjoys a positive coverage of the climate change problem-solver.

Greenpeace-affiliated press in the UK construes a metaphoric discursive space where Shell is presented as a dangerous and reckless giant polluting the environment (Bakir, 2006). The metaphoric mapping from domain Giant onto domain Corporation is enabled by means of evoking a biblical reference to Goliath. Quoting *The Economist*, Bakir (2006:684) indicates that this mapping is embedded ‘*in a series of ‘sight-bites’ with David-and-Goliath connotations, portraying the unevenness of the battle with the world’s then largest non-state oil company’*. Specifically, ‘*Greenpeace’s victory over Shell was widely depicted in the UK and German press as a modern-day victory of David over Goliath.*’ (Tsukas, 1999:516). Research is unanimous in the finding that the ability to win an argument against Shell in the Brent Spar incident rests with the construal of a metaphoric discursive space which is comprehensible to the press. This space is further conveyed by the press to the public to generate publicity both in the UK and in continental Europe (Bakir, 2006; Jensen, 2003).

It is observed that the British press frames Shell’s environmental and climate change-related activities by means of Biblical and protest imagery (O’Neill, 2013). However, current literature does not appear to provide a comprehensive account of how the leading British financial newspapers frame Shell’s environmental and climate change agenda. In particular, there are no comprehensive research data involving the coverage of Shell’s climate change-activities by *The Economist* and *The FT*, the leading financial newspapers in the UK. Furthermore, there are open questions involving, for instance, the juxtaposition of Shell’s framing of climate change with the British press discourse about Shell’s climate change-related activities. These and other pertinent questions are further addressed and examined in this article.

**3. Hypothesis and Specific Research Questions**

Based upon previous research (Livesey, 2002; Mirvis, 2000), it was assumed in the hypothesis that Shell’s framing of climate change in the 2014 AR would be characterised by conceptual metaphors ‘Shell as a Corporate Citizen’ and ‘Shell as a Caring Corporation’. Hence, the following specific research questions were formulated:

i) Would Shell’s 2014 AR involve conceptual metaphors ‘Shell as a Corporate Citizen’ and ‘Shell as a Caring Corporation’, respectively?

ii) Would *The Economist* and *The FT* frame Shell’s climate change discourse by conceptual metaphors ‘Shell as a Corporate Citizen’ and ‘Shell as a Caring Corporation’?

iii) Would *The Economist* and *The FT* frame Shell’s climate change-related activities in 2014 by similar or different conceptual metaphors?

**4. Materials**

Materials in the present study involved i) Shell’s 2014 AR available at [www.shell.com](http://www.shell.com) and ii) articles about Shell’s climate change-activities within the timeframe of 2014 in *The Economist* and *The FT* available online at [www.economist.com](http://www.economist.com) and [www.ft.com](http://www.ft.com). The choice of *The Economist* and *The FT* respectively was motived by the following considerations: First, both *The Economist* and *The FT* positioned themselves as global financial papers. Second, *The Economist* and *The FT* targeted similar readership comprised of business and financial leaders, government officials, as well as corporate executives. Third, *The Economist* and *FT* were associated with free market economy and deemed to be close to the international corporations. Fourth, the level of economics journalism in *The Economist* and *The FT* involved a register of socio-economic discourse that was specialised concurrently with being suited to non-specialist audience (Boykoff & Boykoff 2007; O’Neill, 2013).

**5. Methods**

The methodological framework in the study involved a cognitive linguistic view of conceptual metaphor as a cross-domain mapping (Lakoff, 2006). Conceptual metaphors in the present study were analysed according to research methodology described in Livesey & Kearins (2002) who employed a macro-perspective to identify the discursive fields where conceptual metaphors were drawn and explored (Livesey & Kearins, 2002:237). The corpus of online publications in *The Economist* and *The FT* was searched electronically for the key-words *climate change, Shell, Shell corporation, environment, The Kyoto Protocol*, *carbon capture, environmental pollution, fossil fuels corporation* and then manually checked and analysed in accordance with the above-mentioned methodology (Lakoff, 2006; Livesey & Kearins, 2002). Shell’s 2014 AR was searched electronically using the above-mentioned key-words.

**6. Results and Discussion**

Data analysis has yielded the results presented in Table 1. Table 1 involves conceptual metaphors associated with climate change identified in Shell’s 2014 AR and in the corpus of *The Economist* and *The FT*, respectively.

Table 1. Conceptual Metaphors Associated with Climate Change in the 2014 AR by Shell, The Economist and The FT

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Conceptual Metaphor** | **Shell** | **The Economist** | **The FT** |
| Climate Change as a Journey | YES | NO | YES |
| Climate Change as a Battle | YES | NO | NO |
| Shell as a Responsible Citizen | YES | NO | NO |
| Shell as a Caring Corporation | YES | NO | NO |
| Climate Change as Growth | YES | NO | YES |
| Climate Change as Money | YES | NO | YES |
| Shell as an Immoral Corporation | NO | YES | NO |
| Shell as a Sinner  | NO | YES | NO |

As evident from Table 1, Shell frames its climate change narrative via conceptual metaphors ‘Climate Change as a Journey’, ‘Climate Change as a Battle’, ‘Shell as a Responsible Citizen’, ‘Shell as a Caring Corporation’, ‘Climate Change as Growth’, and ‘Climate Change as Money’. The results of the data analysis indicate that neither *The Economist* nor *The FT* frame their narratives about Shell’s climate change activities via metaphors ‘Shell as a Corporate Citizen’ and ‘Shell as a Caring Corporation’. Moreover, the present data indicate that *The Economist* and *The FT* employ a different set of conceptual metaphors associated with Shell’s climate change-related activities. Specifically, *The Economist* frames them as conceptual metaphors ‘Shell as an Immoral Corporation’ and ‘Shell as a Sinner’. *The FT* represents Shell’s climate change-related activities in 2014 via conceptual metaphors ‘Climate Change as Growth’, ‘Climate Change as a Journey’, and ‘Climate Change as Money’.

* 1. **Shell as an Immoral Corporation and Shell as a Sinner**

It should be mentioned that the computer search for the key words mentioned in the methods section has yielded only one text by *The Economist* in the year of 2014 pertaining to Shell’s climate change activities. In the text, *The Economist* frames Shell as a multinational corporation with nofeelings and no morals via conceptual metaphor ‘Shell as an Immoral Corporation’ (*The Economist*, 17.10.2014), as evident from excerpt 1 below:

(1) If **Shell** comes to fear that drilling in artic waters will damage its brand and encourage other well-regarded companies to distance themselves from it, that may help dissuade it from further drilling. Worries about ‘stigmatisation’ belong in discussions of people with HIV, not in debates over corporations. **Oil majors do not have feelings and cannot be morally injured**. (17.10.2014)

This framing is in contrast with Shell’s self-image of responsibility and care. Furthermore, *The Economist* portrays Shell as a sinner, since it plans to drill in the Arctic, and frames the corporation via the metaphor ‘Shell as a Sinner’ (*The Economist*, 17.10.2014). *The Economist*, however, portrays all the users of fossil fuels as sinners, alongside with Shell:

(2)*…****we are all sinners****: In our driving, flying and phone-charging, in the buildings we work and in the homes we heat, we are all implicated in* ***the use of******fossil fuel***. (*The Economist*, 17.10.2014).

These findings support previous research (Bakir, 2005; Doulton & Brown, 2009; O’Neill, 2013; Tsukas,1999), which indicates that the British press seems to frame Shell by means of conceptual metaphor ‘Shell as a Polluting Giant’ and to embed it into the narrative of climate change as a catastrophe of biblical proportions which equals to the Apocalypse. Arguably, the framing of Shell via conceptual metaphor ‘Shell as a Sinner’ has religious implications, since *The Economist* simultaneously employs the themes of morality and sin in its report about Shell. In this regard, *The Economist* data are evocative of religious and biblical imagery of climate change reported by Koteyko (2012).

* 1. **Climate Change as a Journey, Climate Change as Growth, and Climate Change as Money**

Whilst *The Economist* depicts Shell by means of conceptual metaphors ‘Shell as an Immoral Corporation’ and ‘Shell as a Sinner’, *The FT* reflects Shell’s climate change agenda in 2014 by conceptual metaphors, which are identical to those identified in Shell’s 2014 AR, i.e. ‘Climate Change as Growth’, ‘Climate Change as a Journey’, and ‘Climate Change as Money’. Arguably, these metaphors construe positive representations of Shell by *The FT*. Shell’s positive, or at least neutral-positive image represented by *The FT* is further supported by the framing of Shell as a significant corporate player, for instance ‘*Large energy and industrial groups such as Shell and BP…*’ (25.09.2014). Moreover, *The FT* reports about Shell as a multinational corporation with a globally known reputation, which is embedded into people’s everyday routine: ‘*Large companies are all around us. We buy our mid-morning coffee from global brands such as Starbucks, use petrol from Exxon or Shell…* (*The FT*, 12.08.2014). *The FT* emphasises that Shell is a popular corporation with investors, e.g. ‘*Companies such as GlaxoSmithKline, Royal Dutch Shell and BP – whose shares are popular with retail investors*…’ (*The FT*, 12.09.2014).

The present data suggest that both The FT and Shell regard Shell’s climate change agenda as economic development and growth, with a concrete aim of climate change mitigation and profit generation. In particular, Shell indicates that climate change poses a significant problem and, consequently, corporate actions are to be undertaken to mitigate negative effects of climate change. The corporate actions take time to eventuate and are protracted in the time-space continuum, thus evoking conceptual metaphor ‘Climate Change as a Journey’, e.g.

(3) *Shell* ***plans to continue to invest in innovative technology, talented people and the development of new energy sources*** *that will be vital to meet rising long-term demand,* ***while limiting carbon emissions***. (Shell, 2015:6)

(4) Raizen, **Royal Dutch Shell’s** joint venture in Brazil, **plans to spend** close to 1bn on ‘second generation’ **ethanol plants over the next decade**, in one of the boldest investments yet in **biofuel production** from sugar cane waste. (*The FT*, 28.12.2014)

The ‘Journey’ metaphor is based upon the mental schema SOURCE (negative consequences of climate change) – PATH (corporate actions planned or taking place to mitigate climate change) – AIM (the reduction of greenhouse gasses emissions and the usage of traditional fossil fuels). In contrast with the ‘Journey’ metaphor, which is construed, predominantly, by planned corporate action in time and space, the metaphor ‘Climate Change as Growth’ is evocative of Shell’s climate change-related activities which have already taken place and have generated profit. *The FT* frames Shell and its climate change-related activities in 2014 by foregrounding the concept of growth and the associated conceptual metaphor ‘Climate Change as Growth’ construed in the identical manner to the analogous conceptual metaphor in the 2014 AR by Shell:

 (5) …the deal would lift SNC-Lavalin’s ability to compete for midstream and upstream greenfield projects in the oil and gas sector, particularly in the **fast-growing segments of liquefied natural gas, oil sands and shale gas**, where Kentz has a strong record. **Key clients** include ExxonMobil, Chevron and **Royal Dutch Shell**. (*The FT*, 23.06.2014)

(6) **Growth in energy demand** means that all sources of energy will be needed over the longer term. With hydrocarbons forecast to provide the bulk of the energy needed over coming decades, policymakers are focusing on regulations that balance energy demand with environmental concerns. The management of emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) will become increasingly important as concerns over **climate change** lead to tighter environmental regulation. (Shell, 2015:49)

In addition to the ‘Growth’ metaphor, the present data reveal that Shell frames its climate change-related discourse as ‘climate capitalism’ (Sapinski, 2015:1) by embedding the concept money into the narrative of negative consequences of climate change, as seen from Excerpt 7:

(7) *We already assess potential* ***costs associated with CO2 emissions*** *when evaluating projects. However, in future, governments may increasingly impose a price on CO2 emissions that relevant companies will have to incorporate in their investment plans and governments may also require companies to apply technical measures to reduce their CO2 emissions. This could* ***result in higher energy, product and project costs****.* (Shell, 2015:52)

Shell frames its climate change narrative in relation not only to the profit, but to the potential financial losses and additional expenses incurred from climate change. Shell emphasises that climate change may involve additional costs and frames this contention via the metaphor ‘Climate Change as Money’:

(8) *Rising* ***climate change concerns*** *could lead to additional regulatory measures that may result in project delays and* ***higher costs****. … Over time, we expect that a growing share of our CO2 emissions will be subject to regulation and result in* ***increasing our costs***. (Shell, 2015:12)

However, as follows from the 2014 AR, Shell regards the issue of climate change not only as a negative variable in its corporate planning and strategy. Another aspect of Shell’s climate change discourse framed via conceptual metaphor ‘Climate Change as Money’ involves a positive narrative of ‘climate capitalism’ manifested by a socially significant and morally positive image of the corporation which mitigates the negative consequences of climate change by creating ‘green’ profit-generating technologies and production facilities. The positive facet of ‘Climate Change as Money’ is evident from Excerpt 9, where Shell indicates the necessity of natural gas-based technologies in energy production, which in turn, create profit and are more environmentally friendly in comparison with traditional fossil fuels:

(9) ***Effective carbon-pricing systems*** *are needed. They can drive a shift from coal- to gas-fired power generation****, encourage greater energy efficiency******and create*** *the frameworks* ***for the widespread use of CCS***. (Shell, 2015:8)

Excerpt 9 is indicative of Shell’s strategy of framing climate change as a part of the company’s public relations campaign for environmentally-friendly and sustainable development. An important feature of Shell’s discourse involves sustainable development, which refers to ‘*a complex notion that seeks to reconcile the goals of economic development and ecological wellbeing*.’ (Livesey, 2002:315). Similarly to Shell, *The FT* frames Shell climate change-related activities as a profit making endeavor, as seen in Excerpt 10:

(10) For producers such as Raizen, the result of a 2010 tie-up between **Shell** and Brazil’s Cosan, it also promises to boost productivity, and, potentially, **profits**. (*The FT*, 28.12.2014)

**6.3. Climate Change as a Battle, Shell as a Responsible Citizen, and Shell as a Caring Corporation**

A Shell-specific framing of climate change is associated with the concepts of battle, citizenship and care, which have not been identified in the 2014 data in *The Economist* and *The FT*. In the 2014 AR, the metaphor ‘Climate Change as a Battle’ is foregrounded by placing it in the initial position of the report, in the section titled ‘*Strategic Report. The Chairman’s Message*’. In this opening section, Shell presents itself as a responsible and climate change-aware corporation which engages in climate change mitigation as a battle to be combatted:

(11) *All sectors of society must work together* ***to combat climate change*** *effectively…*.’ (Shell, 2015:6).

It should be observed that conceptual metaphor ‘Climate Change as a Battle’ feeds back into the metaphor ‘Shell as a Responsible Citizen’, with Shell framing the climate change narrative within the discursive space of corporate citizenship and corporate responsibility, as evident from the aforementioned quote ‘*All sectors of society must work together..*.’ (Shell, 2015:6). These findings are in concert with Livesey (2002) who indicates that corporate citizenship is a typical feature of Shell’s post-Brent Spar discourse involving the environment and climate change. In the 2014 AR, Shell frames its climate change narrative via conceptual metaphor ‘Shell as a Responsible Citizen’:

(12) *Our success in business depends on our ability to* ***meet a range of environmental and social challenges****. We must show we can operate safely and manage the effect* ***our activities*** *can have on* ***neighbouring communities and society*** *as a whole*. (Shell, 2015:52)

Shell’s corporate responsibility is manifested by foregrounding the notions of society and community, as well as by the concept of inclusion, expressed by recurring personal pronouns in the third person plural, for instance ‘*our success’*, ‘*our ability’*, ‘*our activities’*. These pronouns are micro-contextually related to the noun phrases ‘*neighbouring communities’* and ‘*society as a whole’* respectively to convey the idea of Shell as an integral part of the community it operates in.

Arguably, the idea of corporate citizenship is concurrent with Shell’s framing of its climate change activities via the ‘Care’ metaphor. Shell’s narrative of care is manifested by an excerpt in the 2014 AR which involves a concatenation of conceptual metaphors of care and growth as a result of Shell’s action to combat climate change. These actions enable Shell ‘*to* ***better share the benefits of our activities****, such as creating new jobs and contracts that* ***help develop local economies****.*’ (Shell, 2015:56). The concept of corporate care is not novel to Shell’s corporate discourse. Its frequent usage has been previously observed by Livesey (2002). The present data support Livesey’s (2001) contention involving Shell’s environment-related narrative framed by the metaphor of care.

**Conclusions**

This article involves a qualitative study of conceptual metaphors associated with climate change, which are identified in Shell’s 2014 AR and subsequently juxtaposed with conceptual metaphors associated with the Shell’s climate change-related activities reported by *The Economist* and *The FT*. The results of the qualitative analysis indicate that Shell frames its climate change-related activities in 2014 via conceptual metaphors ‘Climate Change as a Journey’, ‘Climate Change as a Battle’, ‘Shell as a Responsible Citizen’, ‘Shell as a Caring Corporation’, ‘Climate Change as Growth’, and ‘Climate Change as Money’. Contrasting with these conceptual metaphors, *The Economist* frames Shell’s climate change activities in 2014 via ‘Shell as an Immoral Corporation’ and ‘Shell as a Sinner’. They evoke biblical and religious imagery and de-emphasise concrete measures of climate change mitigation found in the 2014 AR. On the other hand, the moral framing is absent in *The FT’s* representations of Shell’s climate change activities in 2014. Specifically, *The FT* construes Shell’s climate change agenda in 2014 by means of conceptual metaphors ‘Climate Change as Growth’, ‘Climate Change as a Journey’, and ‘Climate Change as Money’ respectively. Judging from these findings, it can be concluded that *The FT*’s framing of Shell’s climate change activities in 2014 coincides with the corporate self-image represented by Shell itself in regards of the issue of climate change. The present findings indicate that whilst both *The Economist* and *The FT* acknowledge sharing similar corporate readership, their framing of Shell’s climate change related activities in 2014 are qualitatively different.
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