

## **Framing in Pakistani and Indian Discourse at the United Nations General Assembly: A Political Discourse Analysis**

**Ammara Aman**

MPhil Scholar, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan

**Akifa Imtiaz**

Assistant Professor, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan

**Asma Kashif Shahzad**

Assistant Professor, COMSATS University, Islamabad, Vehari Campus, Pakistan

### **Abstract**

Frames as mental structures allow us to understand reality and sometimes to create what we take to be the truth. Framing refers to the construction of communication, its language, visuals, messengers and the way it indicates to the listener or spectators how to construct and categorize novel information. The present study examines the typology of frames in political discourse and especially it scrutinized how and why particular frames were used by the speakers in their discourse. For this purpose, four speeches delivered by Pakistani and Indian representatives at the United Nations General Assembly from two consecutive years, 2015 & 2016, have been selected and analyzed using the framework given by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000). The frames that were used in this study are based on the five frames identified by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000); the human-interest frame, the conflict frame, the economic consequences frame, the responsibility frame, and the morality frame. Frames were identified and coded concerning designed questions. The analysis showed that the most used frame was human interest frame while the morality frame was used the least of all. The conflict frame was also among the dominants in which certain issues were highlighted meanwhile a humane view was also presented for the eradication of the cause in harmony with the masses. The proposition of a framework based on generic framing theory and political discourse analysis exposed a dominant use of frames in political discourse.

**Keywords:** Frames, framing, perception building, United Nations, political discourse.

### **Introduction**

Framing is a dynamic and creative process of opinion development. Frames encompass the context within which all forms of interaction take place which includes all human perception, interpretation, and communication (Scheufele, 2006). Wendland (2010) suggested that frames are a cognitive schema that involves a set of interrelated signs that stimulates a strategy of perception and interpretation which the audience relies on to understand and respond to the world around them.

A frame can be called a system that interlinks various concepts and, according to Pan & Kosicki (2003), “for understanding one of the concepts the whole system needs to be understood first”. Similarly, Reese (2007) says that by introducing a single concept into frame family results in all the concepts becoming available for the receiver. D'Angelo & Kuypers (2010) have called frames a prototypes that makes conception of the world, and Reese, Gandy, & Grant (2003) state that the use of such frames is called framing. Frames can be further defined as, “one of the many well-thought-of packages of knowledge, beliefs, and patterns of custom that shape and let people make sense of their experiences” (Entman, 1993). Frames can play quite an important role in mind building (Gorp, 2007) and help to

analyse how people perceive, remember, and argue about their experiences.

### **Background to the study**

The United Nations General Assembly (henceforth, UNGA) provides a platform for the resolution of international conflicts and to form policies on various international issues. This platform provides the best opportunity to convey a State's position. The speeches held there by the Pakistani and Indian State Representatives (henceforth SR) provide an opportunity to study and analyse how these state representatives (SRs) highlight an issue and then project it not only in front of the international community, but also for the awareness of its own masses, by making use of the process of framing.

### **Research Statement**

The aim of the present study is to examine the usage of generic frames in the speeches delivered by Pakistani and Indian SRs at the UNGA sessions in 2015 and 2016. This research operates on the fundamental principle that framing enables the readers to better understand the elements incorporated within a text since the use of frames in the discourse or text helps one to generate a specific perception regarding an issue or it reforms their assessment about an issue.

### **Research Questions**

- What type of frames can be found in the speeches delivered by Pakistani and Indian state representatives (SRs) at the United Nations General Assembly Sessions 2015 and 2016?
- How and why these frames have been used by the Pakistani and Indian state representatives (SRs) at the United Nations General Assembly Sessions 2015 and 2016?

### **Significance of the Study**

For the present study to find out the comparative views of two rival states, India and Pakistan, speeches of SRs, of both, delivered at the platform of UNGA have been selected to get the first-hand information as their stance is synonymous with the State's stance. It is a contemporary study that highlights the issues of the Sub-continent as expressed by respective SRs at the UNGA. This research was primarily carried out to find out the usage of framing in political discourse that leads toward the projection of an issue in a particular way to develop an understanding of an issue in the minds of the audience (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007). The research mainly focuses on the exploration of the concept of framing through linguistically analyzing comparative views of two speakers representing two different states.

### **Literature Review**

Framing has been referred to as a “bridging concept” between society and cognition (Gamson et al., 1992). Framing theory clarifies the ways of embedment and the manifestation of frames into a text. The concept of framing suggests a way of description of the power of the communication of a text. Frame analysis highlights a precise way to swot up the effects over the human mind exerted by the communication of the knowledge from one person to the other. Frame analysis offers the study of the discipline of communication that might contribute to the recognition of something different. Frame analysis paves the way to synthesize the disparate use of key concepts. Frame analysis enables to visualize the invariable involvement of communication which with the use of frames results in the

formation of a coherent theory (Entman, 1993).

According to Matthes (2009), the phenomenon of framing serves well for recreating public debates in content analysis and has been applied in a high number of studies. Human beings are incapable of making sense of the world without sketching the configurations that are cognitively presented and accessible to them for understanding a certain phenomenon (Chong & Druckman, 2007). Thus, framing contributes to the development of a sense of any issue. The notion of identification of culturally available frames dates to Gamson and Modigliani (1987, 1994). Culturally available frames were used to be identified in the court proceedings and the process of documentation issued by actors. The criteria for determination of “Culturally available” frames met in an organization or advocacy network which used to sponsor respective frames (Gamson & Modigliani, 1987, p. 144).

### **Frames and Various Forms**

During the past decades, certain considerable studies have been done to identify the importance of frames (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000). De Vreese (2003) made a broad level distinction between “issue-specific” frames and “generic” frames. The more concrete frameworks that are recognized in debates on specific issues are categorized as “Issue-specific frame” (Entman, 1993, p. 53). Frames that are identified in relation to different subjects, in different cultural contexts and different times and which go beyond the thematic limitations can be categorized as “generic frames”(de Vreese, 2002). Entman (1993) ascribes the processes of frames production as selection and salience. In the process of selection of information, some of the information is been omitted while some information is kept with the other information. Salience refers to the special focus on a specific part of information during a speech delivery; it contributes to making a piece of information more prominent, consequential, or terrific to audiences.

Neuman et al. (1992) developed frames and identified them as ‘human impact’, ‘powerlessness’, ‘economics’, ‘moral values’, and ‘conflict’ as the most commonly used frames by the presenter and the audience. These types of generic frames were found in relation to certain issues which lead to the agreement that these frames are generally more appropriate than issue-specific frames. Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) preceded the research of Neuman et al. (1992) by focusing on the different frames considered in previous studies. They presented their theory regarding Generic framing in which they identified five Generic frames. The research was organized to analyse the impact different styles of news projection may pose on the minds of the audience that included the presentation of news via television in contrast to press media and between sensational and serious news.

### **Frames and Framing**

The phenomena of frame and framing have been used in various fields, including the field of Artificial Intelligence (Minsky 1975), semantics (Fillmore 1975, 1985), and classic studies in sociology (Goffmann 1967). There lie differences between the fields but the frame itself is considered to be a fraction of an existing knowledge, as stated by Semino, Demjén & Demmen (2016, p.3), “that (i) concerns a particular aspect of the world, (ii) generates expectations and inferences in communication and action, and (iii) tends to be associated with particular lexical and grammatical choices in language”. Frames are fractions of discourse; defining issues, endogenous to the political and social world, which includes political speeches, journalistic standards, and social movements.

Lopez & Llopis (2010) elucidate that the typical frame elements are organized regarding the corresponding marketing strategies and the public actors. Accordingly, the

Frame Elements are the themes are followed by the Framing Strategies which are the Interpretation techniques corresponding to the themes. The discourse is being deliberately organized or evaluated in correspondence with the said process by keeping the focus on a specific problem being discussed within the public debate. The frame organizers assimilate the Frame Element with the concept or a slogan to the selected problem and tend to justify its authentication through exemplification. Ardèvol-Abreu (2015) analyzed the repertoire between news and framing. Accordingly, the process of framing is being done within the mind of the journalist who writes the news report. The journalist rather builds the news which gets to the receivers end after passing through the process of decoding. The decoding process is essential as it contributes to creating the environment to understand the reality of the news being reported. Therefore, a news message is always processed through the process of framing which intensifies one aspect of reality at the expense of the other one.

### **Agenda Setting and Framing**

There is a strong parallel between the emphasis of an utterance on definite issues and the importance endorsed to such issues by the audiences, this process of amplifying an issue is called agenda setting (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Framing is one step ahead of the phenomena of agenda-setting as it concerns the assumption that how a characterized issue may cause an impact on the masses and how they comprehend it. The roots of framing can be found deep in the fields of Sociology and Psychology (Pan & Kosicki, 1993).

Kahneman and Tversky (1989) investigated the process of decision making and its influence on people's thought with different presentations of fundamentally indistinguishable decision-making state of affairs. They further analyzed the evaluations made by people of the several preferences offered to them. Goffman (1974) has worked on the sociological basics of framing. To identify various recurrent schemata used by citizens, Graber (1989) held experimental research based on in-depth interviews. Graber has mentioned four characteristics of schemata while elucidating information processing. The first characteristic of schemata is that it determines what information has been discerned, processed, and stocked up, secondly, schemata contribute to the organization and evaluation of new information that has to be fitted into already recognized perceptions, thirdly schemata ends up in the addition of extra information to complete the already existing information, and lastly, schemata help to cope with the information provided about certain scenarios (Graber, 1989). Meijs (2011) worked on the theory of generic framing. His study scrutinized how the Eurozone debt crisis was framed in political cartoons, his focus relied on the examination of the types of metaphorical scenario and the type of frames that were chosen in the political cartoons made at that time. The frames characterized in this study were based on the five frames acknowledged by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000); the conflict frame, the human-interest frame, the responsibility frame, the economic consequences frame and the morality frame.

### **Research Methodology**

The theory of Generic Framing given by Semetko and Valkenburg (2002) as a framework has been used to assess the use of various frames in the present study. Framing is the projection of an incident in such a way that may imply an effect on the audience, the effect might be positive or negative. Generic framing moves one step ahead; it crosses the boundaries of thematic limitations. Generic framing further has been divided into five types i.e. Conflict Frame, Human Interest Frame, Responsibility Frame, Morality Frame and Economic Consequences frame. The conflict between individuals, groups, institutions or countries is being emphasized in the conflict frame. The human-interest frame focuses on an individual's story and gives an emotional angle to the presentation of an affair, issue or

occasion and brings a human face on the front line. In the responsibility frame, the issue or crisis is presented in such a way that attributes responsibility for creating or resolving the issue to either the government or to an individual or group. The probable economic consequences of an event, problem or issue will have on an individual, group; institution; region or country is analysed and presented in the economic consequence frame. An event or issue is interpreted in the context of religious tenets or moral prescriptions in the morality frame.

The present study has been explicitly done under the qualitative paradigm. The tool for data collection used was *speech analyses*. For that purpose e-version of speeches delivered by Pakistani and Indian SRs at UNGA in its 70<sup>th</sup> and 71<sup>st</sup> sessions in the years 2016 and 2016 respectively, were selected. The purpose of the selection of speeches from two consecutive years was to draw a comparison of the usage of frames by two States on the same issues at different times.

### Data Coding and Analysis

The data in the present study has been analysed following van Dijk's (1997) Political Discourse Analysis. A method of coding was espoused to identify generic frames used in the discourse of Pakistani and Indian SRs. Phrases from the sample had been coded and labelled according to the frames such as Conflict Frame (CON), Responsibility Frame (RES), Human Interest Frame (HI), Economic Consequences Frame (ECO), and Morality Frame (MOR). The statements delivered by the speakers have been labelled as [1],[2],[3], and so on to specify the location of selected frames.

### Frames for Analysis

The identification of five frames was done in relation to nineteen developed questions following the mechanism structured by Semetko and Valkenburg (2002).

Frame	Questions	Coding
<i>Human Interest Frame</i>	Is there a human view, presented in the speech, on a specific issue?	(QHI1)
	Does the discourse possess personal characteristics relating to denouncement, sympathy or compassion?	(QHI2)
	Do the speaker's words present a human example or "human face" on any matter or setback?	(QHI3)
<i>Conflict Frame</i>	Does the discourse highlight any upcoming or existing issue?	(QCF1)

	Does the discourse present conflict between groups or states?	(QCF2)
	Does the discourse present different views on conflict/ disagreement?	(QCF3)
	Does the discourse present someone as suppressed or suppressor?	(QCF4)
	Do speakers or state representatives blame each other in their speech?	(QCF5)
<b><i>Responsibility Frame</i></b>	Does the discourse declare someone to be responsible for any issue?	(QRF1)
	Does the discourse demand an urgent need for the resolution of the issue, from the responsible?	(QRF2)
	Does the discourse suggest any possible solution to the issue?	(QRF3)
	Does the discourse declare someone responsible for an achievement?	(QRF4)
<b><i>Economic Consequences Frame</i></b>	Does the discourse recommend an agenda for economic development?	(QECF1)
	Does the discourse predict or discuss financial gain or loss?	(QECF2)
	Does the discourse predict economic consequences that would or won't be followed as a result?	(QECF3)

	Does the discourse project economic development or suppression?	(QECF4)
<i>Morality Frame</i>	Does the discourse include any moral message?	(QMF1)
	Does the discourse seek/demand/ask for the development of social conditions regarding the solution of deteriorated condition?	(QMF2)
	Does the discourse contain any reference to God, morality or some other religious ground?	(QMF3)

Table 4.1: Identification of Frames

### Data Coding

#### *Pakistani State Representative's (SR) Speech (71st UNGA in 2016)*

“ “Terrorism”, however, is now a “global phenomenon”, (QCF1) which “must be addressed” (QHI1) comprehensively and in all its forms, including “state terrorism” ” (QCF1). [16]

“ “The international community” (QRF3) must coordinate its efforts to accomplish this. These efforts should be taken “collectively and not unilaterally” (QRF3) by the passage of any “laws with extra-territorial application” (QRF3) “targeted against certain countries” ”(QCF5). [17]

“Over “three and a half decades” (QHI3) of “conflict and chaos in Afghanistan” has had grave security and “economic consequences for Pakistan” (QECF4). Almost three million Afghan refugees, to whom “we opened our homes and hearts” (QRF4), “remain in Pakistan”” (QHI3). [25]

“ “International law and the declarations of the United Nations on Self Determination” (QRF4), “give the Kashmiri people” (QMR1) the right to struggle for their freedom.” ” [35]

#### *Indian State Representative's (SR) Speech (71st UNGA in 2016)*

“ “We must “curb reckless consumption” (QRF3), and “adopt lifestyles in harmony with nature” (QMF2). Yoga, the storehouse of India's ancient wisdom, “epitomises a sustainable lifestyle”” (QHI1). [9]

“ “India has launched” (QRF4) an ambitious domestic “effort to transform our energy” (QECF3) mix to “achieve 40% energy” (QECF4) from non-fossil fuel sources by 2030. “International Solar Alliance” (QECF1) is intended to make efficient solar technology “available for all” (QHI3). [11]

“ On 21st September, the Prime Minister of Pakistan used this podium to make “baseless allegations” (QCF2) about human rights violations in my country. I can only say that “those accusing others” (QCF2) of human rights violations would do well to introspect and see what “egregious abuses they are perpetrating” (QCF5) in their own country, including in Balochistan. The “brutality against the Baloch” (QCF5) people represents the worst form of “State oppression” (QCF1). [18]

“The Prime Minister of Pakistan also said that India has placed pre-conditions for talks that are not acceptable to him. “What pre-conditions?” (QCF2) “Did we impose any pre-condition”? “We took the initiative to resolve issues”(QRF4) not based on conditions, but “on the basis of friendship” (QHU3)! “We have in fact attempted a paradigm of friendship” (QRF4) in the last two years which is without precedent.” [19]

#### ***Pakistani State Representative’s (SR) Speech (70th UNGA in 2015)***

“ “At the historic Summit over the weekend, we have collectively committed ourselves to achieve “17 Sustainable Development Goals” (QECF1), to “promote equitable and inclusive development” (QECF3) for all our peoples.” [13]

“We need a Security Council” that is more “democratic”, “representative”, “accountable” and “transparent” (QHI1). [20]

“Pakistan is the primary “victim of terrorism” (QCF1). We have “lost thousands of lives” (QCF1) including civilians and soldiers to “terrorist violence”.” (QCF1). [24]

“Our Operation, Zarb-e-Azb” (QRF4), is the “largest anti-terrorism campaign” (QRF4) against terrorists anywhere, involving over 180,000 of “our security forces” (QRF4). “It has made” (QRF4) substantial progress in cleansing our country of all terrorists and will conclude only when our objective has been accomplished.” [26]

“Muslims are “suffering across the world” (QCF1), “Palestinians and Kashmiris oppressed” (QCF1) by foreign occupation; “persecuted minorities”; and the “discrimination against Muslim” refugees fleeing persecution or war”.” [35]

#### ***Indian State Representative’s Speech (SR)(70th UNGA in 2015)***

“Since Independence” (QCF1), we have pursued the dream of eliminating ‘poverty’ (QCF1) from India. We have chosen the path of removing poverty by “empowering the poor” (QRF3). We have “placed priority on education and skill development”.” (QHI1). [11]

“Our attack on poverty today includes “expanded conventional schemes of development” (QRF3), but “we have also launched” (QRF4) a new era of inclusion and empowerment, turning distant dreams into immediate possibilities: new bank accounts for 180 million; direct transfer of benefits; “funds to the unbanked” (QECF3); “insurance within the reach of all” (QECF3); and, “pension for everyone's (QECF3) sunset years”.” [12]  
 “We are focusing on the basics: housing, power, water and sanitation for all - important “not just for welfare, but also human dignity” (QHI1). These are “goals with a definite date” (QHI1), not just a mirage of hope. Our development is intrinsically linked to “empowerment of women” (QMR2) and it begins with a massive programme on “educating the girl” (QMR2) child that has become every family's mission”.” [14]

Each coded phrase has been analysed with reference to the context of the discourse. After the analysis of each coded discourse, a comparison of the results of speeches of both speakers was drawn to find out the extent of each frame used by the speakers.

### Typology of Frames in the Speeches

In the below mentioned five sections, typology of frames in the speeches of the selected speakers, year-wise, will be discussed, as per five frames mentioned by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000); “the human-interest frame, the conflict frame, the responsibility frame, the economic consequences frame and the morality frame,” respectively.

#### 4.3.1 Typology of Frames-Pakistani Speeches

Year	Human Interest Frame	Conflict Frame	Responsibility Frame	Economic consequences Frame	Morality Frame
2016	73	54	67	6	4
2015	52	49	32	3	0
Total Frames	125	103	99	9	4

Table 4.2: Typology of Frames-Pakistan Speeches

In the first speech, at UNGA 71st in 2016, HI was used the most. The most repetitive comments, among both speeches, were regarding the establishment of 'peace' and for that matter suggestions for 'dialogue' were given. In the two speeches, the use of this frame was mostly done to present a human picture of Pakistan in response to world tensions. In both speeches phrases like 'we welcome', 'we persist', 'Pakistan will continue to support', 'Pakistan offers' occurred to share with the world strategies instigated by the country that goes in the best interest of people to get a peaceful resolution to all of the prevailing issues. The use of CON was done, in both of the speeches, to highlight the most threatening issues of the world like 'terrorism', 'insecurity', 'poverty' and 'deprivation'. He underscored these issues as common problems that seek the resolution to bring prosperity to the world. Apart from these issues, he stressed the solution of the “Kashmir dispute”. Throughout both speeches, words like 'Indian atrocities', 'violence', 'violation of human rights' in the territory were repeated to

bring on the front page 'Indian brutalities' in the region. He also mentioned the approximate figure that '100,000 unarmed civilians have died' to get emphasize the severity of the issue caused due to 'Indian illegal occupation' over 'Jammu and Kashmir'. In RES most of the attributes discussed somehow met with each other in the two speeches of the same speaker. The speaker emphasizes the role of Pakistan in 'peacekeeping'. He highlighted 'operation Zarb e Azab' along with achievements in both speeches. 'National action plan' was also highlighted while in the speech of 70th UNGA in 2015 the project of 'China Pakistan Economic Corridor' was also brought to light. Apart from the ongoing plans inside the country, he mentioned the 'efforts of Pakistan' in maintaining world order. He maintained that 'Pakistan has made strenuous efforts' and 'Pakistan is proud of his historic role' in the process. He also praised the role of agencies in their fight against terrorism by using words like 'our comprehensive strategy' and 'our security officers'. Under ECO, in the 2016's speech '2030 economic agenda' was highlighted and the 'robust economic growth' of the country was praised while in the other speech '17 sustainable development goals' were mentioned. Morality frame occurred, just, in the speech of the year 2016' to recommend and demand the suitable solution of Kashmir issue, from the authorities, on moral grounds, as a violation of human rights cannot be ignored.

### Typology of Frames-Indian Speeches

Year	Human Interest Frame	Conflict Frame	Responsibility Frame	Economic Consequences Frame	Morality Frame
2016	34	53	50	15	1
2015	27	4	16	12	4
Total Frames	61	57	66	27	5

Table 4.3 Typology of Frames-Indian Speeches

The speech of 2015, as compared to the latter one, carried quite general statements; neither any specific issue nor project was highlighted throughout nor was any particular institution, state or person credited or blamed for an accomplishment or adversity. The representative presented her views about the improvement of the human condition and regarded 'gender equality', 'protect women' and 'maintain peace across our boundaries' as the steps to be taken in the best interest of humanity. Indian SR also stressed “ensuring peaceful, sustainable and just world” and “placed priority on education and skill development”. Indian SR highlighted the issue of terrorism that was an overt “violation of human rights” as it “targets innocents” moreover it has no boundaries thus it “kills discriminately” and demanded we must investigate “who finance” them while SR stressed on “international partnership” to encounter problems world was suffering from. CON in the speech of 2016 occurred usually on the matter of extremism. She alleged that some countries “speak the language of terrorism” and nurture it. She directly blamed Pakistan for spreading “cross border terror” moreover as a response to the request of resolution of Kashmir issue by the Pakistani SR, she blatantly declared that “Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India”. On the other hand, Modi's speech was free of allegations and the frame was used the least of all. Speaker just

used the frame to highlight that today “world face unspeakable deprivation” moreover India has also been affected by “poverty” “since independence”. The FM, in her speech, praised, under RES, the performance of her government for the development of the country, she informed that 'India has launched' some projects in this run. She highlighted a few of them like “Swachh Bharat Mission”, “The Beti Bachao Beti Parhao” scheme, “The Make in India Brand” initiated by the government that eventually would end up in the progress of the country. SR appreciated the role of the country in the world's progress and maintained that it “depends on the success achieved in India”. In response to the Pakistani Prime Minister's charge of India being responsible for the delay in the dialogue process she credited her country and Prime Minister, by putting in front of the audience, for the initiatives taken by them like “extending an invitation to oath-taking ceremony” and that “PM Modi travelled from Kabul to Lahore”, “we shared Eid greetings” rather “we took initiatives to resolve issues”. But in both speeches speakers met at the same point that “we must reform United Nations” and they presented in almost similar words the solution to the issues faced by the world that “we should forge a global public partnership” that is we must “join hands together” at the “principle of common but differentiated responsibility”. Under ECO, FM, mentioned that “250 million bank accounts have been opened”. She also highlighted some other projects like “the skill India initiative” and “Jan Dhan Yojanaa” that would help in public empowerment hence strengthening the country's economy that eventually would end up in the world's “economic development”. Modi, rather, in his speech generally mentioned that they have worked in the personal sector for “individual enterprise”, “micro enterprise” and “micro finance” etc. MOR was used the least, in all of the four speeches, among all the frames. FM just used the frame to suggest the masses to “adopt a lifestyle in harmony with nature” to get a pleasant environment to live in while Modi used the frame to present his view regarding the worth of “empowerment of women” and “educating the girl” in the development of a suitable and “prosperous society”. He stressed the development and persisted that the “developed world will fulfil its financing commitments”.

### Comparison of Pakistani and Indian Speeches

Underneath discussed is the comparison of the speeches of two different SRs; Pakistani and Indian. The evaluation is separately drawn under each frame. The below-mentioned table gives the total number of frames used in Pakistani and Indian speeches in 2016.

Speakers of the year 2016	Human Interest Frame	Conflict Frame	Responsibility Frame	Economic Consequences Frame	Morality Frame
Pakistani Prime Minister NS	73	54	67	6	4
Indian Foreign Minister SS	34	53	50	15	1
Total Frames	107	107	117	21	5

Table 4.4 Typology of Frames-Pakistani & Indian Speeches 2016

A comparative analysis of both speeches delivered in 2015 by Indian and Pakistani speakers has been done under this section. The comparison has been done to an obvious representation of the argument of two dissimilar presenters on the same issues. The following table is composed of the number of frames used by the two speakers in their speech.

Speakers of the year 2015	Human Interest Frame	Conflict Frame	Responsibility Frame	Economic Consequences Frame	Morality Frame
Pakistani Prime Minister NS	52	49	32	3	0
Indian Prime Minister NM	27	4	16	12	4
Total	79	53	48	15	4

Table 4.5 Typology of Frames-Pakistani & Indian Speech 2015

### Results and Discussion

The content analysis of the frames has proved that a total of 557 frames were used in the selected four speeches of Pakistani and Indian SRs. The division of the total number of Frames used is presented in table 4.5.

Frames	Human Interest Frame	Conflict Frame	Responsibility Frame	Economic Consequences Frame	Morality Frame
Total	186 [P: 125] [I: 61]	160 [P: 103] [I:57]	165 [P: 99] [I: 66]	36 [P: 9] [I:27]	9 [P: 4] [I:5]

Table 4.6 Typology of Frames-Pakistani & Indian Speeches

The content analysis of speeches has proved that HI, throughout, was used 186 times. Speakers had used the frame to express their feelings and to present their remarks on positive episodes or incidents experienced by the world. Apart from these, the use of frame was mostly done for the sake of showing harmony with the victims and to demand the establishment of a peaceful society where people could have access to two fundamental rights: the right to live and the right to freedom. Speakers using the particular frame either had shown contention over the situation or had recommended for the initiatives to be taken, in sympathy with sufferers, where the condition seemed to be worse. A good number of this particular frame was used to stipulate the authorities or the addressees to go for peaceful negotiations for the sake of resolution of all the existing conflicts rather than to opt for a military solution that would provide no benefit to humanity would result in deterioration of

the situation. It is interesting to note that the Pakistani SR used the HI frame 125 times as opposed to the Indian SR who used it only 61 times. This clarifies Pakistan's anti-war stance.

Results from the analysis of the speeches have declared the existence of the CON 150 times. The frame was used to highlight any prevailing or upcoming issue that may leave serious effects. Speakers had mostly mentioned the issues of terrorism and poverty as the most threatening ones. Apart from these two major concerns the main problem discussed by the two speakers: Pakistani PM and Indian FM, was the 'Jammu and Kashmir' issue that is a major bone of contention between the two states. Mostly the frame was used to blame the counterpart, an institution or a state for being a cause of an issue. The two speakers while discussing the 'Kashmir issue' blamed each other for the atrocities being held in their region on innocents. The former blamed the latter for scoring the worst form of brutality in the Indian Occupied Kashmir. On the other hand, PM Modi used the frame for the least and, he used, just to mention general issues most of the countries were facing at the time but he refrained from touching the issue of Kashmir with a mere strategy to not to put the subject in front of the institution where already the case has been under consideration. Hence, Pakistan used the CON frame 103 times and the purpose was to highlight the Kashmir issue.

Out of four speeches, RES appeared 165 times. The frame was mostly used to give credit to a person or an institution for showing progress in any project while it was also used to declare someone accountable for an issue. The speakers, using the frame, put light on the ventures they launched in their countries for the sake of the betterment of the masses. PM Sharif in both speeches highlighted strategies is taken by the government, in his country, along with the forces to eradicate extremism and violence from the world and to build up peaceful earth. He pointed out 'Operation Zarb e Azab' and 'National Action plan' and endorsed his 'government, security forces and soldiers' for getting the designed targets. On the other hand, Indian speakers highlighted some of the projects commenced in the country for the empowerment of the common man. FM also mentioned some of the steps taken by the country in the advancement to a friendly neighbourhood. A negotiated peace was considered to be the best solution to the existing matters from both parties.

The ECO repeated 36 times in the selected speeches. The central use of the frame was done to discuss an agenda that may economically benefit the country. The frame was used by the speakers to predict a financial loss or gain a country would have as a result of the economic programs they had introduced to their country. Speakers by mentioning their economical projects, using the platform of the United Nations, under this frame had tried to place in front of the world their country's economic progress. PM Sharif discussed the '2030 economic agenda' and '17 sustainable development goals' that would provide benefit at the world level. The frame was also used to praise the economic growth of the country, he used words like 'robust growth' and 'economy has reached a plateau' to define the progress of the country in the economic branch. Indian FM also highlighted certain agendas and admired them with words like 'financial inclusion programme' and maintained that such programs would end up 'to enable youth to reap the demographic divide'. Modi also highlighted in his speech that the government has sponsored 'funds to the poor and pensions to retired ones'.

MOR was used the least among all the frames as it occurred only for 09 times throughout all the four speeches. The frame was used by the presenters to give their opinion or a suggestion for the resolution of any prevailing issue on moral or religious grounds. All the speakers utilized the frame in congruence to humanity; they demanded the execution of the declared human rights and principles extended for the sake of human empowerment.

## **Conclusion**

The study has provided a clear overview of how a state perspective can be framed in political speech with the use of specific discourse. A clear picture was constructed by performing a content analysis that revealed what type of frames were used in political speech and which kind of discourse had been used. Just as Weaver (2007) highlighted that frames encompass the interpretive schematics of an event, the agenda of attribution of the precise subjects or objects, we can see, in the present study, what kind of agenda both the SRs are working on.

According to Pluwak (2011), three of the prominent dimensions of framing are the Socio-cultural aspect, the psychological mechanism and political marketing. Similarly, in the present study, we have explored how the issues and stances of the states were both framed and portrayed according to the expectations of their masses and in a fitting manner for a platform like UNGA. Just as Vicari (2010) claimed that frame analysis is a tool to bridge the linguistic features of text and the interpretative processes, in this study we have tried to make a point that no discourse is not framed. There always exists an underlying agenda in the mind of the speaker that s/he presents to the listeners after wrapping the words. Thus, the study contributes to underpinning a framework under which political discourse can be evaluated in relation to frames and to find out how framing can help raise political awareness about an issue.

One of the aims of present study is to bring forward the pedagogical implications of 'framing'. As almost all the discourses are framed; the speaker just not abruptly utters words rather s/he goes through the whole of the situation and after apposite brainstorming, they deliver their point of view after the selection of suitable words. Keeping this significance in mind, framing can be taught in the classrooms so that students could get an idea of how framing can be used to present an agenda and how one can identify it. Further research in this field can be pursued for comparing Pakistani and Indian point of views in print media such as newspapers or journals etc. Moreover, frames can be explored on various social media platforms at the same time as social media is among the most powerful sources being used to alter the minds of the masses.

## References

- (2015, 26). Full text of Indian Prime Minister Modi's speech at UNGA. Retrieved from <https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/full-text-of-pm-modis-speech-at-un-1223100>
- (2015, October 01). Full text of Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's speech at UN general assembly. Retrieved from <https://dnd.com.pk/full-text-of-nawaz-sharif-speech-at-unga/98447>
- (2016, September 22). Full text of Nawaz Sharif's speech at UN general assembly. Retrieved from <http://dunyanews.tv/en/Pakistan/354022-Full-text-of-Nawaz-Sharif%E2%80%99s-speech-at-UN-general> Amsterdam: Boom.
- Chatterjee, A. (2016, September 28). The complete text of Sushma Swaraj's speech at the UN. Retrieved from <http://www.ndtv.com/india-news/full-text-of-foreign-minister-sushma-swarajs-speech-at-un-general-assembly-1466709>
- Ardèvol-Abreu, A. (2015). Framing theory in communication research. Origins, development and current situation in Spain. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, (70).
- Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). A theory of framing and opinion formation in competitive elite environments. *Journal of communication*, 57(1), 99-118.
- D'Angelo, P., & Kuypers, J. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Communication series. Doing news framing analysis: Empirical and theoretical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- De Vreese, C. H., & Semetko, H. A. (2002). *Cynical and engaged: Strategic campaign*

- coverage, public opinion, and mobilization in a referendum. *Communication Research*, 29(6), 615-641.
- De Vreese, C. H. (2003). *Framing Europe: television news and European integration*. Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1975. 'An alternative to checklist theories of meaning,' in *Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley, pp. 123-31.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1985. 'Frames and the semantics of understanding,' *Quaderni di Semantica* 6/2: 222-53.
- Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1994). The changing culture of affirmative action. *Equal employment opportunity: labor market discrimination and public policy*, 3, 373-394.
- Gamson, W. A., Modigliani, A., Braungart, R. G., & Braungart, M. M. (1987). Research in political sociology. In *The changing culture of affirmative action*. (pp. 137-177). Greenwich: Jai Press.
- Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 1-37
- Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media images and the social construction of reality. *Annual review of sociology*, 18(1), 373-393.
- Graber, D. A. (1989). Content and meaning: What's it all about. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 33(2), 144-152.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goffman, E. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face-to-Face Behaviour*. Aldine Publishing Company.
- López, A. M. R., & Llopis, M. Á. O. (2010). Metaphorical pattern analysis in financial texts: Framing the crisis in positive or negative metaphorical terms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(12), 3300-3313.
- Matthes, J. (2009). What's in a frame? A content analysis of media framing studies in the world's leading communication journals, 1990-2005. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 86(2), 349-367.
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public opinion quarterly*, 36(2), 176-187.
- Meijis, E. (2011). A picture is worth a thousand words, framing the eurozone debt crisis: Metaphors in political cartoons. Tilburg University, Tilburg, Netherlands.
- Minsky, M. 1975. 'A framework for representing knowledge,' in P. Winston (ed.): *Knowledge and Cognition*. Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 201-310
- Neuman, W. R., Neuman, R. W., Just, M. R., & Crigler, A. N. (1992). *Common knowledge: News and the construction of political meaning*. University of Chicago Press.
- Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. (2003). Framing as a strategic action in public deliberation. In S. Reese, O. Gandy, & A. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life* (pp. 35-65). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, 10, 55-76.
- Pluwak, A. (2011). The linguistic aspect of strategic framing in modern political campaigns. *Cognitive Studies/ Études cognitives*, (11), 307-319.
- Reese, S. D. (2007). The framing project: A bridging model for media research revisited. *Journal of communication*, 57(1), 148-154.
- Reese, S., Gandy, O., & Grant, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Framing public life*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Scheufele, D. A. & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1): 9-20
- Scheufele, B. (2006). Frames, schemata, and news reporting. *Communications*, 31(1), 65-83.
- Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication* 49(1):103-122.
- Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news. *Journal of communication*, 50(2), 93-109.
- Semino, E., Demjén, Z., & Demmen, J. (2016). An integrated approach to metaphor and framing in cognition, discourse, and practice, with an application to metaphors for cancer. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(5), 1-22.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1989). Rational choice and the framing of decisions. In *Multiple criteria decision making and risk analysis using microcomputers* (pp. 81-126). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.
- Van Gorp, B. (2007). The constructionist approach to framing: Bringing culture back in. *Journal of communication*, 57(1), 60-78.
- Vicari, S. (2010). Measuring collective action frames: A linguistic approach to frame analysis. *Poetics*, 38(5), 504-525.
- Weaver, D. H. (2007). Thoughts on agenda setting, framing, and priming. *Journal of communication*, 57(1), 142-147.
- Wendland, E. R. (2010). Framing the frames: A theoretical framework for the cognitive notion of "Frames of Reference.". *Journal of translation*, 6(1), 27-50.