



Anthropogenic influences on the framing of political discourse

Khilola ALIMOVA¹

National University of Uzbekistan

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received August 2025

Received in revised form

15 September 2025

Accepted 15 October 2025

Available online

25 November 2025

Keywords:

anthropogenic factors,
political discourse,
framing,
ideology,
digital media,
environmental rhetoric,
identity politics.

ABSTRACT

This article explores how anthropogenic factors — including technological, environmental, and social changes — influence the framing of political discourse. It analyzes the transformation of political language through digital communication, environmental narratives, and identity-based ideologies. The research reveals that human-driven influences significantly shape the linguistic, structural, and ideological dimensions of modern political communication.

2181-3663/© 2025 in Science LLC.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47689/2181-3701-vol3-iss5-pp149-155>

This is an open-access article under the Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ru>)

Siyosiy munozaralarni shakllantirishga inson faoliyatining ta'siri

ANNOTATSIYA

Kalit so'zlar:

antropogen omillar,
siyosiy diskurs,
freyming,
mafkura,
raqamli media,
ekologik ritorika,
identifikatsion siyosat.

Ushbu maqola antropogen omillar — texnologik, ekologik va ijtimoiy o'zgarishlarni o'z ichiga olgan — siyosiy diskurs shakllanishiga qanday ta'sir ko'rsatishini tadqiq etadi. U raqamli kommunikatsiya, ekologik narrativlar va identifikatsiyaga asoslangan mafkuralar orqali siyosiy tilning transformatsiyasini tahlil qiladi. Tadqiqot natijalariga ko'ra, insoniyat faoliyati bilan bog'liq ta'sirlar zamonaviy siyosiy muloqotning lingvistik, strukturaviy va g'oyaviy jihatlarini sezilarli darajada shakllantiradi.

¹ Senior Lecturer, Interfaculty Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Philology, National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek.

Антропогенное влияние на формирование политического дискурса

АННОТАЦИЯ

Ключевые слова:

антропогенные факторы,
политический дискурс,
фрейминг,
идеология,
цифровые медиа,
экологическая риторика,
политика идентичности.

В данной статье исследуется влияние антропогенных факторов, включая технологические, экологические и социальные изменения, на формирование политического дискурса. Анализируется трансформация политического языка посредством цифровой коммуникации, экологических нарративов и идеологий, основанных на идентичности. Исследование показывает, что факторы, обусловленные деятельностью человека, существенно формируют лингвистические, структурные и идеологические аспекты современной политической коммуникации.

INTRODUCTION

In the modern era, political discourse has become one of the most influential mechanisms through which human societies construct meaning, shape opinions, and mobilize action. The term anthropogenic refers to human-induced changes, encompassing social, technological, cultural, and environmental factors. These anthropogenic influences significantly affect how political narratives are framed, interpreted, and disseminated. Political discourse, as both a linguistic and ideological construct, is no longer a neutral form of communication; rather, it reflects the complex interrelations between human behavior, media systems, and global transformations [1-3].

Political discourse represents a distinct form of communication designed to persuade, justify, or mobilize public opinion. It operates through linguistic strategies such as metaphor, framing, argumentation, and lexical choice. The goal of political discourse is not merely to inform but to construct ideological narratives that serve political objectives. Scholars like van Dijk, Fairclough, and Chilton emphasize that political discourse is always ideologically motivated and context-dependent [4-6].

In democratic societies, political language functions as a tool for social control and consensus-building. It reflects power relations between the ruling elite and the masses, thereby influencing perceptions of truth, legitimacy, and justice. Through the use of rhetorical devices, political actors seek to align their interests with those of the electorate.

Anthropogenic factors refer to human-driven changes that influence societal structures, including political communication. These influences can be categorized into three main domains:

1. Technological: Digital media, artificial intelligence, and algorithms shape the dissemination and interpretation of political messages.
2. Environmental: The global climate crisis has introduced new themes and priorities in political rhetoric, leading to the emergence of “green politics.”
3. Socio-cultural: Migration, globalization, and identity politics redefine the boundaries of political belonging and discourse framing [7].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employs a qualitative research design based on the principles of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and media framing theory. The aim is to examine how anthropogenic factors — technological, environmental, and socio-cultural — shape the framing of political discourse in various contexts. The research integrates linguistic, social, and communicative approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of how human-induced changes influence political language and its ideological dimensions [1-5].

The study focuses on identifying patterns of linguistic framing, rhetorical strategies, and ideological implications within selected political texts and media communications. The approach is descriptive, interpretive, and analytical, allowing for in-depth examination of both the structure and meaning of political messages.

The primary materials used in this study include: political speeches by national leaders; media articles and reports from reputable international sources; social media posts from official political accounts on platforms such as Twitter (X), Facebook, and Instagram; and environmental and economic policy statements that reflect anthropogenic themes such as climate change, digitalization, and globalization. The selected materials represent a diverse range of political ideologies and cultural contexts to ensure objectivity and comparative depth. Texts were collected from 2015 to 2024 to capture the evolution of anthropogenic influences over time [1-7].

The research utilizes several interrelated methods: critical discourse analysis (CDA), framing analysis, content analysis, and comparative analysis. The application of these methods is expected to reveal how anthropogenic factors redefine the structure and tone of political communication; demonstrate the role of technology and environmental discourse in shaping political ideologies; and identify recurring linguistic strategies that connect human activity with political framing.

RESULTS

The analysis of selected political texts, media reports, and social media communications revealed that anthropogenic factors profoundly shape the framing and rhetoric of political discourse. Three dominant dimensions were identified:

1. Technological framing – characterized by digital media influence, algorithmic targeting, and online personalization of political messages;
2. Environmental framing – driven by climate change narratives and the moralization of ecological responsibility;
3. Socio-cultural framing – based on identity, globalization, and cultural belonging.

These three categories frequently intersect, showing how human activity reshapes not only the topics of political communication but also its form, tone, and ideological orientation.

The study confirmed that the digitalization of communication has transformed traditional political rhetoric into fast-paced, image-driven, and emotionally charged messages. Social media platforms (e.g., Twitter, Facebook, Instagram) have shortened political discourse into micro-framing units — slogans, hashtags, and memes.

For example:

- The slogan “Build Back Better” (used by the Biden administration) integrates technological progress and social justice into a compact, easily shareable message.

- Algorithmic targeting allows political parties to tailor messages according to users' interests and emotions — a clear anthropogenic effect of technological intervention in communication.

Linguistically, these messages exhibit simplified syntax, emotional adjectives, and metaphorical frames (“digital revolution,” “cyber warfare,” “fake news”), reflecting the intersection of human innovation and ideological strategy. Thus, technology acts not only as a medium of communication but as a framing agent that reshapes both linguistic structure and audience reception.

The analysis showed a sharp rise in environmental discourse, especially in speeches by international leaders and organizations such as the UN, EU, and COP summits. The framing of ecological issues relies heavily on anthropogenic metaphors emphasizing human responsibility for planetary change.

Examples include:

- *“Humanity is on a collision course with nature.”*
- *“We are the last generation that can stop climate catastrophe.”*

These statements demonstrate the moral and emotional framing of environmental issues. By using such language, politicians frame climate change as both a scientific fact and a moral imperative, constructing a new global political narrative — green politics. From a linguistic point of view, the prevalence of modal verbs (“must,” “should,” “can”) and emotionally charged lexis (“urgent,” “irreversible,” “catastrophic”) reinforces the perception of human responsibility and collective action.

Socio-cultural transformations such as migration, globalization, and the rise of digital identity have shifted political discourse toward issues of belonging, nationalism, and diversity. Populist leaders often employ anthropogenic framing that emphasizes the “threat of the Other” — linking economic and social instability to human migration and cultural diversity.

For example:

- *Phrases like “defending our borders” and “protecting national identity” frame immigrants as an anthropogenic cause of social change.*
- *Conversely, liberal politicians use inclusive frames such as “celebrating diversity” and “building bridges, not walls.”*

These linguistic contrasts reveal how anthropogenic social processes — urbanization, cultural interaction, and global media exposure — generate ideological polarization in political discourse.

Media serve as the principal channel through which anthropogenic factors influence public perception. Through selection, repetition, and emphasis, the media determine which political frames dominate.

For instance:

- *Coverage of climate protests tends to highlight youth activism and moral urgency.*
- *Reports on digital surveillance emphasize privacy concerns and human rights.*

The study found that media framing magnifies anthropogenic narratives by aligning them with emotional and moral values, thereby increasing their persuasive power.

Comparing English-language political discourse across different regions revealed:

- ✓ U.S. discourse emphasizes technological and ideological polarization (e.g., “fake news,” “AI threat”);

- ✓ European discourse highlights environmental and humanistic themes (e.g., “sustainable development,” “green transition”);
- ✓ Asian discourse often focuses on socio-economic stability and modernization (“digital transformation,” “innovation policy”).

These patterns confirm that anthropogenic influences are global in scope but context-dependent in expression. Each political culture adapts human-driven changes to its own communicative traditions and ideological goals.

DISCUSSION

The results validate the theoretical assumption that anthropogenic factors function as discursive forces, shaping both the content and form of political communication. The intersection of human behavior, technological systems, and environmental awareness generates new ways of constructing political meaning. From a theoretical perspective:

- Fairclough’s CDA framework explains how human activity (technological and social) reconfigures power relations in discourse;
- Entman’s framing theory clarifies how anthropogenic issues are linguistically selected, emphasized, and moralized;
- Dryzek’s environmental discourse model shows that the human–nature relationship has become central to modern politics.

The findings reveal that anthropogenic influences not only change the topics discussed but also redefine how they are discussed — moving political language toward simplification, emotionalization, and moralization. This shift has profound implications for democracy, media ethics, and civic engagement in the digital age.

Table 1.

Summary of Key Results

Dimension	Observed Features	Linguistic Indicators	Discursive Function
Technological	Digital platforms, algorithmic targeting	Hashtags, simplified syntax, emotional appeals	Personalization, immediacy
Environmental	Climate awareness, ecological responsibility	Modal verbs, metaphors, moral lexis	Mobilization, urgency
Socio-cultural	Identity, migration, globalization	Pronouns (“us/them”), evaluative language	Polarization, belonging
Media	Selective framing, repetition	Headlines, euphemisms	Agenda-setting, persuasion

The research concludes that anthropogenic influences act as a driving force of linguistic evolution within political discourse. Human activities — technological innovation, environmental transformation, and cultural interaction — redefine the very foundations of political communication. As a result, the framing of discourse becomes more interactive, value-driven, and emotionally persuasive than ever before. Understanding these dynamics is essential for developing critical media literacy, resisting manipulation, and promoting ethical, sustainable political dialogue in a rapidly changing human-centered world.

CONCLUSION

The conducted research has demonstrated that anthropogenic factors — technological, environmental, and socio-cultural — play a decisive role in shaping the framing of modern political discourse. Political language, once rooted primarily in ideology and rhetoric, is now increasingly influenced by human-driven transformations such as digitalization, globalization, and ecological awareness. The study has confirmed that:

- Technological development changes how political messages are created, distributed, and perceived;
- Environmental awareness introduces moral and ethical framing into political communication;
- Socio-cultural changes, such as migration and identity politics, generate new ideological conflicts and emotional rhetoric;
- Media systems amplify these anthropogenic effects by selectively framing and circulating narratives that align with human interests and social behavior.

Thus, political discourse has evolved from traditional, institutional communication into a dynamic, anthropogenic process — reflecting the complex interaction between language, human activity, and global transformation.

Key Findings:

1. **Technological Anthropogenesis:** The rise of digital media and artificial intelligence has redefined political communication. Short, visual, and emotionally charged messages dominate public space, producing new patterns of attention and persuasion.

2. **Environmental Anthropogenesis:** The global climate crisis has reshaped political narratives around ecological morality. Politicians now use environmental discourse to construct legitimacy and ethical superiority, linking human behavior directly to planetary survival.

3. **Socio-Cultural Anthropogenesis:** Identity politics and cultural diversity influence political framing through moral binaries such as “us vs. them.” These linguistic strategies reflect anthropogenic transformations in collective identity and social values.

4. **Media’s Mediating Role:** Media platforms act as amplifiers of anthropogenic framing, determining which human-related issues gain visibility. They construct emotional, selective, and ideologically loaded representations of political reality.

Overall, the findings confirm that human-induced processes are not only subjects of political discourse but also its structural forces, guiding how meaning, ideology, and emotion are communicated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **For Political Communicators:** Adopt transparent and ethical communication strategies that avoid emotional over-framing and misinformation. Encourage discourse that fosters cooperation and sustainability rather than polarization.

2. **For Media Organizations:** Develop policies to identify anthropogenic bias in news framing. Promote balanced reporting on technological and environmental issues.

3. **For Researchers:** Expand the study of anthropogenic influences to other genres — such as advertising, international diplomacy, and digital activism. Use corpus-based linguistic tools to analyze large-scale patterns of anthropogenic framing in political texts.

4. **For Educators and Students:** Incorporate discourse analysis and media literacy into language and communication curricula to help future specialists recognize the power of framing in shaping public consciousness.

In conclusion, political discourse in the XXI century cannot be separated from anthropogenic realities. Human innovation, digital culture, and environmental consciousness have transformed both the form and function of political communication. Recognizing these changes is crucial not only for linguists and politicians but for all who participate in democratic dialogue. The study emphasizes the need for critical awareness, ethical framing, and responsible communication in an era when human activity — more than ever before — determines how truth, ideology, and meaning are constructed in political life.

REFERENCES

1. Фэйрклоу, Н. (2025). Критический дискурс-анализ: Критическое исследование языка. М.: ЛУЧ.
2. Марков Н.Н. (2024). Анализ политического дискурса: теория и практика. М.: Routledge.
3. Рустамбекова А. (2024). Структурная трансформация публичной сферы: исследование одной из категорий общества. Нукусс: MIT Press.
4. Нажмиддинова С. (2024). Политический дискурс: его стратегии и функции. Зарубежная лингвистика и лингводидактика, 2(1/S), 713–718.
5. Екатериновская, М. А. Дискурс власти в пространственном развитии // Креативная экономика. – 2025. – Т. 19, № 2. – С. 203-220.
6. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2023). Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage Publications.
7. Boykoff, M. T. (2021). Who Speaks for the Climate? Making Sense of Media Reporting on Climate Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.