UAB
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Dipòsit digital de documents de la UAB

This is the **accepted version** of the journal article:

Díaz-Pont, Joana. «Cities and the governance framing of climate change». *Environmental Policy and Governance*, Vol. 31, Num. 1 (2021), p. 18-30 DOI 10.1002/eet.1903

This version is available at https://ddd.uab.cat/record/338294

under the terms of the IN COPYRIGHT license.

Cities and the governance framing of climate change

Joana Díaz-Pont, Facultat de Ciència Política iociologia, edifici B, Campus de la UAB, 08193 Bellaterra (Cerdanyola del Vallès), Barcelona, Spain Email: joana.diaz@uab.cat

Abstract

The article examines cross-discourse of the EuropeanMobilityWeek (EMW) campaign launched at the European level and analyses how it is adapted in six European cities. The objective is to unveil a governance framing that unmasks how cities shape their climate leadership discourse according to their governance aspirations and capacity. By looking at the adaptations across cities' discourses, this research acknowledges the need to confront the limitations and challenges that cities encounter to effec- tively contribute to global climate governance. It suggests that a governance framing exposes these challenges by showing the different realities of cities when they high- light particular governance modes in their discourse. The methodology combines crit- ical discourse analysis and corpus techniques to analyse a total of 18 campaigns in different temporal, geographical and political contexts. EMW's discourse issued at European level is used as the reference corpus to examine how cities reframe their discourse by weakening or strengthening two governance modes characterised as an action-taking approach that focuses on the steering role of government, and a decision-making approach that highlights the city's interdependencies in a societal context. Learning more about discourse as a vindicator of governance modes in urban climate governance can contribute to a better understanding of how climate transi- tions are actually put into practise. The research suggests that climate leadership attributed to cities is in fact a complex and dynamic reality that has to be cautiously examined in order to understand the challenges of climate transitions.

KEYWORDS
city, climate change, discourse, framing, governance

1 INTRODUCTION

In the last decade cities have been claiming a leading role in global cli- mate governance. In the *C40 Cities* webpage one can read statements such as: "There is no single solution for solving global climate change, but cities have the ability, capacity and will to lead." Similarly, The *Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy* presents itself as "the largest global alliance for city climate leadership, built upon the commitment of over 10,000 cities and local governments." These are examples of a rather optimistic and possibilistic climate discourse. But how do discourse and governance really align when cities develop strategic plans, direct resources and policies and implement local climate actions? The harsh reality is that their discourse on climate action leadership encounters many obstacles when put into practise as urban climate governance. The expectations about their capacity to steer transformative climate action often collide with the fact that they lack resources or real power; the state and the market negotiate actions on their side whilst they must implement the resulting policies; they respond directly to citizens and have to face mobilisations and social claims of direct democracy and decision-making (Bulkeley, 2017; Newell et al., 2015). As Stevenson and Dryzek (2013) tell us, the forces that shape public discourse and frame government environmental policies interrogate governance and unmask its limita- tions, inequalities and imbalance. This article is concerned about the

relation between cities' climate discourse and climate governance. Specifically, the objective is to unveil a *governance framing* that unmasks how cities shape their climate leadership discourse according to their governance aspirations and capacity. To this end, the article analyses how six cities discursively transform a sustainable mobility European event and how, in doing so, they vindicate particular climate governance modes. The EuropeanMobilityWeek (EMW) campaign is a yearly event that takes different logics and discourses in each city. During this event, mainstream climate governance takes different paths in each city and governance modes emerge in the cities' discourses on climate change.

The notion of mainstream climate governance is taken from the debates about the different competing and overlapping discourses that frame global environmental challenges and their institutional responses (Bäckstrand & Lövbrand, 2016; Dryzek, 2012; Fröhlich & Knieling, 2013; Stevenson & Dryzek, 2012). This article critically examines the discourse on sustainable mobility as represented in the EU's documents for the EMW campaign and problematises how this mainstream discourse is contested by cities. By looking at the multiplicity and contestation across cities' discourses, this research acknowledges the need to confront the limitations and challenges that cities encounter to effectively contribute to global climate governance. It suggests that a governance framing exposes these challenges by showing the different realities of cities when they adopt particular governance modes to live up to the expectations of their interacting actors and networks. This could be an indication that climate leadership attributed to cities is in fact a complex and dynamic reality, and could even inhibit the governance challenges of climate transitions. Transferring expectations to cities could relax global, state or corporate efforts. Exposing the cities' own expectations also exhibits their own governance challenges along very heterogeneous and changing paths.

As stated earlier, the article's core objective is to unveil this governance framing. As will be later developed, the discourse analysis does not approach the city as a dependent and complex system that needs to be explained, but as the explanatory variable to unveil a governance framing in climate change. As such, the discourse approach is not focused on factors that would explain how cities are redefined and contested in the global economy, their successes and failures, or their role in front of other actors from the state to market and civil society. Discursive institutionalism provides insights to this approach by examining factors such as knowledge, ideas and advocacy coalitions that can explain cities as institutional systems, their changes or persistence as such (Schmidt, 2010). The approach in this article focuses on the city only to explore and explain an alternative governance framing, and why it matters.

Sustainable mobility provides the arena for the analysis as its discourse admits several framings. A sustainable mobility program can include a variety of actions and decisions: reducing the need to travel (less trips, substitution through technology, networking); transport policy measures (reducing levels of car use by promoting walk and cycle, new transport hierarchy, slowing down urban traffic and reallocating space to public transport, parking controls, road pricing, more public space for people); land use planning measures (increasing densities and concentration, mixed use development, housing location and design of buildings) (Banister, 2011). To make sense of and discuss these and other measures of sustainable mobility, policymakers and other interacting actors in climate governance employ frames to define their priorities, persuade or simply to provide meaning according to their worldviews. Four of the most studied climate change framings include economic development, scientific uncertainty, conflict/strategy, and public accountability (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989; Nisbet, 2009). Sustainable mobility measures can be framed, for example, as economic and technological development by supporting alternative fuels and electric cars, and intelligent transport systems. It can be framed as conflict/strategy by focusing, for example, on demand management including measures like parking control or road pricing. The public accountability framing emphasises issues of control, transparency and politicisation; under this framing, sustainable mobility could focus on the interests of advocating groups, or claims for more public space for people instead of cars, for example. This research contributes to deepen these approaches by isolating a governance framing that emphasises specific governance modes. In doing so, it attempts to unveil how cities transit climate governance by distinguishing between two governance modes: an action-taking approach that focuses on the steering role of governmental actors, and a decision-making approach that highlights the city's interdependencies in a societal context. The following sections conceptualise this governance framing and the two governance modes used to delimit it.

1.1 Conceptualising the governance framing

The relevance of discourse approaches to climate governance grows as more voices claim that dominant climate change framings are increasingly sterile in multilevel and networked decision-making environments (Bäckstrand & Lövbrand, 2016; Bernauer & Gampfer, 2013; Stevenson & Dryzek, 2012, 2013). Climate governance has been examined from the multilevel perspective (Bache, Bartle, Flinders, & Marsden, 2015; Bache & Flinders, 2004; Ostrom, 2010); in relation to actors, networks, and power (Jänicke, 2015; Knieling & Leal Filho, 2013; Okereke, Bulkeley, & Schroeder, 2009); as well as by looking at its frames and discourses (Juhola, Keskitalo, & Westerhoff, 2011; Newell et al., 2015). Urban climate governance is a converging field of study for all these perspectives. Its scholarship has evolved, in part, as the integration of governance approaches in the context of cities. Also, it has evolved to counterbalance the tendency in urban studies to overlook the environmental dimension in their analyses on power, society and the city (Betsill & Bulkeley, 2006; Bulkeley, 2010; Corfee-Morlot et al., 2009). Learning more about discourse as a vindicator of governance modes in urban climate governance can contribute to a better understanding of how climate transitions are actually put into practise, whom and where is actually benefiting from climate change policies, and how urban climate policies are contested and managed. If city-specific discourses reveal the cities' governance aspirations, then these discourses should be taken

into account in the global climate debate as indicators of the path that urban climate governance is actually taking.

Governance is recognised to connect, in practise, to a wide range of instruments available for the realisation of societal aims. It takes the form of a combination of formal, informal, regulatory and non-regulatory instruments that range from urban planning tools to information, communication and participation strategies (Fröhlich & Knieling, 2013, p. 13). The governance framing is here understood as a spectrum of the various choices of instruments, actions and decisions that portray a specific governance mode as the result of the interacting and interdependent networks that steer policy. This conceptualisation is anchored in the wider notion of governance linked to decision-making involving various stakeholders, not only hierarchical government decisions (Pierre, 2000), thus implying a less defined role of the state (Rhodes, 1997, 2000) and a greater interaction and interdependence of society (Kooiman, 1993, 2003; Mayntz, 1998). It also uses, as a general reference, the literature that analyses multilevel governance in relation to network interaction and participation (Bache et al., 2015; Bache & Flinders, 2004; Jessop, 2016). Kooiman et al. have developed the concept of "interactive governance" that "emphasises solving societal problems and creating societal opportunities through interactions amongst civil, public and private actors" and "proceeds from the assumption that societies are governed by a combination of governing efforts" (Kooiman, Bavinck, Chuenpagdee, Mahon, & Pullin, 2008, p. 2). This more general approach to the concept of governance is adopted in this research as it provides a wider analytical framework to define governance modes and how they are portrayed in climate discourse.

In the study of governance, distinguishing between different modes is not a new approach. The differentiating approach in this article is that modes are defined following the tradition in urban climate governance studies that recognises cities in relation to action-taking and also to decision-making (Boyd & Juhola, 2014; Bulkeley & Betsill, 2005). These two vectors (action-taking and decision-making) will be used to characterise discourses that are articulated around governance either highlighting one orientation or the other. In order to define governance modes and how they frame the cities' climate discourse, this article is also guided by Bulkeley's (2010) analysis of urban climate governance. Amongst other issues, her works point to institutional capacity, political factors, sociotechnical networks, and resources and knowledge as factors that condition and define different modes of governance, all of which shape the city's response to climate change.

Institutional capacity is a common alibi for cities to legitimise their choice of actions and decisions in their discourse. For example, the lack of resources and institutional power can justify discarding transport policy measures that imply multi-level and multi-stakeholder decisions in favour of softer measures that require less investment and negotiation such as communication or organisational measures (Letnik, Luppino, Bardi, & Bo Zi Cnik, 2018). Sassen provides an alternative approach to explain how cities respond to governance challenges by recognising their capacity to contest through its systemic dynamic: cities contest, for instance, when cars, built for speed, are arrested by traffic and people when they exit the highway and enter the city (Sassen, 2013, p. 210). This wider notion of the city's capability means that cities are also speaking back, for example, when civic platforms claim public spaces for bikes, pedestrians or vulnerable groups. Nevertheless, as stated above, the objective in this investigation is not to go deep into the analysis of the city as a system, the technologies and social institutions that configure it, or its role in sustainability transitions; nor is the goal to study the city in relation to elites and interest groups that may configure a self-sufficient sociotechnical and ecological arrangement (Hodson & Marvin, 2010). Rather, in this article, urban governance is used to operationalise the discourse analysis. This means that discourse is analysed by looking for references to governing techniques, instruments for governing, management of interdependencies and forms of negotiation that define different governance modes.

1.2 Action-taking and decision-making as governance modes in the governance framing

The research distinguishes between two modes through which climate governance can be realised, the action-taking mode and the decision-making mode. This article claims that these modes unveil as cities reframe the European mobility discourse embedded in the EMW campaign. EMW campaigning is contested by each city as a declaration of concerns and priorities aligned with a specific mode of governance that also reflects network forces and steering options. The campaign is launched at the European level using a common discourse. EMW calls cities to engage in climate governance through sustainable mobility actions, events and commitments. The campaign's general guidelines and communication materials are not expected to raise questions and concerns about governance since they are based on a common frame, the generally assumed EU framing of climate change. The reframing, if any, arrives when each city adopts EMW and rebuilds the EU's cross-discourse. For the purposes of this article, the analysis considers whether the reframing is oriented towards a governance mode defined as action-taking or a governance mode defined as decision-making. These modes are a simplification of Kooiman et al.'s interactive governance model that distinguishes between self, co-, and hierarchical governance depending on the structure of interactions between governmental and non-governmental actors: self-governance refers to situations in which actors take care of themselves, outside governmental control; co-governance implies interaction with different actors leading to coordinate opportunities such as co-governance or public-private partnerships; and hierarchical governance is a top-down mode based on steering and control in the form of policies and law (Kooiman et al., 2008).

The governance framing is delimited in this study by two ends that orient discourse (Table 1). In one end of this spectrum is climate governance as action-taking. When framed as action-taking, discourse is expected to connect to action-oriented governance understood as a combination of instrumental approaches based on focal organisation

TABLE 1 Governance modes in the governance framing

	Action-taking	Decision-making
POWER	Government actors	Government, non-government actors and networks
STEERING	Top-down	Coordinated, co-operative interaction
PARTICIPATION	Individual behaviour	Collective action
KNOWLEDGE	Technical expertise for effectiveness	Shared good as group building process
LEGITIMACY	Representation	Participation, deliberation and consensus
RHETORIC	Problem resolution, individual, solution, measure, activity, behaviour	Problem negotiation, stakeholders, partnership, commitment, engagement

Source: Own elaboration based on Pahl-Wostl, 2015; Rhodes, 2000; Sorensen & Torfing, 2007.

towards effective problem resolution and action-taking. The focus is on the capacity for action on multiple fronts as opposed to cooperation, as well as on the call for individual behaviour as the main form of participatory interaction (Delicath, Elsenbeer, & Depoe, 2004; Pierre & Peters, 2000). Action-taking builds on the hierarchical style, with top-down steering and the government acting as the dominant actor. Knowledge is understood as expertise for effectiveness of ruling and therefore it has a technocratic focus and is generated mainly through technical sources. The legitimacy of action-taking derives from representation of the elected government. In the other end of the spectrum, climate governance as decision-making connects to the language and rhetoric of network governance and social interaction. It highlights both the dynamic relationships between actors and their interdependency as new non-governmental actors become relevant in the decision-making process. Governance as decision-making frames a discourse that connects to network-based steering, social interaction, deliberation, cooperation and, ultimately, consensus and decision-making. Knowledge is understood as a shared good and is generated as part of a group building process that acknowledges different sources. Legitimacy derives from participation of all actors affected in the process (Pahl-Wostl, 2015; Rhodes, 2000; Sorensen & Torfing, 2007).

In practise, sustainable mobility requires mixes of these governance modes, each one contributing in different ways to the role that the city can play in global climate governance. Combining packages of measures is a path to minimising unintended effects of specific policies and increasing the chances of an intervention's success (Bruun & Givoni, 2015). For example, cities are not sure about the opportunities and risks of car sharing platforms. Following this article's characterisation of governance modes, action-taking governance could lead to either open or restrictive enforcement policies concerning single-occupant vehicles, whilst decision-making governance might entail negotiations with taxi lobbies. Cities also adopt different approaches to manage traffic congestion and reduce greenhouse gas emissions which can help understand how the governance modes are used in this research. Action-taking modes could promote technical solutions such as the use of electric buses in public transport, the promotion of electric vehicles through subsidies, the organisation of environmental education campaigns, or the promotion of awareness-raising events for a safer and more sustainable use of cars. Decision-making modes could lead to public-private partnerships to promote metred or restricted parking schemes in the city centre or deterrent parking areas at the entrance of the city. It could also lead to co-managed public bicycle schemes, or more ambitions car reduction strategies through urban planning such as superblocks that require coordinated action by many actors including commerce, transport logistics or neighbours (Mueller et al., 2020; Soret, Jimenez-Guerrero, & Baldasano, 2011).

Each city is expected to communicate its policy efforts by framing their climate discourse through a selection of certain considerations and elements over others. The extensive literature on climate framing has helped us understand the importance of frames across policy debates, especially in relation to controversial axes such as left–right, hierarchy-decentralisation, and science-denial (Dunlap & McCright, 2008; Hart & Nisbet, 2012; Lakoff, 2010; McCright & Dunlap, 2011; Nisbet, 2009; Nisbet, Hart, Myers, & Ellithorpe, 2013). This literature adopts the general notion that connecting an issue to a dominant frame is easier than building up a new frame. An extensively documented frame in this body of research examines political polarisation between elites and organisations with the left attributing climate change to industrial capitalism and the right defending the economic system (McCright & Dunlap, 2011). This dominant frame can be used to interpret the cities' changing climate discourses between different political mandates. It can explain why certain sustainable mobility policies tend to connect to the right in the political spectrum if they highlight the role of corporations, industry associations and economic lobbies influencing and formulating transport policy, whilst others are seen as closer to the left if they highlight science advocacy organisations, citizen associations or cyclists. This article claims that the governance framing can help us see beyond by focusing on the process of governance itself. To this end, the typification of governance modes is primarily intended to unmask a certain type of discourse expected under each particular end of the governance framing. The sustainable mobility policy mix includes a wide range of instruments, actions and measures. The set of mechanisms communicated by each city during the EMW campaign is expected to be a selection that fits the chosen frame. The central hypothesis is that cities reframe climate change aligning their discourse with their aspirations concerning governance modes, and exposing a governance framing. This is developed into the following sub-hypotheses:

(1) H1: Discourse on climate change is reframed as governance when it draws closer to citizens.

(2) H2: The governance framing reveals when cities weaken or strengthen decision-making and action-taking governance modes in their discourse.

EMW has been chosen as the context to test these hypotheses for three main reasons. First, the campaign links climate change to mobility, one of the main challenges in Europe's 2050 low-carbon road map. Second, the campaign is launched at the European level using what will be referred to as a cross-national discourse. Finally, EMW's long-running history and extensive levels of participation provide the possibility of longitudinal study across a large number of cities. The next section justifies the selection of six cities in particular and presents the methodological approach for the analysis.

2 METHODOLOGY

This study combines Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and corpus analysis techniques to compare discourses used during the EMW campaigns of 2005, 2012 and 2015 for: Barcelona (Spain), Budapest (Hungary), Brussels (Belgium), Naples (Italy), Gothenburg (Sweden) and Helsinki (Finland). The population of these cities ranges from 500,000 to 1,500,000 inhabitants, they have different population densities, and they all face mobility challenges[1]; they are from northern, western, central and southern regions in Europe; and, finally, they have had an unequal presence and commitment to EMW throughout the study period. The corpus-assisted discourse analysis focuses on identifying changes between cities. It also examines changes between mandates for each city.

EMW has run since 2002 as an information, awareness and action campaign. It has been observed by different cities mainly in the European region, although cities in other regions have also joined. Participation increased from 1,698 cities in 40 countries in 2005 to 1,873 cities in 45 countries in 2015, with ups and downs and a peak in 2011. The countries that are represented, the support of supranational institutions at the European level, and the different dimension of the participating cities show significant stability for the period of study. EMW provides a common frame for the analysis of communication outputs in different temporal, geographical and political contexts.

In order to guarantee context variability, the study examines three separate campaigns for each individual city: EMW2005, EMW2012 and EMW2015. This approach involved analysing 18 EMW campaigns in total. One methodological difficulty was the diversity of sources and the variety of communication tools and strategies. This difficulty was overcome by restricting the studied materials to press releases from official institutions, announcements on municipal websites, and leaflets for the dissemination of proposals and events organised within each EMW. Ultimately, the analysis includes the government composition for the mandates between 2005–2015, the plan of actions and events included in each studied EMW campaign (according to what was published on the official EMW website and supplemented by the official websites of cities where appropriate), official press notes published on the websites of the municipalities, and municipal and EMW-specific web pages.

Fairclough's (1992) approach to CDA is the general analytical strategy. The main feature of this method is its interest in unmasking the ideology and social structure that are embedded in discourse through the critical examination of texts. According to this analysis, discourse is constituted by social structure and (re-)produces social practises and relations. By emphasising the role of governance in the process of discourse construction, the research is aligned with the general theory that language is ideological and legitimises relations of organised power (Habermas, 1987). It also embraces the concept and method of Carvalho (2008) that highlight external factors affecting discourse. As the author stated "discursive effects are not the direct consequence of one actor's discursive interventions but are often dependent on a variety of (discursive) causes and circumstances and show the constraining force of discourse. Examples of discursive effects are discourse structuration, discourse institutionalisation and closure" (Carvalho, 2008, p. 165).

Although having a linguistic character, CDA tends to give less importance to the analysis of a large corpus and concentrates upon issues such as argumentation, coherence, topic choice or structure (van Dijk, 1993). Nevertheless, combining CDA with corpus linguistics provides a more systematic approach to language description that benefits both methodologies and contributes to fighting common criticisms of CDA bias (Baker, 2012). In this research, corpus analysis techniques systematise the study of discourse adaptation. This is done through a keyword analysis using Sketch Engine.[2] This tool supports many languages although the corpora compilation was restricted to English, Spanish and French as all main features of the engine are available for these three. In total, 19 new corpora were prepared: one for each of the three EMW campaigns for each of the six cities; and one for EMW at the European level, which was used as a reference corpus. Each corpus consisted of campaign materials as described above. All the communication materials used to compile the corpora were originally in one of the three specified languages except for a number of press notes used for the study of Barcelona that had to be translated from Catalan into Spanish.[3] Restricting languages to only three of the eight that were present limited the availability of texts to include in the corpora, but simplified the comparative analysis. The final corpus consisted of approximately 134,000 words: 38,602 words from the leaflets and general guidelines documents of EMW at the European level, and 95,479 from 67 files included for each city and each campaign for at least one of each of the three following communication texts: institutional press notes, EMW leaflet/specific website, and EMW announcements on municipal websites.

Summarily, the methodology is designed to characterise discourse and its adaptations using corpus methods for keyword analysis and CDA to interpret results in consonance with the context. In order to test the hypotheses, the methodological procedure follows two phases. First, it performs a keyword analysis of the reference corpus (consisting of EMW communication materials released at the European level). It selects keywords that point to dominant concepts in the governance rhetoric and analyses them in their context in order to assign them to one of two distinct keyword families: one associated to action-taking discourse (ATD), the other to decision-making

TABLE 2 EMW commitment for each city

BARCELONA	City's Commitment[a]			
EMW call	*Week of Activities*	*Permanent Measures*	*Car-Free Day*	Ideology election date
2015	X	X	X	24 May
2014	X	X	O	
2013	X	X	O	
2012	X	X	O	
2011	X	X	X	22 May
2010	O	X	X	
2009	O	X	X	
2008	O	X	X	
2007	O	X	X	27 May
2006	O	X	X	
2005	O	O	X	
BUDAPEST	City's Commitment			
EMW CALL	*Week of Activities*	*Permanent Measures*	*Car-Free Day*	IDEOLOGY election date
2015	X	X	X	
2014	X	X	X	12 Oct
2013	X	X	X	
2012	X	X	X	
2011	X	X	X	
2010	X	X	X	03 Oct
2009	X	X	X	
2008	X	X	X	
2007	X	X	X	
2006	X	X	X	01 Oct
2005	X	X	X	
BRUSSELS	City's Commitment			
EMW CALL	*Week of Activities*	*Permanent Measures*	*Car-Free Day*	IDEOLOGY election date
2015	X	X	X	
2014	O	O	O	20 Jul
2013	O	O	X	07 May
2012	O	O	X	
2011	O	O	O	
2010	X	O	X	
2009	O	O	O	15 Jul
2008	X	X	X	
2007	X	O	X	
2006	X	O	X	
2005	X	O	O	
NAPLES	City's Commitment			
EMW CALL	*Week of Activities*	*Permanent Measures*	*Car-Free Day*	IDEOLOGY election date
2015	X	O	X	
2014	X	O	X	
2013	X	X	X	
2012	X	X	X	
2011	X	X	X	29 May
2010	X	X	X	

(Continues)

TABLE 2 (Continued)

NAPLES	City's Commitment			
EMW CALL	*Week of Activities*	*Permanent Measures*	*Car-Free Day*	IDEOLOGY election date
2009	X	X	O	
2008	X	O	X	
2007	X	O	X	
2006	X	X	X	28 May
2005	X	X	O	
GOTHENBURG	City's Commitment			
EMW CALL	*Week of Activities*	*Permanent Measures*	*Car-Free Day*	IDEOLOGY election date
2015	X	O	X	
2014	O	O	O	14 Sep
2013	O	O	O	
2012	X	X	X	
2011	X	O	O	
2010	X	X	O	19 Sep
2009	X	X	O	
2008	X	X	O	
2007	X	X	O	
2006	X	X	X	17 Sep
2005	X	X	X	
HELSINKI	City's Commitment			
EMW CALL	*Week of Activities*	*Permanent Measures*	*Car-Free Day*	IDEOLOGY election date
2015	X	O	O	
2014	X	O	O	
2013	O	O	X	
2012	O	O	O	28 Oct
2011	O	O	O	
2010	O	O	X	
2009	O	O	O	
2008	O	O	O	26 Oct
2007	O	O	X	
2006	O	O	X	
2005	O	O	X	

[a]According to the categories of action established by the EMW partnership. X = category observed. O = category not observed

LEFT CENTRE RIGHT

Source: Own elaboration based on public institutional data and data from EMW's online database (The EMW website keeps an updated database on each call's commitment for all participating cities [http://www.mobilityweek.eu].).

discourse (DMD). Then, it performs a second keyword analysis in order to examine how these keyword families occur in the city-specific corpora, and examines their use and meaning through CDA. The following section presents the results in connection to the hypotheses.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The general proposal of EMW distinguishes between three categories of actions: week of activities, permanent measures and Car-Free Day. Table 2 shows each city's commitment to these categories of actions between 2005 and 2015, whilst also differentiating between mandates. It shows how the context for the EMW celebration has changed throughout the period of study. Barcelona, Brussels and Naples have gone through political changes and provide the cases to study a possible modulation of discourse in connection to political variation. Budapest, Gothenburg and Helsinki, in turn, have not had political changes and this allows isolating discourse variations of a different nature. The variations in the cities' commitment to EMW also provide another context for CDA.

3.1 Analysis of EMW's cross-discourse as reference corpus

Cross-discourse refers to EMW cross-communication as constructed by the EMW partnership[4] in its transversal role as promoters. Each yearly campaign is articulated around a theme and includes mobility actions and an EMW Award. Every year, the EMW partnership prepares a document of thematic guidelines and a leaflet, and publishes several announcements on its website. These materials constitute the reference corpus.

The corpus analysis of these materials identifies a set of reoccurring keywords distinctive of the governance rhetoric. They are scrutinised in their context in order to assign them to one of two discourse families: the DMD and the ATD. Assigning keywords to distinct discourse families entails interpreting their use and meaning in discourse. Tables 1 and 2 display examples of how certain keywords occur. In the first example on Table 1 "...not one homogeneous group but are diverse *actors* with different and sometimes conflicting...," the keyword "actors" is used in connection to "different and sometimes conflicting," This points to collective interaction, a feature of decision-making in the characterisation of governance modes (Table 1). The corpus analysis assists in identifying keywords, but these are examined according to their meaning in order to assign them to a specific family. After completing the corpus-assisted analysis for the reference corpus, the keyword family for DMD includes 105 occurrences of the following keywords and their derivative forms: actor(s), stakeholder(s), partnership, participate(ion), responsible(ility), commit(ment), engage(ment). Examples of how these keywords are used in context are displayed in Table 3. ATD includes a total of 216 occurrences for its keyword family constituted by: individual(s), action(s), event(s), solution(s), activity(ies), measure(s) and behaviour. Table 4 shows examples of ATD with keywords that occur regularly.

As mentioned, although occurrences are useful in order to isolate the two discourses, this study pays attention to the interpretation of the results in consonance with the context through CDA. CDA indicates that the official discourse of EMW deliberately avoids controversial frames in what can be read as an institutional strategy to depoliticise climate change. The CDA reveals that some of the most common frames in the politicisation of climate change are not present in cross-discourse:

> As mobility demand increases and the need to drastically cut emissions becomes ever more pressing, cities need to be innovative and forward-looking. They need to develop a vision for an urban transport system that meets mobility demand, protects the environment and makes the city a better place to live. With some strategic thinking it is possible to make this vision a reality. (EMW Thematic Guidelines document-Toolkit for Newcomers. February 2012)

This excerpt avoids, for example, the framing of scientific uncertainty that is used to justify the validity of multiple prognoses in climate change and therefore justify different ideological positions concerning the most suitable public policies to tackle the problem (Nisbet et al., 2013). It also avoids conflicting debates by presenting the climate challenge in consensual, technocratic and depoliticised terms (Beveridge & Koch, 2017; Swyngedouw, 2017). The "need to drastically cut emissions" and "increasing mobility demand" are taken for granted, and cities are expected to respond to both challenges through innovative governance. Cross-discourse seeks neutrality spaces where different processes of multilevel and network governance can interact with individual attitudes and behaviours that do not necessarily sustain a certain ideology, as other studies have also indicated in special in connection to climate change depoliticisation. In their analysis of the "Sing for the Climate" campaign, Pepermans & Maeseele (2014, p. 225) showed how the campaign potentially contributed to the depoliticisation—as opposed to the politicisation—of climate change.

TABLE 3 Examples of use of keywords related to decision-making discourse (DMD)

DMD's keyword family: Actor(s), stakeholder(s), partnership, participate(ion), responsible(ility), commit(ment), engage(ment)		
not one homogenous group but are diverse	actors	with different and sometimes conflicting
cooperation between different sectors and	stakeholders	in society and to promote environmental
take a participatory approach. Citizens and	stakeholders	need to be involved from the outset and
Set up a permanent steering group with key	stakeholders	and citizen representatives throughout
together we can engage a wider array of	stakeholders	, develop more impressive and inclusive
different target groups. Build effective	partnerships	. Look at your campaign plan and its objectives
indicators and has legitimacy from country	participation	and involvement in the assessment and the
has tested and developed innovative public	participation	models to improve cycling infrastructure
policies and measures, 4) the assignment of	responsibilities	and resources, and 5) monitoring and evaluation
efforts to reduce emissions and meet	commitments	, making significant progress in
objectives and targets. 3) ensure political	commitment	and select policies and measures. 4) implement
ensured a good level of information and	engagement	, the plan succeeded. creating a new political

TABLE 4 Examples of use of keywords related to action-taking discourse (ATD)

ATD's keyword family: Individual(s), action(s), event(s), solution(s), activity(ies), measure(s), behaviour		
targeted approach that is tailored to the	individuals	. For guidance on how to go about this,
not seem possible solely by using domestic	actions	. This will result in additional emission
but ongoing activities are tackling this.	Actions	are also needed to improve urban air quality
their mobility options. Use it as a base for	events	. Interchange stations are an ideal location
organising a car-free day with big public	events	on 22 September! But plan well enough in
theme and inspiration for suitable campaign	activities	. These guidelines provide concrete ideas
place, you are going to need some tactics or	activities	to draw attention to what you are trying
two relatively new ways to use cars. These	solutions	impact on the number of cars in cities
should be a transparent process that designs	solutions	that will improve the quality of life for
multimodal lifestyles. Some inspirational	measures	undertaken by European cities are listed
participation criteria and general ideas for	measures	and activities that are not specifically
deeper understanding of country conditions,	behaviour	and response to environmental problems.
raising awareness about sustainable travel	behaviour	. the week culminates in the 'in town without

Using cross-discourse as a benchmark has allowed isolating the keyword families for DMD and ATD. The following analysis examines the presence of DMD and ATD in the cities' discourses. This is done in two ways: first, describing how discourse changes in different mandates; and second, studying how discourse changes when the city embraces the campaign and adapts the EU's proposed communication materials to its citizens, even with no political change taking place (H1). In this case, discourse adaptations are examined in order to evidence if changes occur in either DMD or ATD or both (H2).

3.2 Analysis of the cities' discourses

Amongst the analysed cities, Barcelona, Naples and Budapest have gone through political changes in the left-right spectrum during the 2005–2015 period. Nevertheless, the objective of this article is not to examine politicisation in left-right spectrum. In this article, the political changes provide context variability to study discourse adaptations. In the case of Barcelona there are three political phases that allow examining these adaptations. EMW2005 (under a long-running leftist mandate) can be characterised as mainly oriented by DMD. The following excerpt shows how the discourse links governance to cooperation, although the goals and proposals are general and undetermined:

> In the presentation of the Sustainable and Safe Mobility Week, the Chairman of the Committee for Safety and Mobility and Mayor of Barcelona, Jordi Hereu, said: "To get different results, we need organisation and cooperation that allow mixed concepts to create global solutions that follow the principles of prevention, promotion, efficient services and non-waste. (Barcelona City Council, press release September 23, 2005. Translated from Catalan by the author)

During EMW2012 (held under a new centre-right council), discourse changes and the former DMD is reoriented to ATD by lining up event selection to public policies that were central to the electoral campaign of the party that finally came to power. An excerpt from a press release of EMW2012 in Barcelona shows how ATD is adopted and climate governance is framed in technical expertise through the promotion of information and education activities. EMW2012 in Barcelona was released as the "Sustainable and Safe Mobility Week":

> On September 20 at 9:30 a.m. there will be a conference at the Professional Association of Industrial Engineers of Barcelona (CETIP) to promote and contribute to the implementation of electric mobility and technological improvements in this sector. In addition, from September 15 to 22, children will learn traffic rules and will be able to drive at the 1000 m2 kart circuit. (Barcelona City Council, press release September 13, 2012. Translated from Catalan by the author)

EMW2015 also reveals discursive adaptation. This time, as the first EMW to be organised by the newly elected leftist government of the city, it explicitly raises the ideas of cooperation for change and greener, more human cities as the main framing for discourse and event promotion. An excerpt from a press release during EMW2015 exemplifies the type of events that are selected and promoted:

> In 2015, the City Council wants to boost this initiative with the aim of promoting a greener city on a human scale, improving air quality and reducing pollution. For this purpose, together with various organisations and associations related to mobility, we have scheduled a series of activities to raise awareness and educate citizens about the need for a paradigm shift. (Barcelona City Council, press release September 22, 2015. Translated from Catalan by the author)

This city confirms the hypothesis of discursive reframing at the city level, although the reframing could be explained by the political changes in each mandate and not necessarily by the adaptation of discourse from the European level to the city level. The confirmation of governance reframing when discourse draws closer to citizens (H1) arrives with the analysis of the other cities. In other cities it is possible to identify discursive adaptations that do not necessarily

TABLE 5 Examples of use of keywords related to action-taking discourse (ATD)

ATD's keywords in French (in English/close word): événements (events), passagers (passengers/individuals), actions (actions), solutions (solutions)		
EMW2005		
et la place Royale tiendra une série d'	événements	conçus pour promouvoir le transport de
transport de l'environnement. Le dimanche, les	passagers	pourront voyager dans les trains, les tramways
EMW2012		
et les citoyens (au travers d'animations/	actions	mettant en valeur le projet mobilité local
très bien comment. À titre d'	actions	concrètes pour cette semaine de la mobilité
Exemple d'concertations avec des habitants pour envisager des	solutions	à des problèmes de mobilité rencontrés
EMW2015		
Bruxellois qui, déjà aujourd'hui, par leurs	actions	, permettent Une meilleure mobilité à Bruxelles
Peur de l'insécurité et montée de l'	individualisme	: après des années d'engouement, le covoiturage
On mettait ensuite les conducteurs et les	passagers	en relation". Newsletter info Recevez chaque

Note: Brussels EMW2005-2012-2015.

coincide with political change, thus revealing a reframing of a different nature. In the case of Budapest, the analysis shows that the city is committed to EMW regardless of the governing ideology. Budapest held three elections in the period of study, as well as a constitutional referendum. Even with political change, Budapest kept its commitment to EMW intact and steady in all the categories of events. Both the CDA and the corpus analysis are consistent with the idea that Budapest adapts EMW's cross-discourse to strengthen ATD over DMD, and reveals the governance reframing (H2). EMW becomes a sort of a heritage of governmental actors, with a strong national component:

> As national coordinator, the Ministry of National Development conducts the awareness-raising campaign drawing attention to the sustainable and environmentally friendly urban transportation for the eleventh time this year. This time, the topics of the European event series are intermodality and multimodality. Its slogan, 'ChooseChangeCombine!', encourages people to reconsider available transport options and to choose the one best fitting their trip and to combine transport modes. (Centre for Budapest Transport, EMW Programme 2015)

The case of Brussels-Capital Region offers a different perspective from the previous ones since the region was governed by the left throughout the 2005–2015 period, with no changes. It must be pointed out that each city is defined here by its EMW discourse rather than by jurisdiction or other political or territorial criteria. For the purpose of this study, all communication materials produced and released during the celebration of EMW are what define a city's strategy concerning climate change. This is particularly relevant in the case of Brussels since there are significant differences between the metropolitan area and the so-called Région Capitale in terms of political competencies (as is also the case in other cities and metropolitan areas). Nevertheless, this article discusses discourse in relation to the cities' commitment to EMW as publicly stated through the EMW's institutional website. In the case of Brussels, the analysis shows consistency in the discourse over the years, with a focus clearly on ATD. Table 5 shows examples of ATD keyword use for the three campaigns, and reflects how importance is given to individual engagement and action taken by citizens. In this case, adaptation occurs through stronger adherence to ATD than to DMD, thus confirming reframing even when there are no obvious political changes (H2).

The city of Naples follows a similar pattern. In 2011, there was a change of mayor but the government remained in centrist ideological positions. In this case, the structure of commitment to each of the three categories proposed by the EMW at the European level remained stable with some specific modifications that should be explained with further data. In a similar way to Brussels, however, adherence to ATD is stronger than adherence to DMD, with no political change in the city, thus unveiling the governance framing (H2).

The Nordic cities contribute to confirming reframing processes occurring under the governance framing. During the 2005–2015 period, Gothenburg maintained a clearer commitment to holding a week of activities than celebrating Car-Free Day. The EMW at the state level had a very uneven follow-up throughout the 10-year timeline. Taking into account Sweden's uneven participation, and despite the fact that Car-Free Day was present at the 2005, 2012 and 2015 campaigns, the discourse analysis focuses on the week of activities. There is a particular situation in the city of Gothenburg that arises from the fact that some of its neighbourhoods (Lundby, for example) have very comprehensive sustainable mobility programmes that exceed many of the EMW's proposals, which probably have a more limited scope. CDA shows that the discourse adaptation operates by strengthening DMD, with no interference of the governing ideology (H2). Helsinki operates in a similar line as Gothenburg, with no political changes at the city level and unequal participation in EMW countrywide, with a downward trend. The adherence of the city to the different categories of activities in all three EMW campaigns is also uneven and declining. But the city's discourse is consistent with the

commitment to sustainable mobility and the adaptation also operates by strengthening DMD.

In the case of Gothenburg and Helsinki, the corpus analysis also identifies a set of keywords that was not included in the characterisation of the two discourse families. These words are: city, urban, people, user, local, municipal. Their total frequency ratio per 1,000 words in a tested corpus summing the Helsinki and Gothenburg texts is 22, whilst it is 8 for the EMW global corpus. The noteworthy occurrence of such keywords and the examination of their use and meaning in the cities' discourses indicates a process of discourse adaptation that points to a central role of the city. This is confirmed when examining the discourse through CDA. In Gothenburg's and Helsinki's discourses there is a strong focus on citizens. In these excerpts citizens are referred to as users, cyclists, figures, people:

> Week 38 is the week when a lot of activities take place in Göteborg that benefit all the city's road users. On September 22nd the city centre was closed for traffic during this internationally observed event, allowing other forms of transport to take precedence. Lundby Mobility Centre was there, of course, and distributed awards to 400 lucky cyclists. (Lundby Mobility Centre, newsletter June 2005)

> The Car Free Day will be widely covered on social media. A group of public figures has promised to leave their cars at home and try alternative modes of travel. To find out who these people are and how they move around, follow hashtag #autonvapaapäivä on Twitter, Instagram and Facebook (16-22 September). (City of Helsinki website, News September 21, 2015)

The results for the Nordic cities corroborate that there is adaptation in the governance framing, and they could also be indicating particular internal forces shaping this reframing. The following section provides an overview of the results and their implications for future research.

4 CONCLUSION

This study argues that governance modes play a drifting and adaptive role on discourse in several ways. In order to examine and interpret how these adaptations operate, the investigation defines two discourses that articulate around decision-making and action-taking as distinct governance modes. Their theoretical justification and characterisation rest on interactive governance (Kooiman et al., 2008) and urban climate governance literature (Betsill & Bulkeley, 2006; Boyd & Juhola, 2014; Bulkeley, 2010). Decision-making and action-taking discursive adaptations suggest that cities realign the European sustainable mobility discourse in a governance framing. The results show that cross-discourse of the EMW campaign, as built by partnership institutions at the European level, builds both around decision-making and ATDs. The protagonists in these discursive approaches are stakeholders of mobility, including the various governmental and non-governmental actors of climate change. EMW's cross-discourse ranges from an instrumental and focal vision of governance oriented towards action-taking to an interactive governance approach based on interaction and cooperation. The CDA evidences that cross-discourse avoids the most common and controversial framings of climate change likely in order to have validity within the wider European context that the EMW campaign wants to reach, and delivers climate discourse in consensual, technocratic and depoliticised terms (Beveridge & Koch, 2017; Swyngedouw, 2017).

When EMW is embraced by each city, discourse takes different paths. Results suggest that these adaptations expose a governance framing as they take the form of strengthened or weakened DMDs or ATDs. Cities reorient EMW's discourse to either decision-making or action taking coinciding with changes in political mandates, as could be expected according to the existing literature on climate framing (McCright & Dunlap, 2011). But this reframing also occurs when there is no political change. Even more so, there is also discourse reframing in cities belonging to regions that are less committed to EMW because they already have consolidated sustainable mobility policies that sometimes exceed the European campaign's objectives. These evidences suggest that the city-specific discourses operate as claim-making strategies for their climate governance aspirations.

Cities are raising very high expectations in the climate debate both globally and locally. The examination of the EMW campaign has shown how these expectations are transferred to institutional discourse under multiple frames. The campaign acts as the starting line speaker of a marathon where participants are expected to reach the common goal by following the same route and rules. But the reality is different. The literature on urban climate governance has shown that cities encounter very different paths, obstacles and goals. This body of research has documented that sustainable cities face differences and limitations regarding issues as diverse as the institutional capacity, the interconnection between networks of actors, resources or public responsibility (Bache et al., 2015; Newell et al., 2015; Okereke et al., 2009).

It has been suggested that cities' discourses vindicate different paths to transit climate governance. Indeed, this is yet another look at discourse to disentangle the hidden or not so hidden ideas and values that frame policies in a specific city, mandate, society. But the contribution is believed to be relevant at a time where the expectations on cities are higher than ever. Now that cities have been placed at the centre of multilevel and multinetwork climate governance, it is more urgent than ever to elucidate what their discourse is saying about how they steer climate transitions. In the case of sustainable mobility, this research suggests that the governance framing reveals how cities' climate leadership discourses legitimise different governance modes by accommodating and reconfiguring climate governance promoted at the European level.

On the one hand, it is an expected finding since each city has urban models that configure their particular governance mode. It is also expected that each city promotes the governance mode that best suits its programmatic priorities by selecting a particular mix of

policies. But what the research intends to highlight is that the leadership attributed to cities in their expected central role as drivers of climate transitions is, at least, complex, heterogeneous and dynamic. Cities' leadership discourses should be more cautious and transparent or they could be actually masking lack of leadership and hindering climate transitions. The global climate debate is constantly reframed to shape the contending and differing roles, ideas, responsibilities and power of the various actors involved. Framing the climate debate as urban governance leadership has implications that need to be taken into account, specially concerning the relaxing expectations that this framing could bear on other key actors of global climate governance.

ENDNOTES

[1] All cities belong to types A1, A2 and B1 according to the criteria established in the State of Cities Report for the EU (European Commission—RWI 2010). The report groups cities into "city types" with the aim of providing a solid foundation to compare cities with similar basic structural characteristics. Type A cities are described as "principal metropolises" and are international and national centres that differ from other cities in size and economic agglomeration, and account for the largest number of patent applications per population and the largest share of new businesses. A1 cities represent the highest urban concentration of economic prosperity, as measured by GDP per head, and type A2 are large economic centres of national importance and/or capital cities. Type B cities (regional centres) are considerably smaller than the principal metropolises, but subtype B1 cities provide highly specialised services, particularly in the financial and business service sector, public administration, health and education.

[2] http://www.sketchengine.co.uk.

[3] Sketch Engine supports Catalan but not with full functionality.

[4] The EMW campaign is based on a partnership between the European Coordination (three networks of local authorities plus mobility and communication experts, including ICLEI—Local Governments for Sustainability—and Eurocities), the national coordinators (representatives from national ministries and agencies) and the European Commission.

REFERENCES

Bache, I., Bartle, I., Flinders, M., & Marsden, G. (2015). Blame games and climate change: Accountability, multi-level governance and carbon management. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, *17*(1), 64–88.

Bache, I., & Flinders, M. (2004). *Multi-level Governance*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/0199259259.001.0001

Bäckstrand, K., & Lövbrand, E. (2016). The road to Paris: Contending climate governance discourses in the post-Copenhagen era. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, *21*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2016.1150777

Baker, P. (2012). Acceptable bias? Using corpus linguistics methods with critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *9*(3), 247–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2012.688297

Banister, D. (2011). Cities, mobility and climate change. *Journal of Transport Geography*, *19*(6), 1538–1546. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2011.03.009

Bernauer, T., & Gampfer, R. (2013). Effects of civil society involvement on popular legitimacy of global environmental governance. *Global Environmental Change*, *23*(2), 439–449.

Betsill, M. M., & Bulkeley, H. (2006). Cities and the multilevel governance of global climate change. *Global Governance*, *12*(2), 141–159. https://doi.org/10.2307/27800607

Beveridge, R., & Koch, P. (2017). The post-political trap? Reflections on politics, agency and the city. *Urban Studies*, *54*(1), 31–43.

Boyd, E., & Juhola, S. (2014). Adaptive climate change governance for urban resilience. *Urban Studies*, *52*(7), 1234–1264. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098014527483

Bruun, E., & Givoni, M. (2015). Six research routes to steer transport policy. *Nature*, *523*, 29–32.

Bulkeley, H. (2010). Cities and the governing of climate Change. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, *35*(1), 229–253. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-072809-101747

Bulkeley, H. (2017). Cities and governance. In M. P. Sutto (Ed.), *Urban climate change crossroads* (pp. 29–38). London, UK: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315548906.

Bulkeley, H., & Betsill, M. (2005). Rethinking sustainable cities: Multilevel governance and the 'urban' politics of climate Change. *Environmental Politics*, *14*(1), 42–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/0964401042000310178

Carvalho, A. (2008). Media(ted) discourse and society. *Journalism Studies*, *9*(2), 161–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700701848162

Corfee-Morlot, J., Kamal-chaoui, L., Donovan, M. G., Cochran, I., Robert, A., Teasdale, P. J., … Change, C. (2009). *Cities, climate Change and multilevel governance*. (*OECD environment working papers No. 14*.) Paris: OECD Publishing.

Delicath, J. W., Elsenbeer, M. A., & Depoe, S. P. (2004). *Communication and public participation in environmental decision making*. Albany, UK: SUNY Press.

Dryzek, J. S. (2012). Paradigms and discourses. In *The Oxford handbook of international environmental law*. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199552153.013.0003.

Dunlap, R. E., & McCright, A. M. (2008). A widening gap: Republican and democratic views on climate Change. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, *50*(5), 26–35. https://doi.org/10.3200/ENVT.50.5.26-35

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fröhlich, J., & Knieling, J. (2013). Conceptualising Climate Change Governance. In J. Knieling & W. Leal Filho (Eds.), *Climate change governance* (pp. 9–26). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-4941.

Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, *95*(1), 1–37.

Habermas, J. (1987). *Teoria de la acción comunicativa* Racionalidad de la acción y racionalización social (Vol. 1). Madrid, Spain: Taurus.

Hart, P. S., & Nisbet, E. C. (2012). Boomerang effects in science communication: How motivated reasoning and identity cues amplify opinion polarization about climate mitigation policies. *Communication Research*, *39*(6), 701–723. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650211416646

Hodson, M., & Marvin, S. (2010). Can cities shape socio-technical transitions and how would we know if they were? *Research Policy*, *39*(4), 477–485.

Jänicke, M. (2015). Horizontal and vertical reinforcement in global climate governance. *Energies*, *8*(6), 5782–5799. https://doi.org/10.3390/en8065782

Jessop, B. (2016). Territory, politics, governance and multispatial metagovernance. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, *4*(1), 8–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2015.1123173

Juhola, S., Keskitalo, E. C. H., & Westerhoff, L. (2011). Understanding the framings of climate change adaptation across multiple scales of

governance in Europe. *Environmental Politics*, *20*(4), 445–463. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2011.589571

Knieling, J., & Leal Filho, W. (2013). *Climate change governance*, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.

Kooiman, J. (1993). *Modern governance: New government-society interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as governance*. London, UK: Sage.

Kooiman, J., Bavinck, M., Chuenpagdee, R., Mahon, R., & Pullin, R. (2008). Interactive governance and governability: An introduction. *The Journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies*, *7*(1), 1–11.

Lakoff, G. (2010). Why it matters how we frame the environment. *Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture*, *4*(1), 70–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524030903529749

Letnik, T., Luppino, G., Bardi, A., & Bo Zi Cnik, S. (2018). Review of policies and measures for sustainable and energy efficient urban transport. *Energy*, *163*, 245–257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.08.096

Mayntz, R. (1998). In (Ed.), *New challenges to governance theory*. Florence, Italy. European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre.

McCright, A. M., & Dunlap, R. E. (2011). The politicization of climate change and polarization in the American public's views of global warming, 2001-2010. *Sociological Quarterly*, *52*(2), 155–194. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2011.01198.x

Mueller, N., Rojas-Rueda, D., Khreis, H., Cirach, M., Andrés, D., Ballester, J., … Bartoll, X. (2020). Changing the urban design of cities for health: The superblock model Natalie. *Environment International*, *134*, 105–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.105132

Newell, P., Bulkeley, H., Turner, K., Shaw, C., Caney, S., Shove, E., & Pidgeon, N. (2015). Governance traps in climate change politics: Reframing the debate in terms of responsibilities and rights. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, *6*(6), 535–540. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.356

Nisbet, E. C., Hart, P. S., Myers, T., & Ellithorpe, M. (2013). Attitude Change in competitive framing environments? Open-/closed-mindedness, framing effects, and climate change. *Journal of Communication*, *63*(4), 766–785. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12040

Nisbet, M. C. (2009). Communicating climate Change: Why frames matter for public engagement. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, *51*(2), 12–23. https://doi.org/10.3200/ENVT.51.2.12-23

Okereke, C., Bulkeley, H., & Schroeder, H. (2009). Conceptualizing climate governance beyond the international regime. *Global Environmental Politics*, *9*(1), 58–78. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep.2009.9.1.58

Ostrom, E. (2010). A multi-scale approach to coping with climate Change and other collective action problems. *Solutions: For a Sustainable & Desirable Future*, *1*(2), 27–36.

Pahl-Wostl, C. (2015). Governance modes. In C. Pahl-Wostl (Ed.), *Water governance in the face of global change* (pp. 85–98). Cham, Switzerland: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21855-7_5.

Pepermans, Y., & Maeseele, P. (2014). Democratic debate and mediated discourses on climate Change: From consensus to De/politicization. *Environmental Communication*, *8*(2), 216–232.

Pierre, J. (2000). *Debating governance*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2000). Governance, politics and the state. In *Political analysis*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997). Understanding governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability. In *Public policy and management*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (2000). Governance and public administration. In J. Pierre (Ed.), *Debating governance*. (p. [xiii], 251). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Sassen, S. (2013). Does the City have speech? *Public Culture*, *25*(2), 209–221. https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-2020557

Schmidt, V. A. (2010). Taking ideas and discourse seriously: Explaining change through discursive institutionalism as the fourth 'new institutionalism'. *European Political Science Review*, *2*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1017/S175577390999021X

Sorensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2007). *Theories of democratic network governance*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2008.00751.x

Soret, A., Jimenez-Guerrero, P., & Baldasano, J. M. (2011). Comprehensive air quality planning for the Barcelona metropolitan area through traffic management. *Atmospheric Pollution Research*, *2*(3), 255–266. https://doi.org/10.5094/APR.2011.032

Stevenson, H., & Dryzek, J. S. (2012). The discursive democratisation of global climate governance. *Environmental Politics*, *21*(2), 189–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2012.651898

Stevenson, H., & Dryzek, J. S. (2013). *Democratizing Global Climate Governance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139208628

Swyngedouw, E. (2017). Unlocking the mind-trap: Politicising urban theory and practice. *Urban Studies*, *54*(1), 55–61.

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse Society*, *4*(2), 249–283.

How to cite this article:

Díaz-Pont J. (2021). Cities and the governance framing of climate change. Environmental Policy and Governance, 31: 18–30. https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1903