

Persuasive Techniques in Selected Newspaper Headlines: A Critical Stylistic Study

Assistant Instructor: Israa Faisal Abed

Al-Nahrain University- Continuing Education Center

Gmail: israa.faisal@nahrainuniv.edu.iq

اساليب الاقناع المستخدمة لمختارات من العناوين الصحفية : دراسة نقدية اسلوبية

مدرس مساعد : اسراء فيصل عبد جامعة النهرين - مركز التعليم المستمر

Abstract:

The current study examines the persuasive techniques used in selected newspaper headlines on the COVID-19 vaccine using a critical stylistic approach. Headlines have a significant effect in molding public views by employing certain linguistic structures and stylistic choices that correspond to ideological, political, or cultural goals. Using Jeffries' (2010) concept of critical stylistics, the current study evaluates ten headlines from prominent international newspapers. To identify the underlying ideological and persuasive techniques, the analysis utilizes tools such as naming and describing, implying and assuming, prioritizing, and presenting actions/events. The findings show that headlines utilize emotionally charged language, strong modality, and selective agency to convey urgency, assign blame, and elicit emotional reactions such as dread, optimism, or unity. For example, statements like "vaccine hesitancy threatens progress" highlight reluctance as a serious impediment, but others, like "India reaches record vaccination numbers," stress national success to instill confidence. The study also reveals the use of inclusion and exclusion tools to highlight or disguise specific actors and views, so changing public perceptions of vaccinations and their impact. By analyzing these linguistic choices, the study reveals how headlines may be used as both informational tools and effective persuasive techniques. The current study contributes to the emerging subject of critical stylistics by shedding light on how media discourse impacts attitudes and actions during public health crises. **Keywords: critical stylistics, persuasive techniques, newspaper headlines, COVID-19 vaccine, media discourse.**

المستخلص:

بحث هذه الدراسة في الأساليب الإقناعية المستخدمة في عناوين الصحف المختارة حول لقاح COVID-19 باستخدام نهج الأسلوبية النقدية. تلعب العناوين دورًا مهمًا في تشكيل وجهات نظر الجمهور من خلال توظيف تراكييب لغوية وخيارات أسلوبية تتماشى مع الأهداف الأيديولوجية أو السياسية أو الثقافية. بالاعتماد على مفهوم الأسلوبية النقدية لجيفريز (٢٠١٠)، تقوم الدراسة بتحليل عشرة عناوين من صحف دولية بارزة. وللكشف عن التقنيات الأيديولوجية والإقناعية الكامنة، يستخدم التحليل أدوات مثل التسمية والوصف، والتضمين والافتراض، وإعطاء الأولوية، وعرض الأفعال/الأحداث. تُظهر النتائج أن العناوين تستخدم لغة مشحونة عاطفيًا، وصيغًا دلالية قوية، وانتقائية في تحديد الفاعلين للتعبير عن الشعور بالإلحاح، وإلقاء اللوم، وإثارة ردود فعل عاطفية مثل الخوف أو التفاؤل أو الوحدة. فعلى سبيل المثال، تعكس عبارات مثل "التردد في أخذ اللقاح يهدد التقدم" التردد باعتباره عقبة خطيرة، في حين أن عبارات أخرى مثل "الهند تحقق أرقامًا قياسية في التطعيم" تركز على النجاح الوطني لتعزيز الثقة. كما تكشف الدراسة عن استخدام أدوات الإدماج والاستبعاد لتسليط الضوء على جهات فاعلة معينة أو التعتيم عليها، مما يؤدي إلى تغيير التصورات العامة حول اللقاحات وتأثيرها. ومن خلال تحليل هذه الاختيارات اللغوية، تكشف الدراسة كيف يمكن استخدام العناوين كأدوات إعلامية فعالة وتقنيات إقناعية مؤثرة. وتساهم الدراسة في مجال الأسلوبية النقدية الناشئ من خلال تسليط الضوء على كيفية تأثير الخطاب الإعلامي على المواقف والسلوكيات خلال الأزمات الصحية العامة

:Introduction

Newspaper headlines are masterfully composed texts that aim to grab readers' attention, frame the content, and affect audience perception. They are more than merely summaries of news pieces. Headlines are among the most noticeable and influential components of media discourse, and they have a significant influence on how news is viewed and consumed. Their ability to convey complex ideas in a few words is made possible by their language brevity and stylistic clarity, which can have a significant impact on readers' comprehension of events and concerns (Bell, 1991). The two main functions of headlines are "to inform" as well as "to persuade". They might draw attention to some sides of a tale while downplaying others by spotlighting particular parts of it. The publication's or its target audience's ideological position may be supported by this selective framing. For example, media language is never neutral, according to Fowler (1991); rather, it reflects and perpetuates society views. Word choice, grammar, and syntax are especially important in headlines because they encode implicit assumptions and direct interpretations. The persuasive effectiveness of headlines is even more important in times of crisis, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. During this time, vaccine-related headlines have served as a source of knowledge, reassurance, and, at times, controversy. They have been used to promote public health initiatives, address vaccine hesitancy, and combat disinformation. According to research, emotionally charged language, rhetorical devices, and stylistic tactics in headlines have a considerable impact on readers' attitudes toward health-related activities (Peters et al. 2014). Examining headlines with a critical stylistic perspective reveals how language is employed to create specific realities, emphasize certain storylines, and promote ideological positions. This method is especially important for examining how the media influences people's thoughts about COVID-19 vaccinations and their adoption.

The Significance of Exploring the Persuasive Techniques in Headlines

The exploration of persuasive tactics in headlines is critical for comprehending the way the media influences public opinion and behavior. Headlines are one of the most important components of news reporting because they influence how readers interpret the content and decide whether or not to engage with it. As Bell (1991) points out, headlines are designed to distill complex tales into brief, effective words, making them naturally persuasive. This persuasive nature is not coincidental, but rather an intentional linguistic and stylistic tactic used by media sources to gain attention and align with their ideological objectives. Throughout crucial times like the COVID-19 pandemic, public health headlines, especially those involving vaccines, have had a significant impact on cultural attitudes. Persuasive strategies contained in headlines, such as the use of emotionally charged language, selective framing, and prioritizing of specific narratives, can either increase public trust in vaccines or increase doubtfulness. According to Jeffries (2010), language in the media, particularly headlines, is a solid ideological instrument that shapes perceptions and reinforces prevailing narratives. The dangers are particularly serious during health crises, as people's compliance with standards is frequently dependent on reliable communication. Furthermore, understanding persuasive strategies in headlines promotes critical media literacy by allowing readers to recognize and examine how wording selections might influence views. Dor (2003) found that headlines operate as "relevance optimizers," guiding readers toward specific interpretations while eliminating alternate perspectives. Understanding these approaches enables audiences to critically assess information offered in headlines, resulting in more informed and autonomous decision-making.

:Objectives of the Study

1. Understanding Linguistic Persuasion in Media
2. Analyzing Ideological Constructs in Newspaper Headlines
3. Evaluating Media's Role in Public Health Communication
4. Enhancing Critical Awareness

:Literature Review

Newspapers have traditionally been seen as effective elements for molding the public's view, owing to their ability to frame news in ways that impact how events are perceived. Newspaper headlines and stories serve as persuasion means, affecting readers' perceptions of both current concerns and larger social ideologies (van Dijk, 1988). According to Bell (1991), in his book "The language of news media" newspaper headlines are more than merely a summary of news material; they are designed to capture readers' focus and drive interpretation. Headlines employ a variety of linguistic tactics, including word choice, modality, and framing, to elicit emotional reactions and encourage the reader to take a particular attitude. Furthermore, Richardson's book "Analyzing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis" (2007) focuses on that headlines employ the selection to highlight some views or personalities while ignoring others. This is obvious in research investigating discourse about politics, where headlines frequently reflect a certain framing of events by emphasizing certain

perspectives while omitting others. The framing effect, in which the presentation of a story influences its interpretation, is an important persuasive approach in news reporting. For example, a headline that characterizes a politician as "championing" a new program conveys a favorable judgment, but one that refers to the same politician as "pushing through" the measure implies compulsion or dispute. Peters et al. (2014) write a research on health issues in discourse has looked into how newspapers utilize persuasion to affect behaviors relating to health. health-related news items, particularly those concerning vaccinations, commonly utilize headlines that invoke insecurity and a sense of urgency in order to affect the public's choices. This type of language, paired with certain rhetorical methods, influences public views and behaviors, hence impacting the entire response to public health problems. As noted by Caple and Bednarek (2016), headlines commonly use dramatic language or empathetic signals to generate a feeling of priority or significance, which influences the way readers respond to the published content. In this respect, headlines are forceful ideological instruments that influence readers' views of events, players, and concerns. For example, in conversations about equality or issues of politics, headlines frequently utilize certain verbs and adjectives to create a positive or negative portrayal regarding individuals or organizations. The wording employed in these headlines is intended not just to clarify, but also to encourage readers to take a certain viewpoint on the subjects that are being discussed. According to Wahl-Jorgensen (2020), emotionally charged headlines—whether they elicit fear, joy, fury, or sympathy—are more attention-grabbing and can gently alter readers' perceptions about the subjects being reported. This is particularly noticeable throughout life-threatening illnesses, when the urgency and societal significance of the issue require imposing emotional appeals.

Critical Stylistics as a Theoretical Framework

Lesley Jeffries (2010) proposed Critical Stylistics, which is a systematic way to studying how texts, particularly media discourse, utilize language techniques to deliver information and agenda. This paradigm blends stylistics' thorough textual analysis with Critical Discourse Analysis's larger sociopolitical issues, providing methods for detecting hidden conceptual signals inherent in language. In contrast to conventional stylistics, which constantly concentrates on literary texts, Critical Stylistics examines non-literary materials such as political monologues, advertisements, and political monologues. Jeffries believes that language is not neutral, but rather an active constructor of social reality. This supports Fowler's (1991) finding that media language reflects and promotes ideological beliefs. Critical Stylistics allows academics to carefully analyze how language choices impact readers' perceptions and sentiments. Jeffries (2010) proposes a range of textual and abstract tools that serve as the foundation for Critical Stylistics. These tools show the ideological foundations of texts:

1. Naming and describing

It is an effective linguistic strategy that examines how items, events, and individuals are named and stated in texts. This tool demonstrates how name assemblies may deliberately transmit ideologies, beliefs, and opinions. The use of nouns and modifiers formulates distinct descriptions of entities or occurrences.

2. Representing Actions/Events/States

Grammar-based patterns, notably the usage of active vs passive voice, influence how agency and responsibility are expressed.

3. Equating

and

contrasting

This tool develops associations of "similarity or difference", frequently resulting in asymmetry.

4. Prioritizing.

The sequence of details in a text influences whether it is "foregrounded or backgrounded"

5. Implying

and

Assuming

Many writings use "implicit meanings or presuppositions" to deliver their subject matter.

6. Negating

Negation involves highlighting or dismissing specific notions.

7. Exemplifying

and Enumerating

The strategic application of lists or examples highlights certain facets of a topic.

Data Collections:

The current study examines ten English-language newspaper headlines on the COVID-19 vaccine, taken from well-known English-language newspapers including "The New York Times, The Guardian, BBC News, The Washington Post, and The Times of India". The choice concentrates on how critical stylistic tools which , employed as persuasive techniques are used to affect the public's view towards the issue of vaccination. Headlines were picked as the main source of data because they capture significant ideologies in a brief and

convincing form, presenting them perfectly for a critical stylistic evaluation. The headlines were published from 2020 to 2022, a time highlighted by massive international attention on COVID-19 vaccine.

The Used Approach:

To examine the selected newspaper headlines, the current study uses an approach based on mixed methods that combines "quantitative and qualitative" methodologies. The combination of "quantitative and qualitative" methodologies enables a thorough investigation of persuasive strategies, handling both observable patterns and broader context-dependent implications.

:Data Analysis

1. "COVID-19: Thousands of people in UK vaccinated as rollout begins" (BBC News, 2020).

The headline names "COVID-19" as the main topic, placing the content within the context of the global pandemic. The phrase "thousands of people" is ambiguous but strategically chosen to imply considerable and powerful behavior. This "unspecified quantifier" prevents the specificity and can indicate common development or achievement. In this respect, the naming tool is employed in this headline. Concerning the implication tool, Using the phrase "people in the UK" emphasizes a national viewpoint, instilling a sense of local pride or duty. The term "vaccinated" is neutral yet action-oriented, stressing beneficial medical intervention. The phrase "rollout" refers to the coordinated, large-scale dissemination of vaccinations, whereas "begins" conveys a feeling of urgency and progression. The headline highlights the encouraging news of vaccination efforts, with "thousands of people in the UK vaccinated." This framework emphasizes accomplishment and achievement, aiming to increase public faith in the vaccine. It ignores logistical obstacles, vaccination reluctance, and other negative factors, presenting a positive narrative. The headline implies that the vaccine deployment is an important and noteworthy event. The term "thousands" indicates widespread engagement, although the actual quantity is not mentioned. The underlying assumption is that the rollout is well-organized and effective, as demonstrated by the phrase "rollout begins," which implies that the process is proceeding smoothly. The action "vaccinated" is highlighted in the title, implying that it has been done and is still in progress. However, the agency (that is vaccinating) is not mentioned, instead focussing on the beneficiaries ("thousands of people in the UK"). The lack of a specific actor (e.g., healthcare experts or the government) draws emphasis on the accomplishment rather than the individuals responsible. There is an implicit difference between the pre-rollout phase (implied to be passive) and the present phase ("rollout begins"), indicating a movement toward activity and progress. The title connects "thousands" with success, implying that the figure is significant and indicative of efficient vaccination administration. The vaccine's reach is demonstrated with the quantifier "thousands." Despite being ambiguous, it serves as an example of advancement, enabling readers to deduce the scope of the campaign without supplying precise information. Nothing is specifically negate in the title, but the lack of details about difficulties (such as logistical problems or vaccination reluctance) subtly downplays or dismisses these worries in favor of an upbeat story. The headline highlights the advancements made in UK vaccination campaigns in an optimistic and upbeat manner. By emphasizing the number of participants ("thousands") and the rollout's beginning, it quietly fosters trust in the immunization program. A one-sided, success-oriented viewpoint is reinforced when obstacles or restrictions are left out. By emphasizing the beneficiaries of the immunization and leaving out the agents (healthcare professionals or authorities), the focus is shifted from the method to the result. The analysis here demonstrates how the headline, through its linguistic choices, generates a narrative of progress and success that is consistent with ideological aims of increasing public belief in immunization programs.

2. "Johnson & Johnson COVID vaccine faces scrutiny over side effects" (BBC News, 2021). By examining this headline using Jeffries' (2010) critical stylistics model, we may identify persuasive techniques inherent in the language, such as naming, describing, implying, and prioritizing. This analysis will demonstrate how these stylistic decisions help to construct a certain narrative and underlying ideology. The title opens by naming "Johnson & Johnson," a well-known pharmaceutical business. The use of a well-known brand lends authority and weight to the remark, portraying the problem as a major public concern owing to the company's repute. This option positions the vaccination in a specific business and global context, emphasizing the company's responsibilities. The word "COVID vaccine" is especially important since it quickly connects the issue to the current epidemic and the worldwide immunization effort. The title, "COVID vaccine," resonates with an issue that is extremely topical, emotionally charged, and significant to a large audience. The inclusion of the virus's name links the vaccine directly to the epidemic, highlighting the greater public health context in which it is being scrutinized. The word "faces scrutiny" implies active, continuing inspection or criticism. "Scrutiny" has a negative connotation, implying that the vaccination is being critically reviewed or investigated,

particularly in terms of safety and efficacy. This statement introduces an evaluative component, implying that the vaccination is susceptible to public or government scrutiny. The addition of "overside effects" elaborates on the reason for the inspection. By emphasizing "side effects," the title emphasizes the vaccine's possible damage or danger. The term "side effects" suggests that the vaccination may have negative repercussions, prompting readers to consider the potential drawbacks. This option shifts the narrative to the vaccine's possible hazards rather than its advantages, which may induce dread or doubt in the audience. The title prioritizes "scrutiny over side effects" rather than the vaccine's advantages or efficacy. The headline's structure indicates that the major problem at hand is possible hazards and safety issues, diverting public attention away from the larger aim of fighting COVID-19 through vaccination. This prioritizing indicates a critical viewpoint, emphasizing potential hazards above the vaccine's protective or lifesaving benefits. Furthermore, by putting "scrutiny" in the midst of the headline, the activity of critical evaluation is sidelined, leaving the prospective unfavorable assessment as the target audience's primary emphasis. The word "over side effects" serves as a clarification, underlining concerns about the vaccine's safety. The headline assumes that the reader is already aware of the general importance of the COVID-19 vaccine, which is why it does not need to explain the vaccine's purpose or significance. It also assumes a shared understanding that side effects are a source of concern and warrant attention. These assumptions guide the reader to view the scrutiny as legitimate and relevant. The phrase "faces scrutiny" means that the vaccination is now under major public or scientific study. The use of the word "scrutiny" implies that there is something incorrect or suspicious about the vaccination. It suggests that the inspection is not a casual observation, but rather a thorough study, potentially conducted by regulatory officials or the media. This implies danger or dispute. Besides, the title implies that the reader will instantly associate the vaccination with its possible hazards, framing the debate around damage rather than benefit. This assumption casts the vaccination in a bad light, which makes it look disputed or under danger. The headline depicts the incident of scrutiny as a situation that the vaccine is experiencing in real time. The word "faces scrutiny" implies a continuous or forthcoming incident, portraying the vaccination as being actively reviewed or questioned. This dynamic movement creates a feeling of immediacy in the headline, forcing readers to ponder the safety of the vaccine and potential hazards. The usage of the phrase "over side effects" portrays the inquiry as being primarily focused on bad outcomes linked with the vaccination. This portrayal emphasizes the vaccine's disadvantages by focusing on the negative consequences, a framing that may heighten the reader's doubts about the vaccine's safety. The headline implies a contradiction between the vaccine's intended public health advantages and the alleged negative consequences revealed by the inquiry. By emphasizing "side effects," the headline contrasts the vaccine's intended preventive function with the potential hazards connected with its usage. The contrast between the vaccine's desirable purpose (combating COVID-19) and its bad characteristics (side effects and scrutiny) produces stress which may lead readers to be more cautious or dubious. Furthermore, the usage of "Johnson & Johnson" rather than just "the vaccine" distinguishes this specific vaccine from others in the global immunization campaign. The headline implies that, while other vaccinations may not be subject to such scrutiny, this one is, and so the reader is urged to consider this specific vaccine with greater mistrust. The headline prevents any discussion of the vaccine's success or usefulness in combating COVID-19. Focusing simply on the scrutiny and potential adverse effects ignores the vaccine's larger advantages or positive consequences in the battle against the epidemic. This selective framing contributes to a narrative based on potential harm and skepticism, giving the audience the feeling that the vaccination is more troublesome than beneficial. The decision to focus on "side effects" ignores other potential positive news about the vaccine, such as its effective distribution or the number of lives saved by vaccination efforts. Using Jeffries' (2010) critical stylistics paradigm, the headline "Johnson & Johnson COVID vaccine faces scrutiny over side effects" demonstrates the language choices that use persuasive strategies. The title influences the narrative by emphasizing the vaccine's possible hazards and the scrutiny it faces. By emphasizing "side effects" and "scrutiny," the title indirectly presents the vaccination in a negative light, implying that it is troublesome and raising safety concerns. This research reveals how stylistic aspects in headlines educate and impact popular views and beliefs, portraying the vaccination as both a health solution and a cause of debate.

“COVID-19 vaccine: What you need to know about the new mandates” (New York Times, 2021).

The headline opens with the clear mention of "COVID-19 vaccine," identifying the article's key subject. This approach establishes the vaccination as a relevant and timely issue, quickly drawing the reader's attention. The phrase has a neutral to positive meaning, emphasizing the vaccine's usefulness in combating the epidemic. The term "new mandates" provides a level of clarity by noting recent regulatory or policy changes. The term

"mandates" connotes power and duty, implying government-enforced immunization laws. While the descriptor "new" highlights the regulations' timeliness and relevance, it also indicates possible debate or change, which piques people's interest. The phrase "What you need to know" in the headline emphasizes the presentation of critical information to the reader. This statement conveys utility and relevance, implying that the article includes vital information for understanding the ramifications of the new regulations. By emphasizing the reader's informational demands, the headline portrays itself as a useful and authoritative source. The emphasis on "new mandates" elevates legislative developments above other parts of the vaccination debate, such as scientific advances, public attitude, or vaccine accessibility. This emphasis indicates an effort to educate readers about government activities and their possible consequences. The headline includes many assumptions:

1. Mandates are essential. By stressing "new mandates," the title implies that these rules are significant and need attention from the public.

2. Readers require knowledge: The phrase "What you need to know" implies that readers are either uneducated or underinformed about these mandates. This generates a sense of urgency, which encourages readers to connect with the material.

3. Mandates pertain to COVID-19 vaccines: The headline presupposes a direct and exclusive relationship between the requirements and the vaccine campaign, leaving out broader public health policy or other pandemic-related actions.

The "new mandates" are the focal point of the headline, with the COVID-19 vaccination serving as the backdrop or trigger. The phrase "What you need to know" implies that the directives are active and important, necessitating the reader's comprehension and possible compliance. However, the headline does not explain the nature of these obligations (for example, who they impact or what they demand), generating ambiguity and drawing readers into the story for clarity. While the headline may not openly utilize contrasting language, it does establish an implied distinction between the educated and the uninformed. By providing information on "what you need to know," the piece serves as a link between the two groups, appealing to readers' need for awareness and control in the face of shifting demands. The emphasis on "new mandates" also distinguishes the current situation from earlier policies or norms, implying a shift or evolution in the COVID-19 reaction. This difference gently emphasizes the pandemic's changing nature and attendant concerns. The headline negates other frames of the vaccine story, such as the scientific or human aspects of immunization. It focuses on the administrative and regulatory components of the COVID-19 vaccination rather than its effectiveness, safety, or public image. This limited emphasis simplifies the larger vaccination discourse by diverting attention away from potentially controversial issues concerning vaccine reluctance, access, or ethical concerns. Using Jeffries' (2010) paradigm of critical stylistics, the headline "COVID-19 vaccine: What you need to know about the new mandates" demonstrates how language and stylistic choices contribute to a convincing narrative. By naming and defining the COVID-19 vaccine and new rules, stressing public awareness, and indicating the relevance of the demands, the headline molds readers' opinions and accords with an ideology that values compliance and institutional authority. This research highlights the ability of headlines to shape public conversation by framing facts in ways that support various agendas and views.

3. "U.S. vaccine mandates: A step forward in the fight against COVID-19" (Reuters, 2021). The headline "U.S. Vaccine Mandates" refers to the principal issue. This phrase relates specifically to government-imposed requirements for COVID-19 immunization. The term "mandates" is neutral yet authoritative, stressing policy enforcement. While the term does not convey overt judgment, it does establish a serious tone that indicates institutional authority. The term "a step forward" frames the mandates positively, implying development and betterment. This descriptive choice reveals a purposeful ideological position, presenting the regulations as both essential and desirable. The term "in the fight against COVID-19" places the regulations within a larger global health narrative, portraying them as part of a continuous struggle against the epidemic. The headline emphasizes the progressive nature of vaccination requirements by using the phrase "a step forward." This statement appears in the middle of the headline, emphasizing progress and accomplishment while associating the mandates with good societal development. Any opposing viewpoints, such as worries about personal liberties, vaccination reluctance, or enforcement issues, are eliminated. This selective emphasis emphasizes the perceived benefits of the regulations while omitting possible issues, influencing the reader's impression of the topic. The headline argues that vaccination requirements are both essential and effective approaches for fighting COVID-19. By framing the mandates as "a step forward," it implies that they are a rational and positive move forward in the battle against the epidemic. The title also suggests that everyone agrees on the significance of this "fight,"

presenting COVID-19 as a shared adversary that justifies such actions. It implicitly presents the US government as proactive and accountable. The headline links vaccination requirements with progress, referring to them as "a step forward." This creates a stark contrast between the present and the past, implying that the lack of requirements was a less successful or stagnant era in combating the epidemic. The implied contrast portrays the mandates as a watershed moment, emphasizing their significance and urgency. Although the headline does not provide specific details or statistics, the phrase "a step forward" exemplifies progress and improvement in combating COVID-19. The lack of numerical data or specifics allows the headline to generalize its message, appealing to a broader audience and focusing on the overall narrative rather than measurable outcomes. While the headline does not expressly negate any assertions, it does imply rule out any counterarguments or disputes regarding vaccination requirements. Individual rights, opposition to mandates, and practical obstacles are pushed to the background, resulting in a one-sided narrative that associates mandates with development and public health. By removing these viewpoints, the title denies their relevance or significance in this context. Using Jeffries' (2010) critical stylistics approach, the title "U.S Vaccine Mandates: A Step Forward in the Fight Against COVID-19" displays a skillfully designed narrative emphasizing progress, collective action, and accountability. The headline depicts vaccination requirements as critical steps in battling the epidemic by identifying and explaining them, prioritizing and suggesting. The headline promotes public health programs and encourages faith in government action by emphasizing positive features and putting possible conflicts in the background. This study emphasizes the importance of language choices in molding public discourse and furthering ideological goals.

"Vaccine hesitancy is a global issue: How countries are combating misinformation" (Reuters, 2021).

The headline opens with "Vaccine hesitancy," which refers to a particular phenomena implying reluctance or unwillingness to vaccinate despite vaccine availability. The word has a negative connotation, portraying reluctance as a problem to be solved. Describing it as a "global issue" emphasizes its significance, implying broad and pressing concern. This categorization makes the problem global, instilling a sense of communal duty while implicitly ignoring specific circumstances or variances in vaccination reluctance. The second section of the headline, "How Countries Are Combating Misinformation," focuses on action. The word "combating" provides a militaristic image, equating attempts to fight disinformation with a battle. This framing portrays urgency and resolve, depicting countries as active participants in resolving the situation. The use of "misinformation" as a specified target emphasizes the role of inaccurate or misleading information in prolonging vaccination reluctance, shifting the emphasis to external forces rather than internal social or systemic issues. The headline emphasizes the concept that vaccination reluctance is a worldwide issue, above individual or regional experiences. By noting that governments are "combating misinformation," it indicates proactive actions being done to solve the problem. This prioritizing presents the problem as one that can be solved by action, concentrating emphasis on solutions rather than the root reasons of vaccination hesitancy, such as distrust in governments or historical disparities in healthcare systems. The headline's structure also indirectly positions vaccination reluctance as the major problem and misinformation as the secondary issue. However, it implies a causal relationship, indicating that misinformation is a major cause of vaccination reluctance. The headline suggests

- a few assumptions:
1. Vaccine reluctance is problematic: By referring to it as a "global issue," the title implies that vaccine hesitancy is generally harmful and requires immediate action.
 2. disinformation is the underlying cause: The phrase "combating misinformation" implies that misinformation is a major factor to vaccination reluctance, overshadowing other possible explanations such as institutional hurdles or real medical concerns.
 3. Countries are actively tackling the issue: The use of the present continuous tense in "are combating" implies that governments are taking meaningful actions to alleviate the problem.

The headline depicts vaccination reluctance and disinformation as interrelated processes in which nations actively intervene. The word "combating" suggests a continual, forceful endeavor, which is consistent with the urgency and severity implied by the phrase "global issue." The depiction of countries as actors implies a level of governmental accountability and agency, emphasizing institutional efforts above individual or community-led initiatives. The headline connects vaccination reluctance with a worldwide disaster by referring to it as a "global issue." This wide perspective contrasts with local or individual examples of reluctance, implying that the issue transcends geographical and cultural bounds. Furthermore, it compares governments' activities (combating disinformation) with the problem itself, resulting in a contradiction between those actively addressing the issue

and the misinformation seen to be the major cause. While the headline highlights misinformation as the primary barrier to vaccination uptake, it indirectly ignores other variables that contribute to vaccine reluctance. Historical distrust of healthcare institutions, religious or cultural views, and socioeconomic impediments are not present. By eliminating these causes, the headline simplifies the story, emphasizing misinformation as the primary reason and promoting the belief that resolving it is sufficient to overcome reluctance. Using Jeffries' (2010) critical stylistics approach, the headline "Vaccine hesitancy is a global issue: How countries are combating misinformation" displays a well-crafted narrative that emphasizes urgency, action, and institutional authority. The title depicts vaccination hesitancy as a worldwide problem caused by misinformation, positioning countries as active players in fixing it. By emphasizing certain parts of the issue while ignoring others, the headline simplifies a complicated situation, directing public conversation in a way that matches with institutional ideology and supports belief in global health policies.

4. "Europe's vaccine rollout: Why some countries are struggling to vaccinate" (Reuters, 2021).

The headline begins with "Europe's vaccine rollout," stating the main issue and placing the conversation regionally and culturally. The phrase "rollout" refers to a planned, large-scale implementation, implying a degree of order and development. However, it also conjures up images of a logistical procedure that may face roadblocks, laying the groundwork for the critical tone presented in the second half of the title. The word "some countries" offers information while remaining ambiguous, avoiding direct references to individual states. This decision permits the headline to generalize the issue while avoiding alienating individual readers. The phrase "struggling" is particularly noteworthy since it describes the immunization procedure in some nations as difficult or inefficient. This negative assessment leads the reader to perceive these countries' efforts as problematic or inadequate, in contrast to a suggested benchmark of success. The headline format stresses the problem above progress. While "Europe's vaccine rollout" provides a general framework, the subordinate phrase "Why some countries are struggling to vaccinate" focuses on obstacles and weaknesses. This emphasis on difficulty alters the narrative from a celebration of accomplishments to a condemnation of failures, stressing challenges over successes. The headline emphasizes "why" as the major topic, implying that understanding these difficulties is critical, prompting the reader to investigate causes and consequences. This emphasis fosters a problem-solution framing, in which vaccine problems are portrayed as concerns that must be analyzed and resolved. The headline embeds several assumptions that shape the reader's interpretation:

1. Struggles exist in Europe's vaccine rollout: The use of "struggling" assumes that some countries face significant difficulties, framing the rollout as uneven and problematic.
2. Vaccination is a critical goal: By focusing on "struggling to vaccinate," the headline assumes that widespread vaccination is an urgent and necessary objective.
3. Explanations are needed: The inclusion of "why" implies that the struggles are unexpected or require justification, suggesting an underlying critique of these countries' preparedness or policies.

The term "are struggling to vaccinate" in the headline suggests that the vaccination procedure is an active, continuing endeavor. This usage of the present continuous tense emphasizes immediacy and dynamism, suggesting that these issues have not been settled but continue in real time. The absence of specified actors (e.g., governments or institutions) results in a passive construction, focusing emphasis on the struggles themselves rather than those in charge of resolving them. Furthermore, the word "vaccine rollout" portrays vaccination as a methodical procedure, but the juxtaposition with "struggling to vaccinate" creates a contradiction between goal and execution. This comparison discreetly undermines the efficiency or competence of the existing systems. The headline indirectly distinguishes between "struggling" and "non-struggling" nations in Europe. This contrast frames the former group as outliers or exceptions, stressing their perceived failings in comparison to an implicit success standard. By not mentioning individual nations, the title generalizes the troubles, enabling readers to see them as symptoms of larger systemic problems rather than isolated instances. The headline undermines any notions of success or homogeneity in Europe's vaccination deployment. It draws attention away from favorable accomplishments, such as high immunization rates in certain nations, and instead emphasizes discrepancies and obstacles. This absence generates a selective narrative that emphasizes criticism over joy, portraying Europe's immunization efforts as inconsistent and weak. Using Jeffries' (2010) concept of critical stylistics, the title "Europe's vaccine rollout: Why some countries are struggling to vaccinate" exemplifies how language and stylistic choices shape a critical narrative. The headline portrays Europe's immunization efforts as inconsistent and difficult by stating and explaining issues, stressing problems, and indicating the need for explanations. By depicting activities as continuing and contrasting

successful and failing countries, it draws attention to inequities and problems, influencing public conversation on responsibility and progress. This approach emphasizes the importance of headlines in shaping perceptions and promoting certain ideological positions.

5. **"The COVID-19 vaccine: Public health measures and the role of the pharmaceutical industry"** (Reuters, 2021). The headline opens with "The COVID-19 vaccine," a clear allusion to the subject of the story. The usage of "The" here serves as a definite article, indicating that the headline is referring to a specific and well-known vaccine: the one created to prevent the COVID-19 epidemic. This framing assumes that the audience is already familiar with the vaccination, presenting it as a well accepted public health instrument. The word "COVID-19 vaccine" is an objective description, but it also conveys a feeling of urgency and importance given the pandemic's worldwide scope. The second portion of the headline contains two components: "public health measures" and "the role of the pharmaceutical industry." These phrases give further context and information about the vaccine's larger effects. "Public health measures" imply a systematic and structured approach to pandemic management. The phrase "measures" implies that there are deliberate activities being done to limit the virus's impacts, which frequently include public vaccination programs, social separation, and mask requirements. It portrays the vaccination as part of a bigger public health strategy. The second component, "the role of the pharmaceutical industry," offers a fresh viewpoint by emphasizing private-sector engagement in vaccine research, distribution, and promotion. The phrase "role" positions the pharmaceutical business as a vital actor in the pandemic response, recognizing its obligation to provide solutions. However, this word can also convey an underlying sense of influence and authority, implying that the pharmaceutical sector actively shapes the public health environment. The format of the headline brings "The COVID-19 vaccine" at the forefront, emphasizing its essential relevance in the conversation. By putting the vaccination first, the headline establishes it as the main topic, with the other two components ("public health measures" and "the role of the pharmaceutical industry") explaining its background and repercussions. The prioritizing of "public health measures" above "the role of the pharmaceutical industry" suggests a conceptual bias. Public health initiatives are positioned as part of a bigger, more collaborative plan, with the pharmaceutical sector serving as a contributing component. This sequence may indicate that the vaccine's development and distribution are largely viewed as part of a global health program, with the private sector playing a supporting role. The order in which the components are presented contributes to the idea that the vaccination is primarily a public health intervention, with the pharmaceutical sector playing a secondary but important role. The headline indicates that both "public health measures" and "the role of the pharmaceutical industry" are critical components of the vaccine's efficacy. It implies that the vaccination cannot be evaluated in isolation, but rather as part of a larger reaction to the epidemic. This suggestion prompts the reader to evaluate the link between government-led public health initiatives and pharmaceutical firms' contributions. Additionally, the phrase "the role of the pharmaceutical industry" implies that the reader will accept the notion that pharmaceutical corporations play an important role in public health. While it is worded neutrally, the term "role" may imply a level of trust in the pharmaceutical industry's conduct. It does not cast doubt on these firms' impact, instead presenting them as responsible participants in the pandemic response. The headline depicts the vaccination as both a "public health measure" and something influenced by the "role of the pharmaceutical industry." The word "public health measures" frames the vaccination as part of a larger reaction, stressing the social and community dimensions of the vaccine deployment. It emphasizes the importance of public health officials in ensuring that vaccines are provided and administered to the public in a timely and effective way. On the other side, "the role of the pharmaceutical industry" portrays the industry as a key player in the vaccine's success. This statement implies that pharmaceutical firms are not only neutral players, but important contributors to the solution. The word "role" highlights the pharmaceutical firms' involvement in the process, influencing the reader's opinion of the vaccine as the result of both public health initiatives and private sector innovation. A critical stylistic examination of the headline "The COVID-19 vaccine: Public health measures and the role of the pharmaceutical industry" demonstrates how language shapes perceptions and influences knowledge. By analyzing the linguistic choices, such as naming, prioritizing, insinuating, and expressing actions/events, the headline frames the vaccination as a critical instrument in the worldwide response to COVID-19, with public health measures and pharmaceutical business engagement collaborating. This framing emphasizes the interdependence of government and corporate initiatives, creating the impression that the vaccination is both a public health requirement and the result of private-sector partnership. The ideological implications of this presentation highlight the necessity of both governmental and private sector participation in tackling global health concerns.

“The global vaccination race: Who’s winning the battle against COVID-19?” (The Guardian, 2021). The headline uses the term "The global vaccination race" as the main focus, referring to the multinational effort to distribute and deliver vaccines as a "race." The phrase "race" implies competitiveness and urgency, presenting vaccine distribution as a contest in which nations compete for victory. This choice of terminology conveys a feeling of competitiveness and progress, implying that vaccine success or failure is measured and substantial. The description “the battle against COVID-19” metaphorically positions the pandemic as an adversary to be fought. This militaristic language draws on war-like imagery, presenting vaccination efforts as a life-or-death struggle. The use of emotionally charged terms like “race” and “battle” creates a narrative of high stakes, emphasizing the gravity of the situation and the importance of collective action. The headline emphasizes the competitive character of worldwide immunization efforts by asking the question "Who's Winning?" This rhetorical question implies that vaccine success is quantitative and that there are clear leaders and laggards. The headline ignores other dimensions of vaccination distribution, such as equality, ethical issues, and public health results, in favor of an emphasis on competitiveness. The title accords with an ideological viewpoint that portrays vaccination as a yardstick of national or institutional excellence by emphasizing the "winners" and "losers." The headline indicates that vaccination progress may be tracked and compared between countries, giving the impression that certain countries thrive while others lag behind. The expression "winning the battle" implies that vaccine success is the major sign of efficacy in eradicating COVID-19. It also believes that worldwide vaccination efforts are essentially competitive rather than collaborative, ruling out the prospect of unity in combating the epidemic. The term "race" in the headline refers to immunization efforts as an active, continuing event. This framing portrays countries as active players in a dynamic process, stressing urgency and progress. The phrase "battle" depicts the pandemic as a dangerous opponent, emphasizing that vaccination is the most important step in fighting it. These images weave a story of global growth, struggle, and resolve, imbuing the vaccine campaign with heroic and aspirational aspects. The headline clearly distinguishes between countries that are "winning" and those who are not. Using a competitive metaphor, it compares vaccination progress to victory in a race or combat, promoting a binary perspective of success and failure. This equivalency simplifies a complicated global health issue by emphasizing quantitative measures (e.g., doses provided, population coverage) while ignoring qualitative factors such as vaccination reluctance, infrastructural constraints, and access discrepancies. The headline indirectly dismisses opinions that question the competitive nature of immunization initiatives. For example, it ignores collaborative projects like COVAX, which seek to promote equal vaccination delivery across nations. By emphasizing "winning," the title minimizes the ethical and practical problems of global immunization, including supply shortages or vaccine nationalism. Using Jeffries' (2010) critical stylistics paradigm, the title "The global vaccination race: Who's winning the battle against COVID-19?" exemplifies how language choices embed beliefs and shape public debate. The headline creates a competitive narrative by identifying, ranking, and insinuating, while also highlighting collaborative efforts and ethical issues. This investigation emphasizes the importance of headlines in molding public opinions, demonstrating how language can be used to persuade and perpetuate ideologies.

6. **“Biden’s vaccine push: Federal mandates and the challenge of convincing Americans”** (The Guardian, 2021). The first aspect of the headline, "Biden's vaccine push," quickly identifies the topic as President Joe Biden's endeavor. The possessive word "Biden's" personalizes the strategy, making it appear that the immunization push is inextricably linked to his leadership. This decision places the onus on Biden, portraying him as the primary driver of this public health initiative. The adjective "push" conveys a feeling of active effort and tenacity, maybe indicating a degree of pressure or force in his approach. By employing the word "push," the title implies that the campaign is an active undertaking, maybe with a feeling of urgency or strong persuasion. The phrase "federal mandates" describes the government's acts as authoritative and mandatory. The term "federal" refers to the national level of government, implying that these mandates are issued by the country's top authorities. This word positions the issue as a policy topic, emphasizing the state's involvement in establishing the vaccine environment. The term "mandates" conveys a sense of duty and legal enforcement, emphasizing the instructions' non-negotiable character, which may elicit sentiments ranging from acceptance to opposition, depending on the reader's views on government intrusion. The latter part of the headline, “the challenge of convincing Americans,” adds an element of difficulty and struggle. The term “challenge” implies that there are significant obstacles to be overcome in persuading the American public to accept the vaccine. This word choice suggests that Biden’s task is not straightforward or easy, and it may frame the issue as a broader societal struggle rather than a simple policy implementation. The phrase “convincing Americans” directs attention to the people

of the United States as the target of persuasion. This places the focus on the relationship between the government and the public, specifically on the challenge of altering people's beliefs or behaviors regarding vaccination. The headline's structure puts "Biden's vaccine push" and "Federal mandates" ahead of the "challenge of convincing Americans." The early emphasis on Biden's active leadership and the government's legal power elevates the vaccination rollout's political and authoritative components. The issue of persuasion is portrayed secondary, indicating that, while influencing the public is important, the major focus is on the political and institutional factors at work. This priority makes Biden's vaccination push the key issue, linking the story with political power and government involvement. The headline, which leads with "Biden's vaccine push" and "Federal mandates," implies that the emphasis is on top-down action and policymaking. Only after outlining the government's part does the headline shift to the public's reaction, framing the task of persuasion as a secondary but nonetheless significant aspect. The headline suggests that "convincing Americans" is a difficult undertaking, implying considerable skepticism or opposition to the vaccination. The word "challenge" emphasizes that the process of persuading the public is not simple, and its placement at the end of the headline shows that the problem is mostly about overcoming resistance or opposition. Likewise, the headline implies that anyone who reads knows the importance of "federal mandates" in the context of the epidemic. This assumption mirrors the larger context of the COVID-19 epidemic, in which government intervention in the form of mandates, laws, and recommendations has become an important part of public debate. The term "convincing Americans" indicates that readers are aware that vaccination hesitation or opposition is a well-known and contested subject in the United States, implying an assumption about public attitude. The headline represents the action of "convincing" as a challenge or struggle, using the noun "challenge" to frame it as something that requires effort to overcome. This representation frames the act of persuasion as difficult, implying that a significant proportion of Americans are resistant to the idea of receiving the vaccine. The phrase "Biden's vaccine push" represents the action as something the president is actively undertaking, suggesting a determined effort on his part to implement vaccination measures despite potential difficulties. The term "federal mandates" refers to government enforcement as a crucial component of the immunization campaign. It highlights the government's ability to implement regulations, demonstrating an authoritative approach to addressing vaccination reluctance. This terminology also emphasizes the conflict between public health policy and individual liberties, presenting the issue in terms of government control vs human liberty. The headline indirectly compares "Biden's vaccine push" with popular opposition, implying a potential confrontation between government power and personal choice. The term "challenge" emphasizes that the fight is about more than simply deploying the vaccination; it is also about overcoming resistance from individuals who may oppose the mandate or the vaccine itself. The contrast between top-down government action and bottom-up popular hesitation creates a tension that imbues the headline with an underlying ideological message. The contrast between "federal mandates" and "convincing Americans" is equally significant. Federal mandates are authoritative actions enforced from above, whereas "convincing Americans" refers to a more personal, grassroots-level persuasion campaign. The headline contrasts political authority with the persuasive job of transforming hearts and minds, emphasizing the situation's complexity. Using Jeffries' (2010) critical stylistics approach, this study of the headline "Biden's vaccine push: Federal mandates and the challenge of convincing Americans" identifies numerous major persuasive methods, including naming, describing, suggesting, and prioritizing. Through linguistic choices such as "push," "federal mandates," and "the challenge of convincing Americans," the title presents the vaccine campaign as both an authoritative, top-down endeavor and a battle to persuade a hesitant audience. These stylistic choices construct the story by portraying the government as the principal agent of action while simultaneously emphasizing the challenge of overcoming popular skepticism. This investigation shows how the media, via its use of language, shapes public views of governmental activities and social difficulties during a national health crisis.

7. **"How vaccine inequality is delaying the end of the COVID-19 pandemic"** (The Guardian, 2021). The headline opens with the words "vaccine inequality," which is heavy and emotionally sensitive. The term "inequality" is important since it has a strong negative connotation and implies an unequal allocation of resources. This framing presents the concepts of inequality and injustice, influencing the reader's view of the situation. The term "inequality" also quickly connotes a social and ethical concern, implying that the existing distribution of vaccinations is ethically incorrect and must be corrected. Following that, the phrase "delaying the end of the COVID-19 pandemic" highlights the effect of vaccination disparities. The use of the term "delaying" is essential because it communicates the impression that the epidemic has a certain conclusion in sight, but that end is being postponed due to unequal vaccine distribution. The term "delaying" suggests an impediment or a

barrier, implying that vaccination inequity impedes progress and crisis resolution. The statement also emphasizes the urgency and need of tackling this issue in order to bring the epidemic to an end. By employing the phrase "delaying," the headline portrays vaccination inequity as a major contributor to the pandemic's continuing existence. The headline's structure prioritizes "vaccine inequality" before "delaying the end of the COVID-19 pandemic." This ranking is essential because it identifies vaccination inequity as the most pressing problem that must be addressed in order to stop the epidemic. By focusing on inequality, the headline draws attention to a single cause—rather than the epidemic or other contributing factors—that is preventing the situation from being resolved. More importantly, the word "how" at the start of the headline suggests an investigation or explanation of this cause. The framework implies that the reader will get insight into how vaccination inequity is directly impacting the ongoing nature of the epidemic, and how addressing it might potentially lead to a faster resolution. This prioritizing highlights the need of resolving inequality in order to address the larger global challenge. The headline, "How vaccine inequality is delaying the end of the COVID-19 pandemic" implies that the reader is aware of vaccination inequality and its implications. The phrase "vaccine inequality" presupposes that everyone understands what it means: uneven access to immunizations depending on location, money, and social position. This assumption is based on the reader's acquaintance with global vaccine distribution issues, and it does not expressly describe inequality, but rather assumes that the reader is aware of the problem. Also, the headline indicates that vaccination inequity is a major and crucial component in the ongoing COVID-19 epidemic. It implies that without addressing this inequity, the epidemic cannot be handled in a timely manner. The headline assumes that there is a clear link between equitable vaccination distribution and the eventual conclusion of the epidemic, framing vaccine disparity as a serious impediment to international health recovery. The headline portrays vaccination disparities as intentionally "delaying" the conclusion of the pandemic. Using the word "delaying," the title portrays vaccination inequity as an active factor impeding the worldwide attempt to contain the epidemic. The use of the word "delaying" lays responsibility on the systemic challenges underlying vaccine delivery, emphasizing them as a real impediment to the intended objective. The phrase "the end of the COVID-19 pandemic" refers to a goal or occurrence that is possible but has been hampered by unequal vaccination distribution. This framing portrays the end of the epidemic as a distinct, identifiable event that is now within reach, but only if vaccination inequity is addressed. The image of the pandemic's conclusion as something that may be postponed rather than endlessly prolonged offers an underlying hope, as well as urgency, in solving the situation. The headline, "How vaccine inequality is delaying the end of the COVID-19 pandemic" employs a number of crucial stylistic tactics to position vaccination disparities as both a major global health issue and a moral concern. The headline highlights the urgent need for fair vaccination delivery by utilizing phrases like "inequality" and "delaying," positioning this problem as the primary hurdle to addressing the epidemic. The headline also indicates a clear relationship between vaccination equality and the end of the epidemic, reinforcing the notion that fair access to vaccines is critical for worldwide health wellness.

Conclusion:

This study investigated the persuasive techniques employed in selected media headlines regarding the COVID-19 vaccine using Jeffries' (2010) critical stylistics paradigm. The results show how linguistic structures and stylistic choices influence public perceptions, actions, and beliefs amid a global health crisis. Newspaper headlines, which serve as potent media tools, are methodically created to convince readers by framing situations, assigning blame, eliciting emotions, and influencing ideological positions. The current study finds out the following aspects which are:

1. **Naming and Describing:** Headlines use emotive language like "hesitancy," "inequality," and "scrutiny" to frame the vaccination debate. These choices are intended to elicit moral reactions and generate a feeling of urgency regarding vaccine-related concerns.
2. **Representing Actions:** Headlines frequently foreground particular parties, such as governments, pharmaceutical corporations, or the general public, to assign blame or laud progress. For example, terms like "rollout begins" or "mandates introduced" stress active participation and accountability, which influences perceptions of leadership and activity.
3. **Prioritizing and Foregrounding:** The headlines highlight certain parts of the vaccination story, such as problems, accomplishments, or disparities, while ignoring others. For example, topics such as vaccination hesitancy and unfair distribution are routinely raised, directing public attention toward essential issues.
4. **Implying and Assuming:** Headlines include implicit ideological assumptions that frame vaccinations as a "battle," "race," or "solution." These metaphors and assumptions connect readers to certain worldviews, instilling

urgency, unity, and trust in immunization efforts. Finally, the study emphasizes the importance of newspaper headlines as persuasive instruments for shaping public views and actions during crises. Headlines use strategies including identifying, describing, prioritizing, and emotional framing to create narratives that steer public debate, match with ideological goals, and elicit certain responses. This study emphasizes the significance of critically interacting with media discourse and the possibility of critical stylistics as a framework for revealing the ideological and persuasive components of media language.

References

- ❖ BBC News. (2020, December 8). COVID-19: Thousands of people in UK vaccinated as rollout begins. BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-55273210>
- ❖ BBC News. (2021, April 12). Johnson & Johnson COVID vaccine faces scrutiny over side effects. BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-56722057>
- ❖ Bell, A. (1991). The language of news media. Blackwell.
- ❖ Dor, D. (2003). On newspaper headlines as relevance optimizers. Journal of Pragmatics, 35(5), 695–721. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00134-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00134-0)
- ❖ Fowler, R. (1991). Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press. Routledge.
- ❖ Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Longman.
- ❖ Jeffries, L. (2010). Critical stylistics: The power of English. Palgrave Macmillan.
- ❖ New York Times. (2021, August 13). COVID-19 vaccine: What you need to know about the new mandates. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/13/health/covid-vaccine-mandates.html>
- ❖ Peters, G. J. Y., Ruiter, R. A. C., & Kok, G. (2014). Threatening communication: A critical re-analysis and a revised meta-analytic test of fear appeal theory. Health Psychology Review, 7(S1), S8–S31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2012.703527>
- ❖ Reuters. (2021, February 17). The COVID-19 vaccine: Public health measures and the role of the pharmaceutical industry. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-vaccine-pharma-idUSKBN2A509Q>
- ❖ Reuters. (2021, March 22). Europe's vaccine rollout: Why some countries are struggling to vaccinate. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-europe-idUSKBN2B80Z9>
- ❖ Reuters. (2021, September 9). U.S. vaccine mandates: A step forward in the fight against COVID-19. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-health-vaccine-idUSKBN2FZ0OB>
- ❖ Reuters. (2021, October 15). Vaccine hesitancy is a global issue: How countries are combating misinformation. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-misinformation-idUSKBN2A40O9>
- ❖ Richardson, J. E. (2007). Analyzing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis. Palgrave Macmillan.
- ❖ Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2020). Coronavirus coverage in UK newspapers: Emotional storytelling and critical literacy. Journalism, 21(9), 1193–1210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884920921988>
- ❖ The Guardian. (2021, May 5). The global vaccination race: Who's winning the battle against COVID-19? The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/may/05/the-global-vaccination-race-whos-winning-the-battle-against-covid-19>
- ❖ The Guardian. (2021, June 21). How vaccine inequality is delaying the end of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jun/21/how-vaccine-inequality-is-delaying-the-end-of-the-covid-19-pandemic>
- ❖ The Guardian. (2021, September 13). Biden's vaccine push: Federal mandates and the challenge of convincing Americans. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/sep/13/biden-vaccine-mandates-challenge-convincing-americans>