



ECOLINGUISTICS AND CLIMATE CHANGE DISCOURSE: THE POWER OF LANGUAGE IN SHAPING ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION

Muhammad Javaid Anwar
raojavid96@gmail.com

College of Foreign Studies, Department of English Language
and Literature, Yangzhou University, Jiangsu, China.

Kinza Batool
kinishah5@gmail.com

College of Foreign Studies, Department of English Language
and Literature, Yangzhou University, Jiangsu, China.

Abstract

The present study analyses the contribution of language based on the ecolinguistic approach to the development of social cognition and reaction to climate change. It emphasizes the role of language decisions, metaphors, and stories in building specific understandings of the world that affect perceptions of the environment and actions. The study follows the qualitative research method based on the theory of ecolinguistics. It explores climate-related discourses in various settings, including the way language constructs ecological realities and the urgency or lack thereof, as well as encouragement or discouragement of action. The results of the study demonstrate that language not only mirrors but also guides environmental consciousness. The use of such terms as “climate crisis” and “global emergency” makes it more urgent, whereas metaphors, such as the “planet is a shared home”, make it feel more shared and, hence, have collective responsibility. The paper has found that ecolinguistics offers a valuable insight into the persuasive nature of the discourse and its moral implications for sustainability. The role of linguistic strategies in making or breaking climate action is brought into the light. This study highlights the relevance of mindful communication in solving the ecological crisis. It also recommends that the new digital and grassroots discourses be investigated in future studies to enhance environmental activism.

Keywords: *Climate Change, Discourse, Ecolinguistics, Environmental Action, Metaphors and Framing*

Corresponding Author: Muhammad Javaid Anwar (College of Foreign Studies, Department of English Language and Literature, Yangzhou University, Jiangsu, China.). **Email:** raojavid96@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Climate change has been one of the biggest challenges to the existence of human beings, particularly in the twenty-first century. No longer a distant threat, global warming, unusual weather conditions, melting, and loss of biodiversity of glaciers. Nevertheless, although scientific studies are a good source of evidence as to the sense of urgency of the climate crisis, its perception, discussion, and response to the crisis are highly affected by language. Words designate how problems are formulated, how solutions are imagined, and how individuals are motivated or discouraged to behave. It is in ecolinguistics that it counts. The relationship between land and language, which is concerned with how language options affect our attitudes to ecology, ecological responsibility, and sustainability, is called ecolinguistics. The role of ecolinguistics, in relation to climate change, is that it allows us to learn how language is silently powerful in the way in which the crisis itself is framed and how language can be mobilized to effect or inhibit environmental action.

In other words, climate change is not only a scientific problem; actually, it is a social, cultural, and discursive phenomenon. The way we discuss it will affect our reaction toward it. The feeling of urgency is taken away when politicians or media houses use the term climate change as a debate, and not a crisis. In the same way, the metaphors of activists about climate, like climate emergency or climate tipping point, reveal danger and urgency, which influence the perception of society towards action. Language does not reflect reality, but it creates it. Through its ways of framing, language can neutralize action, promote action, or even propagate denial, by normalizing climate change. Therefore, it is not just an academic activity but a required process of analyzing climate change in terms of ecolinguistics to appreciate the role of discourse in changing the behavior of environmental beings.

Ecolinguistics examines the deeper meanings and brings to light the latent ideologies of environmental communication. As an example, the eco-friendly products may be advertised with the discourse of green that will help to relate consumerism to sustainability. Such discourse might seem to justify environmental action, but ecolinguistic analysis can show either that it does or does not legitimize sustainable behavior, or that it is just disguising further overconsumption. In the same way, the policies of the government presented as development projects can disguise the ecological destruction within the terms of progress. When one is sensitive to such discursive patterns, ecolinguistics can demonstrate how language may either support ecological values or perpetuate destructive behaviors.

Also, when dealing with climate change, discourse can be used in many layers, with scientific, political, media, activist, and everyday discussions. Scientific reports rest on technical language; hence, they may turn unreachable to the general audience. The

political speech can be based on some persuasive techniques that are aimed at accentuating economic development rather than ecological harmony. The news media often simplify or dramatize events on climate that form narratives of fear or blame or of hope. Activists, in their turn, appeal to emotion-evoking language to increase awareness and trigger action by everyone. All of these discourses play a role in the formation of how society views climate change and how people respond to it or not. Ecolinguistics offers the means to critical analysis of such discourses, to pose the question of who is given voice, who has interests, and whose futures are projected by language.

Meanwhile, Ecolinguistics defines the meanings underlying the surface and brings to light the ideologies of environmental communication. As an example, green discourse is frequently used in advertising that markets friendly products to tie consumerism to sustainability. Such talk can seem on the surface to be advocating environmental action, yet ecolinguistic analysis can show whether it advocates sustainable practice or is merely a manifestation of ongoing overconsumption. Likewise, the policies of the government conducted in the form of the so-called development projects might conceal ecological destruction behind the term of progress. When such discursive patterns are paid attention to, ecolinguistics can demonstrate to us that language may either support ecological values or promote negative practices.

Also, in the situation of climate change, a discourse is active on a variety of levels, scientific, political, media, activist, and daily conversations. Scientific reports are technical in nature; hence, they may be unreachable to ordinary people. There can be the implementation of persuasive strategies in political speeches to focus on economic growth rather than on the ecological balance. News media often over-simplify or dramatize climate events that construct discourses of fear, blame, or hope. Activists, in contrast, appeal to the emotions and communicate the awareness and call to action. All these discourses play a role in the development of the societal perception of climate change and the manner in which individuals respond or fail to respond to the issue. Ecolinguistics offers the methods to critically examine these discourses to ask into which voices are given power, which interests are fulfilled, and what sorts of futures are constructed through language.

In addition, there is no cross-cultural and cross-social homogeneity in climate change discourse. The ecological values and worldviews are carried with different languages and traditions. As an example, indigenous people tend to employ holistic, nature-based discourse, perceiving human beings as one with the environment and not independent of it. As opposed to this, the concurrent Western discourses have conventionally conceived of nature as a resource that can be employed, which accentuates the capacity of man to govern nature. This kind of conflicting mode of communication suggests a more in-depth cultural attitude to nature, and the methods of ecolinguistics may

be employed to indicate how particular discourses are more conducive to sustainability as compared to others. Applying a cultural ecolinguistic perspective to climate change, therefore, could offer insight into how ecological responsibility conceptions are established by various communities and how various discourses could encourage larger shifts towards action, positively impactful changes.

The climate also makes one realize the necessity of treating the current communication of climate change with scepticism. Nevertheless, scientific warnings have not necessarily been converted into meaningful action, regardless of decades of scientific warnings. The limitation of communication of climate change may be one of the reasons. When language is too technical, it puts non-experts off; when it is too alarmist, it may tend to cause apathy or denial; when it is too vague, it is not likely to create a sense of urgency. With the help of the examination of these communication issues, ecolinguistics can point out the ways of more effective climate communication. As an example, studies have found the collective responsibility and shared values frame to be more motivating in climate change framing than the abstract scientific problem frame. Likewise, metaphors of nurturing, stewardship, and community could stimulate more action than those of war or disaster.

Additionally, a significant aspect of ecolinguistics is that it focuses on the nature of stories that we live by, the prevailing narratives and frames that we use to frame our social activities (Stibbe, 2021). Arguably, the ecological world we are building is made within the frame of the stories that we carry with us in our language (Stibbe, 2015). The example would be that endless economic growth stories could be incompatible with the ecological fact of limited resources. The narratives of human conquerors of nature can legitimize non-sustainable actions. Meanwhile, other narratives like the ones that stress balance, nature respect, and ecological boundaries can provide ways to more sustainable futures. Ecolinguistic analysis, in the context of climate change, is the analysis of what stories are being told about climate change and the potential of other stories to create more powerful environmental action.

As such, the paper employs the ecolinguistics prism to examine how the discourse on climate change has been effective in forming the perception of the masses about the climate crisis and how individuals react towards it. The paper will show a couple of ways that some language strategies prompt imminence, optimism, or action by looking through the metaphors, stories, and frames commonly used in climate communication. It will also consider the part played by Ecolinguistic.

1.2 Research Questions

In this study, three guiding research questions will be addressed.

1. How can ecolinguistics help us understand the role of language in shaping public perceptions of climate change?

2. What kinds of linguistic strategies are used in climate change discourse to encourage or discourage environmental action?
3. In what ways can ecolinguistic analysis contribute to building more effective and action-oriented climate change communication?

In conclusion, one can say that ecolanguage in climate change research is not a mere scholarship. It is a sort of practical way of re-conceptualizing the way we articulate one of the largest issues of our day. Language may suppress the ecological imagination, or open it up, instill destructive action as the norm, or cause action towards change.

This paper examines our rhetoric of climate change, and this is as important as the policies we make and the technologies we invent.

1.2 Research Objectives

1. To examine how ecolinguistics can help us to understand the role of language in shaping public perceptions of climate change.
2. To analyze the kinds of linguistic strategies that are used in climate change discourse to encourage or discourage environmental action.
3. To explore how ecolinguistics analysis contributes to building more effective and action-oriented climate change communication.

2. Literature Review

The interaction between the environment and the language has also emerged as a major topic of applied linguistics over the past few years. An example of understanding the ways language embodies and creates the relationship between human beings and nature is presented by ecolinguistics (Fill and Muhlhauserl, 2018). In the context of climate change discourses, ecolinguistics suggests the way people think about environmental concerns and act on the premises of narrative, metaphors, and frames. This briefing is an account of the focal contribution to the topic of ecolinguistics and the discourse of climate change, and explores how researchers have associated linguistic decision-making with ecological perception and behavior.

Another concept that can be applied to substantiate how the language and environment are interrelated is the multidisciplinary ecologistics practice, which forms the association between language and environment. This field has become a prestigious one as a result of the analysis of the linguistic constructs, metaphors, and stories behind climate communication (Penz and Fill, 2022). Ecolinguistic research indicates that the process of telling climate change can either subjugate or uplift the vulnerable populations. The framing of climate change as an environmental justice issue, as an example, considers its disproportionate effects on disadvantaged groups. The field of ecolinguistics raises concealed linguistic clues that legitimize or keep the power disparity and, consequently, the climate policies and the masses, in general (Hasbun-Mancilla et al., 2017).

The discourse of the ecological climate change news is examined mainly through the prism of appraisal theory, framework, metaphor theory, and approach theory. Through the prism of eco-critical discourse analysis, made up of issues, speech, and news headlines, and comparing the differences between the new climate change report opinion and ideas and beliefs by the two countries, Wang (2018) compared the climate change news articles in China and the United States and contributed to the increased ability of people to compare and analyse discourse and become aware of the language ecology protection. The multimodal use (using language and posters with pictures) in these campaigns was studied to present positive stories or ideologies to protect the other species and prevent their exploitation, which was considered beneficial (Zhdhanava, Kaur, and Rajandran, 2021). In 2020, Moghadam and Samar investigated the use of metaphor in academic texts written in a second language: Gong (2019) reviewed the annual environmental report of China Three Gorges Corporation (2015), and Yu (2020) reviewed ecological reporting in Chinese, English, or Italian commercial social responsibility reports. The history of framing in social sciences is long. We might cite threads of belief that start with Goffman (1974) conception of the frames that explain social situations; or the work of Tversky and Kahneman (1981), which proposed that positive or negative 'message frames' frames have a structure and can be used beneficially to bolster unrelated information, but I think the most important to media psychology is the work of Bransford and Johnson (1972), who in their studies offered an idea that frames may enhance recall and awareness when the image comes out as an informative aid to the unrelated information. The impact can be similar to the impact that graphic content can have on a daily newspaper, internet reader, or a television news viewer.

2.1. Ecolanguage: Background and Theory

Ecolinguistics as a field of study can be traced back to the 1990s when linguists like Michael Halliday (1990) became of the opinion that linguists needed to shift their focus to the ecological issues. Halliday has also pointed out that the discourses of industrial societies, which are growth-oriented, such as economic growth or ever-expanding markets, are part of the cause of unsustainable activities because they instill into the common language destructive ideologies. Ecolinguists like Halliday and others like Stibbe (2015) extend the argument that language is not a neutral phenomenon, but has ecological implications based on the way it locates humans in relation to the environment.

Ecolinguistics is also related to ecocriticism and critical discourse analysis (CDA). The CDA framework developed by Fairclough (1995) has been extensively used to analyse how power and ideology are performed within the text and adapted to identify how discourses normalise environmental damage by ecolinguists. Such a critical lens helps to point out the fact that climate change is not just a scientific or political problem but also a linguistic and discursive one.

2.2. Climate Change Framing

Framing of the problem is one of the fundamental problems of climate change communication. Another important finding of various studies is that the explanation of climate change has a substantial influence on the formation of attitudes and support for policy in the population. To illustrate, Lakoff (2010) has brought into focus the idea of using metaphors such as the war on climate change or carbon footprint to create powerful mental frames that determine thinking and action. Similarly, Nerlich and Jaspal (2012) have noted that the metaphor of a time bomb or planet's emergency makes a person more desirous but also potentially frightening and powerless. The perception of climate change, therefore, depends on the use of words to formulate an idea of whether it is manageable or not.

2.3. Discourses of Responsibility and Agency

Climate change is often reported in the media where governments or international organizations are blamed instead of individuals or corporations, since it is the easiest way to reduce personal and corporate accountability (Carvalho, 2007). This fits the notion of erasure introduced by Stibbe (2014), in which damage is disguised or backgrounded linguistically. An example is the use of vague terms that make industrial polluters a faceless group, e.g., industrial polluters increased their emissions, which exonerates the human actors of the ill.

Overall, the literature review demonstrates that the climate crisis revolves around language. With metaphors, frames, or narratives, discourse determines how societies perceive climate change and what they do in response. Reviewing this area offers a basis to discuss how discourse can be used to inform environmental action, and therefore the urgency of paying attention to the words we speak in response to climate change.

3. Methodology

The current work is based on a qualitative approach based on ecolinguistic analysis. The article does not involve primary data collection because it focuses on the influence of language on discussions regarding climate change; the focus of the study is based on secondary data collected in the form of published scholarly papers, reports, and discourse papers. The methodology of undertaking the research is to critically examine the literature available at the moment to identify shared linguistic devices, metaphors, stories, and framing that shape the opinion of people and intervention in the environment. The paper shows the importance of ecolinguistics in assessing the influence of climate change communication and offers suggestions on how the knowledge can be applied to more rational discourse practices based on the results of the previous studies.

3.1. Significance of the Study

The proposed research will help fill the gap in language and environmental agency. Not only is it a scientific or even a political question, but it is a question of language, as

the manner of discussing it, in large measure, determines how people think about it and how they treat it. This article highlights how words, metaphors, and stories can be used to create awareness, responsibility, and action by people through an ecolinguistic analysis of the discourse about climate change. The study is useful in the sense that it reaffirms that effective action in responding to climate issues cannot be based on technological or policy-based intervention only, but effective action should also consider how communication and discourse can be used in motivating people to take sustainable action. In addition, the paper is a contribution to a growing body of ecolinguistic literature because it shows that linguistic analysis can be part of making communication practices more responsible, empowering, and action-oriented. The study is useful to scholars, teachers, policymakers, and environmentalists since it will give them information on how language can be a tool towards positive ecological change.

4. Data Analysis and Findings

The current study looks at the role that ecolinguistics can play in helping us realise how language is deployed to shape the way people think about climate change. The nature of linguistic practices deployed in climate change talk that triggers environmental responsibility, and ecolinguistics analysis can help us develop more efficient and action-oriented climate change communication. The analysis is based on valuable information gathered from published papers

4.1. Discursive Constructions of Climate Change

Language does not exist as a neutral tool of communication; language is a social resource, which has ideological, cultural, and political value. The discursive constructions in the form of climate change can elucidate why people may see climate change as an imminent fact, a remote potential, or even a debatable myth when it is projected into the discourse. Through the ecolinguistic approach, we are able to examine the linguistic resources of the text, in the form of news articles, political speeches, the reports of NGOs, and the campaigns on social media.

Metaphor can be listed as one of the most outstanding discursive constructions within climate change communication. An example of this is that climate change is often projected as a war (fight against climate change, combat global warming, battle rising seas). This metaphor is urgent and mobilizing, but it also suggests confrontation and defiance, with nature at times taking the role of the adversary. The other repeating metaphor is the one that has the phrase journey or path (towards a greener future), (on the road to sustainability), which portrays a more optimistic and collaborative framing. These metaphors are of great importance in ecolinguistics because language not only conveys information but also creates emotional orientations of the environment. The metaphors of war can be thought-provoking to action, yet may also cause one to feel tired and hopeless; however, the metaphors of journey give direction without causing fear.

Moreover, the question of framing is most closely related to metaphor. Frames are cognitive schemata, and they highlight certain aspects of reality and mislead others. As an example, when the media present climate change as an inherently economic strain, then the discourse might lead to people opposing climate policy, especially those who fear that they may suffer financial losses. In comparison, the description of climate change as a chance to innovate or a population health problem is bound to provoke a wider appeal to environmental action. By analysing such frames, ecolinguistics can be used to trace how language constructions signify in a way that has a political effect.

Besides, there is a second dimension of discursive construction in words. Such words as crisis, catastrophe, or disaster are dramatic and allow an impression of urgency, yet may also paralyze a person with a feeling of fear. Rather, the use of such terms as resilience, adaptation, and transition gives a feeling of agency and possibility. The peculiarities of word choice demonstrate that climate discourse is the place where opposing ideologies struggle over hegemony. Indicatively, the fact that oil and gas companies are more at home with terms such as energy transition or net zero pathways makes the radical character of climate action more palatable and shifts the burden out to the distant future. These examples demonstrate that words may be used to move and to delay.

In addition, the climate change discourse has no less important a narrative. The power of stories is that they neatly arrange events into causally connected stories with heroes, villains, and victims. In much mass discourse, the casualties of climate change are small island states and indigenous peoples, and the villains are the industrialized states or fossil fuel industries. The actors who would be the heroes in the search for averting catastrophe are activists, researchers, and policymakers. However, none of these tales is uniform; some discourses change the blame and place climate change on a natural cycle, which leaves human agents out of the equation. Ecolinguistically, such eradication of agency is an issue because it eradicates group responsibility and justifies a lack of action.

Finally, the discursive constructions are more inclined to be constructed along cultural beliefs and worldviews. The Western discourses are more inclined towards individualism and technological optimism, in which individual responses, such as recycling or believing in future technology, come out as the answers. The discourses of the indigenous people emphasize the aspect of relationality and interrelation, whereby climate change is regarded as a disruption in the harmony between human beings and nature. This contrast brings out the variability of discursive resources and highlights the importance of paying attention to cultural differences in ecolinguistic analysis.

In general, discursive accounts of climate change can be seen as exemplifying the functioning of language as not only informative but also able to set emotional, ideological, and cultural paths. The active contribution of such constructions to forming the perception

of urgency, agency, and responsibility is revealed through ecolinguistics, and makes active factors that it facilitates or inhibits environmental action.

4.2. Linguistic Strategies and effects of language on environmental action.

After identifying the discursive construction of climate change, the next step is to contemplate which specific linguistic tools form the responses of the masses. This part will elaborate on whether metaphors, narratives, and framing could influence the promotion or inhibition of environmental action.

Tools of persuasion, such as metaphors, are essential in the mobilization of people. The metaphor of a tipping point is particularly powerful: it creates a sense of danger about to occur right around the corner, and there is the sense of having crossed a certain threshold of no return, that once this threshold is crossed, it will be too late. Such a metaphor is a useful way of describing scientific complexity in straightforward terms, but it is also prone to producing fatalism. Similarly, the metaphor of the carbon footprint has been resorted to in order to personalize the blame to the extent that individuals feel remorse over their consumption decisions. It has, however, been argued that this metaphor has been strategically moved by firms as a way of taking the attention out of the systemic factors.

Therefore, metaphors may spur engagement, they may also repel blame. Narratives make metaphors stronger since they provide people with narratives that they can identify with. The speech of activist Greta Thunberg employs a discourse of intergenerational justice: young people as the ethical agents facing complacent politicians. The story has great connectivity in the sense that it personalizes the otherwise general issue of climate change. Similarly, the stories of loss and damage of the marginalized groups stir empathy and a common fight and motivate the audience to invest in adaptation and facilitate the climate justice policies. Conversely, the disengagement of people by narratives with climate action being seen as a threat to jobs or national sovereignty can be used to demonstrate how narrative tactics can be deployed to progressive as well as regressive agendas.

Further, linguistic tactics that build group responses are also lexical options. The presence of the terms 'clean energy and renewable energy, e.g., is defensively redirective, indicating with a hint that clean is moral well-being and safety, whereas renewable is technological sustainability. The terms green economy and sustainable growth attempt to bring harmony between economic and environmental values, and therefore, such terms are acceptable even to those who fear economic losses. The ecolinguistic criticism, however, warns that such words can even be a contradiction in disguise since sustainable growth itself can be an oxymoron, following the ecological price of the ongoing growth.

Another relevant strategy is the employment of inclusive and exclusive pronouns. Where political leaders utter, 'We must act now', the pronoun "we", imparts the meaning of we-we-we. Nevertheless, accountability is avoided, and the blame is directed elsewhere

when the same political figures go ahead to pronounce that they have to reduce emissions. There would be ecolinguistic analysis of the use of the pronouns, which would help dig up the fact that the minute-looking linguistic decisions have titanic implications on the agency perceptions.

Repetition and emphasis are other rhetorical devices. Urgency is restated in the factual restatements of climate emergency or code red for humanity. However, the reiteration of the end-of-world motif, as well, results in people being desensitized and causes emotional overload and detachment. This is the reason why it is a fine line to make urges urgent and lead to despair, and that is where the climate communicators need to exercise extreme caution.

Moreover, the analysis demonstrates that linguistic strategies coincide with the relations of power. In a telling instance, fossil fuel producers are also fond of strategic obfuscation, hedging regarding lower-carbon remedies, rather than making an explicit commitment to reduce carbon emissions. Such ambiguity creates a feeling that there is a duty to be performed, in case anybody is willing to continue doing business in the same manner. The responsibility is to the future as well when politicians use future-oriented speech (by 2050 we will get to net zero), and in this case, it also includes a call to the future goals, but does not take any action in the present.

All these strategies demonstrate that language does not only mirror the politics of climate change but is, in fact, its politics. Ecolinguistically, there is a need not only to reveal these strategies but to propose an alternative, which will aid in empowering, being responsible, and taking action as a community.

4.3. To Sustainable Climate Change Communication: an Ecolinguistic Approach.

Firstly, ecolinguistics is focused on the centrality of constructive framing. That is, rather than communicating about the issue of fear and disaster, communicators can communicate about climate change in a manner that highlights solutions, resilience, and common responsibility. The theme can be made appealing to hope over despair by framing climate action as a communal exploration of a healthier and fairer future, e.g., the ecolinguistic approach cautions communicators against metaphors and stories that enable instead of paralysing the audiences. Secondly, ecolinguistics would refer to the significance of values and worldviews. The current climate change communication is inclined towards economic and technological frames, whereas ecolinguistics suggests adopting relational and ecological values. This encompasses the understanding of humans as not independent of nature, but in a way that they are connected in nature. Communication that relies on the principles of the Indigenous worldview of reciprocity and balance is useful in refining the concepts of human-nature relationships. When such values are instilled into mainstream communication, more fundamental cultural shifts toward sustainability may occur.

Third, ecolinguistic analysis stresses linguistic inclusivity. It involves using pronouns, metaphors, and stories that distribute responsibility justly and non-exclusively. For example, collective discourses (we must change our systems) can be promoted by relocating the discourses of accusation (they are polluting). However, inclusivity is not always the exclusion of accountability, and instead, must balance the shared responsibility with differentiated responsibility between nations, companies, and individuals.

The other purpose is to criticize the greenwashing and misleading discourses. Ecolinguistics serves to reveal attempts to hide or exaggerate promises or attempts to hide responsibility through the analysis of both the corporate and governmental linguistic strategies. This essential position matters so as to check strong players and ensure the use of climate change discourse in the interest of environmental action, rather than profit.

Finally, the study shows that effective communication of climate change should be associated with the combination of emotion, logic, and culture. The speech of a scientific or technical type can hardly affect the crowd, except that narratives, metaphors, and cultural frames can. Ecolinguistics provides the path of bringing these dimensions together in a manner that will not only make the communication process factually accurate but also emotional and culturally relevant.

On the whole, this discussion demonstrates that it is a language that plays a pivotal role in the construction of the attitude towards climate change and to environmental action per se. Investigating discursive constructions, the linguistic strategies, and ecolinguistic point of view, it is obvious that communication is not combined with passing information; on the contrary, it is perceived as a way to establish shared orientations to the future. The strength of language is that it can form realities, organize the action, and reorganize the relationship between people and the surrounding world.

Climate change communication can be transformed through the employment of ecolinguistic thinking into discourses that are empowering to people and communities, contribute to collective responsibility, and ultimately play a role in the urgent issue of the climate crisis.

It is clear that the discourse on climate change is in no way neutral: the vocabulary used in the analysis is actively determined by the language options with the help of which the crisis is presented as either a catastrophe requiring passive acceptance or as a collective responsibility which can be acted upon. War against climate change metaphors are urgent and can cause fear and fatalism, whereas inclusive narratives focus on cooperation and responsibility, like our shared future. The use of lexical means such as global warming, as compared to climate crisis, also determines whether a person views the problem as remote and slow or short-term and threatening. Notably, ecolinguistic views demonstrate that discourse empowerment and solution-focused discourse promote group activity and not

despair. Overall, the results indicate that language not only mirrors environmental issues, but it is also a major factor in either facilitating or barring environmental action.

5. Conclusion

It is concluded that there is no such thing as a neutral language; on the contrary, metaphors, stories, and the words people use influence the way they perceive and act on climate problems. An example is the use of such terms as “climate crisis” or “climate emergency”, which make the situation more urgent, whereas the inclusive metaphors, such as the Earth being a “shared home”, encourage collaboration. On the contrary, the tragic narratives can stimulate fear and passivity, whereas the solution-focused conversation can promote agency and optimism.

Further, climate change can be built using linguistic patterns, narratives can influence perception, and ecolinguistics may be used in advocacy. Study results validate the fact that discourse is a hindrance or spur to collective action. It renders ecolinguistic analysis scholarly, to say the least, and practical and ethical. To conclude, the words we use to describe the planet influence the relationship with it immensely. Conscious, empowering, and inclusive environmental communication is necessary to help sustain behavior and a better environmental future. The development of further studies can be carried out to investigate new modes of climate discourse, like social media, digital activism, and youth movements, to have a better insight into the functioning of changing linguistic strategies on global ecological action.

References

- Bransford, J. D., & Johnson, M. K. (1972). Contextual prerequisites for understanding: Some investigations of comprehension and recall. *Journal of Verbal Learning & Verbal Behavior*, 11(6), 717–726.
- Carvalho, A. (2007). Ideological cultures and media discourses on scientific knowledge: Re-reading news on climate change. *Public Understanding of Science*, 16(2), 223–243.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fill, A., & Mühlhäusler, P. (Eds.). (2018). *The Routledge handbook of ecolinguistics*. Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press
- Hasbún-Mancilla, J. O., Aldunce-Ide, P. P., Blanco-Wells, G., & Browne-Sartori, R. (2017). Framing climate change in Chile: discourse analysis in digital media. *Convergencia*, 24(74), 161-186.
- Lakoff, G. (2010). Why it matters how we frame the environment. *Environmental Communication*, 4(1), 70–81.

- Nerlich, B., & Jaspal, R. (2012). Metaphors we die by? Geoengineering, metaphors, and the argument from catastrophe. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 27(2), 131–147.
- Penz, H., & Fill, A. (2022). Ecolinguistics: History, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of World Languages*, 8(2), 232-253.
- Stibbe, A. (2014). An ecolinguistic approach to critical discourse studies. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 11(1), 117–128.
- Stibbe, A. (2015). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by*. Routledge.
- Stibbe, A. (2021). *Stories of resistance: Ecolinguistics in action*. Bloomsbury.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211(4481), 453–458
- Wang Q. (2018). The Ecological Discourse Analysis of Advertisement from a Systemic Functional Perspective— A Case Study of Advertisement of Children’s Milk. *Journal of Shaoguan University*, 58, 43–57.
- Zhdanava, A., Kaur, S., & Rajandran, K. (2021). Representing non-human animals as equals: An ecolinguistic analysis of vegan campaigns. *Journal of World Languages*, 7(1), 26-57.