

CLIMATE STRUGGLE AND IDEOLOGY IN MACRON'S SPEECHES (2024–2025): AN ECO-CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Anggeli Trisna Mekar Tiara, Marliza Arsiyana

Universitas Negeri Semarang (UNNES), Semarang, Indonesia

E-mail: anggELITIARA81@students.unnes.ac.id

Received: 2026-04-30

Accepted: 2026-05-25

Published: 2026-06-10

Abstract

This study investigates how climate struggle and ecological ideology are constructed in four speeches delivered by Emmanuel Macron (2024–2025) using an eco-critical discourse analysis framework within Fairclough's (1992) three-dimensional model, Halliday & Matthiessen's (1994) ideational metafunction, Stibbe's (2015) ecolinguistic model, and Corbett's (2006) environmental ideology. The global environmental crisis is one of the greatest challenges facing humanity today. Despite the growing body of critical discourse studies on climate communication, little attention has been paid to how French leadership constructs ecological ideology in international forums. This research employs a qualitative approach, with the research data comprising the discourse on the fight against climate change in Emmanuel Macron's speeches. The results showed that the climate struggle is dominated by material processes, with France and Western institutions positioned as the primary agents of global climate action. The ideology identified across the four speeches is conservationism, wherein nature is valued for its benefits to humanity rather than for its intrinsic value. Yet, through the eco-linguistic lens of ecosophy, Macron's discourse occurs as ambivalent, which reflects a sincere ecological commitment that nonetheless remains rooted in a neoliberal framework. Thus, it prioritizes private financing, market mechanisms, and technocratic governance.

Keywords: *Critical discourse analysis; ecolinguistics; environmental ideology; climate diplomacy; Macron.*

1. Introduction

Contemporary ecological conditions indicate an escalating planetary crisis, with conditions that have long permitted human life to flourish now under severe threat. Preceding studies point out that the Earth's natural processes are encountering a sequence of major changes, and these changes have the capacity to make it more difficult for people to survive in the future (Albert et al., 2023; Grumbach & Hamant, 2020; Martin et al., 2017). Indeed, for several years now, scientists have been predicting and warning of major disasters that could endanger the survival of humanity (Lidicker, 2020). Climate change has consequently occurred as the most critically debated issue of our time. Reflecting on the report by the NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information (2026), there has been an average anomaly in global ground temperatures from 1850 to 2024, where global

temperatures have gone through a significant transformation over time. The peak was reported in 2023 to 2024, when temperature anomalies passed 1.2°C above normal. Consequently, the global warming of today is a reality that is constantly worsening due to human activity. This situation is aggravated by eight more threats to the environment, including marine acidification, water scarcity, loss of biodiversity, and chemical pollution (Rockström et al., 2009).

France addresses this issue with the utmost seriousness, as reflected in the high levels of public awareness and concern surrounding climate change when compared to the average European citizen. Proof of this was recorded in a survey conducted by YouGov for the European Investment Bank (EIB) (2018), which found that 82% of French citizens stated that they were concerned or very concerned about climate change. As president, Emmanuel Macron is one of the key figures in the fight against climate change. Macron has been successful in formulating and implementing climate policies in order to address the urgency of climate change felt by the French public.

Speeches and appeals have frequently functioned as essential instruments utilised by Macron to signify his commitment to the issue, as witnessed during several international visits and forums in 2024–2025, where he addressed the global climate crisis. A speech is one form of discourse text, as discourse itself can manifest in spoken and written forms. In order to analyze discourse, Fairclough (1992) outlines three stages of analysis: text, discourse practice, and sociocultural practice. Fairclough (1992) also points out that linguistic choices within a discourse contribute to disclosing the social background and identity of a speaker. Van Dijk (1998) further supported this idea by emphasizing that Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) brings perspectives on discursive practices such as hegemony, domination, inequality, and discrimination. In addition, Stibbe (2015) clarifies that in ecolinguistics, language operates as an instrument to awaken collective consciousness and motivate more responsible behaviour towards nature. The framing of environmental issues in various international forums can affect the way global actors perceive responsibilities and potential solutions. Therefore, it is important to analyze discursive practices in order to grasp how political, economic and moral interests are mutually related and influence the direction of discussions on climate change. In this context, the linguistic choices made by Macron in various international forums between 2024 and 2025 can be considered ecological discourse that contributes to building a global narrative on the urgency of addressing the climate crisis.

Several previous studies have examined ecological issues and climate change using discourse analysis and ecological approaches, such as in environmental communication (Agbeleoba et al., 2025; Zhang & Jocuns, 2023), public policy (Christensen & Bentsen, 2024), international relations (Walewicz, 2022; Wang et al., 2023), and literature (Gong, 2023; Sadi et al., 2024). Furthermore, various studies have been conducted to cover a number of aspects by applying diverse methodologies and theoretical frameworks, including Fairclough's model (Leung, 2020; Saragih et al., 2026; Naz et al., 2022), van Dijk's model (Wang & Zhao, 2023; Yuliastutik, 2024), and the history-of-discourse (DHA) approach (Leipold et al., 2019; Telesiené & Hadler, 2023). Taken together, these studies demonstrate that climate discourse can be productively examined across disciplines. However, most existing studies apply either CDA or ecolinguistics in isolation, without integrating both within a unified analytical framework. In this regard, there are no studies that do engage with political speeches tend to focus on media representation or policy outcomes, hence leave the ideological dimension of ecological discourse in official presidential speeches largely unexamined. Moreover, no study has yet applied an ecocritics which mix Fairclough's

CDA, Halliday's ideational metafunction, Stibbe's ecolinguistics, and Corbett's environmental ideology to analyse how a sitting head of state constructs the climate struggle and ecological ideology in international forums. This gap is particularly evident given the growing role of Global leaders in building the climate narrative in the post-Paris Agreement era (Eckersley, 2020; Parker et al., 2017). To address this issue, this study analyzes 4 speeches by Emmanuel Macron at international forums during 2024–2025. This study addresses the following research questions: (1) How is the struggle against climate change represented in Macron's speeches? (2) What environmental ideology underpins these representations?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) originated from the work of experts in linguistics at the University of East Anglia in the 1970s. In their work, they paid attention to the use of language within social institutions and the relationship between language, power and ideology (Wodak, 1995; Hodge & Kress, 1979; Fowler et al., 1979). It was heavily affected by Halliday's systemic functional linguistics, which is known for providing well-defined linguistic categories to break down the relationship between discourse and social meaning (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). Fairclough (1992) states that Critical Discourse Analysis refers to itself as a discipline that separates critical approaches from non-critical ones. In this regard, Fairclough (1992) constructs a framework that separates three dimensions within every piece of communication, which are: (1) text, whether it be how discourse is produced, an analysis of the speaker's personal experiences, or their knowledge whilst taking their beliefs into consideration; (2) discourse practice, wherein the speaker is aware of their own reality and identity; (3) sociocultural practice, where social and cultural relations are assessed in terms of how they impact the discourse produced. This three-part framework has a profound impact on the way environmental research is analysed. As discussed by Wang & Huan (2023) in their critical discourse analysis of climate change negotiations across various political institutions, the CDA approach is helpful in disclosing the narratives that support or challenge ecological modernisation.

2.2 Systemic Functional Linguistics

In its capacity as a social system of signs, language can be used to construct meaning within the context of social life (Banks, 2024; Kusmanto et al., 2023). Hence, the way in which an individual chooses to use language will yield specific meanings in accordance with the situation at hand. According to the Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) framework, language can be conceived as an active agent for expressing experience, forging relationships, and composing coherent messages (Riyanto & Ardianto, 2023). These three major functions are known as the meta-functions, which encompass the ideational, interpersonal, and textual aspects, and always work together in every instance of language use. Halliday & Matthiessen (2014) explains that:

- a. The ideational aspect pertains to the way language represents human experience of the world, whether physical or mental. Halliday & Matthiessen (2014) states that rules of grammar do not limit themselves to labelling experience, but actively help to shape that experience into a form of understanding. Thus, language actively constructs reality as understood by humans. Furthermore, this meaning is also embodied in structures involving process, participant, and circumstance (Webster, 2019).

- b. The interpersonal aspect works to forge a relationship between the speaker and the hearer in an exchange of information, goods, and services (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Thus, in any exchange, there is a giver and a receiver. The grammatical forms that convey interpersonal meaning are the elements of Mood, which consist of Subject and Finite. Furthermore, modality is also a prominent feature in interpersonal meaning (Zhou, 2024). It is because this feature conveys the speaker's attitude towards the proposition being conveyed, whether through modal adverbs, modal auxiliary verbs, or intonation.
- c. The textual aspect concerns the way a message is compiled to form a complete and coherent text (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). According to Webster (2019), cohesion pertains to the unity between sentences that is produced by connecting elements (cohesives), which are not confined to a single clause or sentence but can transcend such boundaries. Meanwhile, Morris & Hirst (1991) explain that coherence relates to the connection between the text and the surrounding situational context. Despite that, Potter (2016) explains that the information structure within a clause consists of two elements: Given Information and New Information, the function of which is to construct the information structure within the discourse.

This research concentrates on the ideational aspect, as it is suitable for conveying a range of experiences, both external and internal. At this point, Halliday & Matthiessen (2014) organises experiential reality into six recognisable process types, each accompanied by distinct participant roles, which are: (1) material processes, or processes of physical action involving an Actor and a Goal; (2) mental processes, or processes of sensing (perception, reaction, cognition) involving a Senser and a Phenomenon; (3) relational processes, or processes of being, divided into attributive (Carrier and Attribute) and identificative (Identified and Identifier); (4) behavioural processes, or processes of physiological activity primarily involving a Behaver; (5) existential processes, or processes expressing existence involving an Existent; and (6) verbal processes, or processes of information exchange involving a Sayer, a Receiver, and a Verbiage. In terms of practical application, this classification system is useful for identifying patterns of meaning-making through specific configurations of participants. Previous studies have found that the choice of process type carries systematic ideological connotations. In political discourse, the dominance of material processes positions actors as active and assertive, whereas a greater reliance on relational or existential processes makes actors and accountability less distinct (Cabrejas-Peñuelas, 2023; Kashif et al., 2022). This pattern takes on ecological implications when applied to environmental texts, as the attribution of agency to human or non-human participants yields profoundly different relationships between humans and nature (Luan, et al., 2024).

2.3 Ecology and Environmental Ideology

Stibbe (2015) points out that ecolinguistics leverages various linguistic theoretical frameworks as instruments to study linguistic patterns, with the objective of disclosing the values and beliefs that determine the way humans perceive and live their lives. Its purpose is to open up space for change regarding these beliefs. Furthermore, Nesbitt-Larking (2017) perceives narratives embedded within a discourse as representations of ideology, referring to a belief system embraced by a particular group regarding the nature of the world. It pertains to past conditions, present realities, and the ideal vision that needs to be realized in

the future. This belief system does not end at the abstract level, but deepens into the way people understand and experience their daily lives (Ewick & Silbey, 1994). Hence, when employing an eco-linguistic analytical framework, the research will not focus so much on the truth of an ideology, instead focusing on assessing the ecological impact of that ideology. At this point, Stibbe (2015) classifies discourse into three types from an ecolinguistic perspective, which are: (1) beneficial discourse, or discourse that is beneficial to the ecosystem; (2) ambivalent discourse, or discourse that is ambivalent or has dual effects; and (3) destructive discourse, or discourse that can destroy the ecosystem. In practical analysis, this classification is utilised to identify the direction of the ecological impacts produced by the discourse. There is a growing body of research on ecological discourse analysis which confirms that this three-track classification has been the main evaluation method in this field. This method is applied to various types of texts, such as political speeches, media texts, and policy documents. In recent studies, the issue of climate change has remained the most prominent thematic focus (Song et al., 2025). In political discourse, the ecological impact of this classification system is explained by Laurie & Thompson (2025), who argue that the application of critical ecolinguistics to government energy policy reveals that the linguistic normalisation of fossil fuels represents a damaging form of discourse, despite being framed rhetorically as a pragmatic necessity. In its analytical practice, this classification system is employed to identify the direction of the ecological impacts produced by a particular discourse.

In this context, the researcher argues that the ideology constructed by a discourse is the primary determinant of whether that discourse is beneficial, ambivalent, or destructive to the ecosystem. In this regard, Corbett (2006) maps out a spectrum of environmental ideologies rooted in the thinking of Rodman (1983), Fox (1996), and Hay (2002). However, Corbett (2006) acknowledges that the placement of ideologies on this spectrum is subjective. Consequently, the assessment of a discourse's ecological impact always involves the analyst's own interpretation. Therefore, Corbett (2006) divides his ideological model into: (1) anthropocentrism, where humans view themselves as the most important element of nature; (2) ecocentrism, where all elements in the world are seen as interdependent and equal. Yet, this model has more detailed extensions between these two poles.

Thus, Corbett (2006) explains that within the anthropocentric model, there are several ideological levels, including: (1) conservationism, which is human-centred and acknowledges that resources must be used wisely to ensure their sustainability for the sake of humanity itself; (2) preservationism, which incorporates non-utilitarian reasons such as aesthetic, scientific, and religious values for conserving nature; (3) unbridled instrumentalism, which holds that nature exists solely to be exploited for the benefit of present-day humans, without regard for future generations. On the other hand, within the ecocentric model, Corbett (2006) identifies at least two ideological variants, namely: (1) an ideology based on ethics and values that recognises the intrinsic value of non-human beings and inanimate objects in nature, as well as their right to exist; (2) ecological sensibility, which emphasises relationships, systems, and individuals through a non-interventionist ethic, and the use of nature whilst considering criteria such as diversity, complexity, integrity, harmony, and ecological stability. In this case, the struggle between human-centered and nature-centered perspectives has indeed influenced the narrative of climate change in politics. It has been proven by Doudaki & Carpentier (2023) through their analysis of various environmental groups, where the conflict between those who favor human interests and those who prioritize the balance of nature has indeed shaped the narrative of the climate

change issue. It starts with how the narrative is constructed, how it is debated, and extends to how it can become more polarised or extreme in the political arena.

3. Research Method

This research employs a qualitative approach, with the research data comprising the discourse on the fight against climate change in Emmanuel Macron's speeches. Qualitative methods are a research approach that seeks to comprehend social and cultural phenomena from the perspective of those involved, through the collection of non-numerical data to probe their meanings, experiences, and outlooks in specific situations (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). The data for this study consists of speech texts delivered by Emmanuel Macron, President of France, addressing the issue of climate change in international forums during the 2024–2025 period. At this point, it selected because it encompasses several moments in global climate governance. Macron's speeches were collected from official transcripts published on the French Presidency website, and news footage that is available through website platforms. The researcher also used several criteria in collecting data as follows: (1) the speech was delivered by Emmanuel Macron within the 2024–2025 period; (2) the speech explicitly addressed climate change as a central theme; and (3) the speech was delivered in an international forum. Hence, texts that did not meet these three criteria were excluded by researcher. Thus, this selection process follows the principles of purposive sampling. In purposive sampling, data sources are chosen based on their relevance to the research questions instead of statistical representativeness (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). Thus, this research relied on the researcher as the main instrument. In the qualitative research process, the researcher took an active part as the main instrument for processing and interpreting the data, instead of being a passive observer (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). The analysis was then conducted in three stages: (1) a discourse analysis based on Fairclough's CDA model (1992) to determine the way in which the speech text was produced and positioned within the political and institutional discourse; (2) text analysis using Halliday's (2014) ideational metafunction to identify the grammatical representation of actors, actions, and contexts of climate change; (3) an ecological evaluation using Stibbe's (2015) framework and Corbett's (2006) environmental ideology spectrum to assess the ecological assumptions embedded in the discourse and identify the ideological orientation of Macron's climate discourse. To assure the reliability and validity of the findings, this study employed theoretical triangulation, which refers to the use of two or more distinct theoretical frameworks to analyse the same data or phenomenon (Arianto, 2023). This approach involves cross-referencing the interpretative outcomes of one theoretical framework against another. Hence, the consistent findings across various theories can strengthen the validity of the research results and reduce the potential for theoretical bias.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Representation of the Climate Struggle in President Macron's Speeches

Fairclough's (1992) three-dimensional framework underlies the analysis of Macron's speeches. In the textual dimension, the analysis focuses on linguistic choices such as vocabulary, grammar and structure in order to establish authority and position oneself within social relations. Then, in the discourse practice dimension, the analysis considers the way in which the text is produced in accordance with institutional norms and the speaker's awareness of their role and identity. In the sociocultural dimension, the analysis identifies

the way in which the discourse maintains existing power relations and forms of ideology. These 3 dimensions are applied sequentially to the (4) speeches to be analysed below:

In speech (1), as a text, Macron preferred to use scientific terminology, such as 'carbon sinks', 'additionality' and 'bioeconomy', to strengthen France's credibility and authority as a global power with a thorough understanding of environmental issues. Fairclough (1992) explains that at the textual level, discourse analysis attends to the linguistic choices through which a speaker constructs authority and positions themselves within social relations. The structure of the speech is also arranged very systematically through numbering, for example, '*Deuxième élément*', '*Troisième point*', and '*Quatrième point*'. Furthermore, the use of pronouns, such as 'nous/on', is employed to foster solidarity, and 'la France' to affirm national identity. Thus, this points to the fact that the language is designed to position France on the global diplomatic stage. As discourse practice, Macron is building France's image as a responsible partner, competent in science and generous. The content of the speech also refers to statements made by other leaders and previous bilateral agreements. Hence, the speech is grounded in an existing network of international legitimacy. At this point, France's position appears consistent and collaborative, instead of being motivated solely by self-interest. However, as socio-cultural practice, Macron's statement that France would provide an additional 500 million euros in financial support attaches conditions to the financial aid. This indirectly positions France as the global steward of environmental finance and perpetuates the structural inequalities between developed and developing nations. Therefore, the repeated emphasis on "*argent privé*" and "*analyse coût-bénéfice*" reflects an environmental ideology rooted in neoliberalism. In this case, forest conservation is treated as a financial and governance issue, instead of an issue of justice for indigenous peoples or post-colonial justice.

In speech (2), as a text, Macron also uses scientific and institutional terms such as 'budgets carbone', '*neutralité carbone 2050*', 'NDC', and 'Global Methane Pledge' to build France's image as a climate-responsible nation. His initial statement, '*la France, depuis 2017, respecte ses budgets carbone*' depicts as a self-justifying claim that morally positions France above other countries that have not yet fulfilled their commitments. As discourse practice, the structure of the speech (2) is also linear and organized, reflecting the bureaucratic logic of French policy, which asserts its identity as the rule-setter in global climate governance. However, the dominant use of the pronoun 'nous/on' creates a collective equality, as if all countries have the same responsibility and capacity to face the climate crisis. As socio-cultural practice, this speech reproduces hegemonic power relations. It asserts that the European Union is "*le premier bailleur international*" with 28 billion euros, and France alone mobilized 7.7 billion euros. This situation positions Western countries as the primary source of finance, controlling the agenda, terms, and direction of the global climate transition. This framing ideologically legitimizes the financial dominance of Northern countries over the Global South. Calls for "*finance privée*" and reform of the World Bank and IMF further reinforce green neoliberal ideology, where solutions to the climate crisis are delegated to market mechanisms and Western financial institutions, rather than to structural justice or the recognition of developed countries' ecological debt to developing countries. However, the speech's closing defense of science as the foundation of policy, when read within the geopolitical context of the COP, depicts as a rejection of the positions of developing countries, who often question whether Western science truly reflects climate justice for them.

In speech (3), as a text, Macron opened his speech with a train metaphor, the phrase "stopper a train that était parti à pleine vitesse" to describe the climate crisis. This choice of words serves to construct a narrative that the international community has managed to avert disaster thanks to collective leadership, with France as one of its main drivers. Yet, when Macron cited the perspective of developing countries, he said, "vous rouvrez chez vous des centrales à charbon... et vous venez nous donner des leçons". This can be seen as a strategy of discursive polyphony, where the voices of the South are presented, but remain within a narrative frame controlled by speakers from the North. As discourse practice, the speech's structure is divided into three discussion categories: methane, coal, and financing, which reflects a distinctive technocratic style of discourse. In this style, the complexity of the climate crisis is reduced to a list of technically manageable issues. Thus, as socio-cultural practice, the speech acknowledged the geopolitical tensions between the North and the South. The statement that rich countries should not ask developing countries to choose between climate and development is an acknowledgment. However, this statement is immediately followed by the proposal of market-based solutions such as JETP, biodiversity credits, and the mobilization of "finance privée," all of which remain centered on Western financial architecture. It reflects a critique of the system that is recognized and then absorbed into that same system. In this regard, the framing of the 4Ps Pact as a solution for global reconciliation, formulated as "bousculant ceux qui voudraient opposer un sud global à un nord égoïste," ideologically asserts that there is no structural contradiction between the interests of the North and the South. This claim obscures the reality of historical imbalances in responsibility for carbon emissions.

In speech (4), as a text, Macron's speech began with diplomatic greetings, from the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia to the President of the World Bank. These greetings served as a hierarchy of power, indicating with whom France felt the need to build strategic alliances. Macron then used various quantitative data such as "9 cases on 10," "12 million hectares," "60% of resources," "one person on four," and "200 million hours." This function was to establish Macron's authority as an actor who speaks based on science and data. The speech was structured in five parts, namely "premier chantier" to "cinquième chantier." Thus, as discourse practice, Macron is building France's identity as both a technical and moral leader. This is evident when Macron mentions the AfD's investment of over \$10 billion and the national plan to reduce water consumption by 10%. The context of this speech is made clear: it was delivered in Riyadh in the presence of Mohammed bin Salman. Protocol-wise, this situation placed Macron in the position of a guest. However, through his discourse, Macron maintained his position as a global figurehead. He repeatedly praised his host, for example with the phrases "sa vision très claire" and "votre accueil chaleureux," as a strategy of temporary diplomatic subordination, while maintaining discursive dominance through ownership of proposals and agendas. This speech demonstrates the power of the New Water Coalition. In this regard, the New Water Coalition's proposal, which positions France, Saudi Arabia, Kazakhstan, and the World Bank as the primary drivers, asserts that solutions to the global water crisis must go through large-capital actors. The proposed solution also does not involve structural redistribution or the recognition of rich countries' ecological debt to poor ones. The repeated emphasis on "finance privée," desalination technology, and market mechanisms reflects green neoliberal ideology.

Looking at his four speeches, the researcher found that Macron consistently used the vocabulary of science, solidarity, data, and justice as instruments capable of establishing France's moral authority and reproducing Western financial dominance in global

environmental governance. As Fairclough (1992) emphasized, discourse is never ideologically neutral. This can be seen in Macron's speeches, which depicts how climate diplomacy operates as an arena where power is actively legitimized through language. In his various speeches, Macron also framed the environmental crisis as if it could be solved solely by relying on market mechanisms, private investment, and technical and bureaucratic governance systems. This recurring pattern of discourse indicates the existence of a regular and interconnected ideological framework. However, it is not limited to one speech or one particular event, instead it serves as a foundation for thinking that underlies Macron's entire approach to environmental issues.

Based on the ideational analysis guided by Halliday's (2014) ideational metafunction, material processes were the most dominant type of process across the 4 speeches (see Table 1), occurring 39 times and constituting 45.35% of the total data. These findings are consistent with the nature of political speeches presented at international climate conferences.

Table 1.

Types of Process

No.	Types of Process	S1	S2	S3	S4
1.	Material	7	10	10	12
2.	Mental	1	1	1	2
3.	Behavioral	0	0	0	0
4.	Verbal	0	0	0	
5.	Relational	4	5	9	6
6.	Existential	0	1	1	0
TOTAL		21	21	22	22

According to Halliday & Matthiessen (2014), the material process describes actions and events that occur in the real world, namely linking an actor with a concrete action directed towards a specific goal. The dominance of this material process is consistent with the practical demands of international climate diplomacy, where speakers are expected to demonstrate concrete commitments, instead of just expressing positions. Previous research on political discourse confirms that the dominance of the material process positions actors as active, decisive, and responsible parties (Muldoon et al., 2025; My Nhat & Thu Hien, 2023). The tendency to employ action-oriented representations reinforces political legitimacy through commitment. In this regard, France is linguistically positioned as the primary driver of environmental change, so that its promises carry the weight of physical inevitability, instead of being the result of dependence on the political situation. In this process, there is an actor who performs an action directed at a specific goal (see Table 2 & Table 3).

Table 2.

Process of Macron's Speech (1)

<i>l'accord de Paris</i>	<i>a posé</i>	<i>nos objectifs communs fondés sur la science</i>	<i>très clairement</i>
The Paris Agreement	has set / laid down	our common objectives based on science	very clearly
Actor	Pr: Material	Goal	Circum: Manner

In Table 2, the Paris Agreement is positioned as the 'Actor'. This means that blame or responsibility is no longer attributed to individual nations, but instead to international law as a whole. Consequently, no single country is truly accountable for concrete action. France, too, can avoid scrutiny whilst still praising itself for the progress achieved collectively.

Table 3.

Process of Macron's Speech (3)

<i>on</i>	<i>va porter</i>	<i>nos trajectoires 2035</i>	<i>à Belém</i>
we (Europeans)	will carry / present	our 2035 trajectories	in Belém
Actor	Pr: Material	Goal	Circum: Place

In Table 3, Macron uses the word 'on' to refer to 'we Europeans'. With this choice of words, he elevates Europe's position as a leader, whilst simultaneously sidelining developing countries (the Global South) from an active role. This pattern indicates that simple choices of pronouns can reveal who is considered important and who is overlooked in the global power structure. Then, the most dominant type of participant in the 4 speeches was the Actor, with a total of 36 occurrences, or 29.75% (see Table 4). In the data, this finding mirrors the dominance of material processes, which is because the Actor is the participant role most connected to material processes

Table 4.

Types of Participants

No.	Types of Participants	S1	S2	S3	S4
1.	Actor	8	9	9	10
2.	Goal	7	8	8	9
3.	Sensor	1	1	1	2
4.	Phenomenon	1	1	1	2
5.	Carrier	3	4	5	3
6.	Attribute	3	4	6	4
7.	Identified	0	0	1	1
8.	Identifier	0	0	1	1
9.	Existent	0	1	1	0
TOTAL		25	30	32	34

According to Halliday & Matthiessen (2014), Actor in a sentence is the party that initiates or performs the action, where Actor is the centre of control and power within a clause. Based on Macron's speeches, this Actor role is consistently filled by pronoun "nous/on" and Western institutions, such as France, the French Development Agency (AFD), the European Union, the TFFF, and the Water Finance Coalition (see Table 5 & 6).

Table 5.

Process of Macron's Speech (2)

<i>la France</i>	<i>respecte</i>	<i>ses budgets carbone</i>	<i>depuis 2017</i>
France	respects	its carbon budgets	since 2017
Actor	Pr: Material	Goal	Circum: Time

In Table 5, the structure of the sentence makes France appear to be a country that strictly complies with the carbon budget. The use of 'depuis 2017' supports the impression that this claim is an ongoing reality, not just speculation.

Table 6.

Process of Macron's Speech (4)

<i>l'Agence Française de Développement</i>	<i>a engagé</i>	<i>plus de 10 milliards de dollars</i>	<i>dans le secteur de l'eau, déjà</i>
the French Development Agency	has committed	more than 10 billion dollars	in the water sector, already
Actor	Pr: Material	Goal	Circum: Place

In Table 6, the AFD is classified as an Actor in the funding commitment process. There is a specific target amount, which is 'plus de 10 milliards de dollars'. With this figure, the AFD's actions feel substantial and measurable, instead of just meaningless promises.

Looking at Table 5 and Table 6, the pattern is always the same, where the control over environmental governance is placed in Western institutions. Meanwhile, nature and the recipients of aid or commitments only serve as objects, where they are the ones being controlled. Nevertheless, this structure constructs reality as illustrated by Wang's (2026), in which Western leadership is presented as the central and unavoidable focal point of global climate action. Hence, this unequal division of roles makes environmental governance appear to be the exclusive privilege of Western.

Nevertheless, the most prevalent type of circumstance in the four speeches was the Circumstance of Location, with a total of 22 occurrences, or 28.57% (see Table 7). Location circumstants in this data cover two aspects: (1) place, such as the expressions "in Belém", "in these primary forests", and "in the water sector"; (2) and time, such as "since 2017", "by 2030", "next December", "every year", "aujourd'hui", and so on.

Table 7.

Types of Circumstances

No.	Types of Circumstances	S1	S2	S3	S4
1.	Location (Place/Time)	5	6	5	6
2.	Extent	4	4	3	7
3.	Manner	2	3	3	4
4.	Cause	1	2	3	4
5.	Condition	0	0	1	2
6.	Accompaniment	0	1	1	1
7.	Matter	3	3	2	1
TOTAL		15	19	18	25

The dominance of locational circumstances is generally linked to time. This reflects an important strategy in political discourse. This strategy involves anchoring commitments and claims to specific, verifiable spatial and temporal coordinates. For example, in Table 8 & 9:

Table 8.

Process of Macron's Speech

<i>les trois quarts de la biodiversité sont terrestres</i>		<i>dans ces forêts primaires</i>	<i>aujourd'hui</i>
three quarters of terrestrial are biodiversity		in these primary forests	today
Carrier	Pr: Relational	Circum: Place	Circum: Time

In Table 8, there is a relational process that assigns statistical properties to biodiversity. In other words, nature is defined on the basis of figures that can be measured and known to humans. Nature is considered in terms of what it provides for humans, instead of what nature itself does or experiences.

Table 9.

Process of Macron's Speech

<i>une personne sur deux</i>	<i>connaît</i>	<i>au moins un mois de pénurie d'eau</i>	<i>chaque année</i>
One in two people	experiences	at least one month of water shortage	every year
Sensor	Pr: Mental	Phenomenon	Circum: Time

In Table 9, the human experience of water scarcity is depicted as a mental process. In other words, the focus is on people's feelings and suffering, instead of the causes or solutions to the water scarcity itself.

In this case, Macron's four speeches on ecological issues indicate that the language used in these addresses functions as an ideological mechanism forming the international audience's perspective on environmental realities. Based on Halliday's ideational metafunction framework, the analysis found that the choice of words and sentence structures in these speeches are consistently used to construct a distinctive experiential world. There are three main characteristics of this constructed experiential world, they are: (1) this world is ruled by concrete actions, where political commitments and promises are always paired with numerical targets and specific deadlines; (2) this world centres on reality that can be proven scientifically, as reflected in the frequent use of data, figures, and references to science-based mechanisms; (3) this world is filled with urgent calls for collective responsibility, where climate and water crises are depicted as collective problems that require urgent action from all parties, especially developed countries and multilateral institutions. As Kenzhekanova (2015) points out, the construction of reality in political discourse is shaped through systematic linguistic strategies, whereby language is used not only to convey information, but also to shape the audience's way of thinking. The representation of experience, constructed through the selection of processes, participants and descriptions, reflects an effort to assert a particular perspective as something rational and widely acceptable.

4.2 Ideology in President Macron's Speeches (2024–2025)

Corbett (2006) divides environmental ideologies into two opposing poles: (1) anthropocentrism; and (2) ecocentrism, both of which are further subdivided into several schools of thought. In this study, the researcher found that Macron's speech texts tend to align with the anthropocentric pole which is conservationism and preservationist. To validate

the results, the researcher also utilised the theoretical framework of Stibbe (2015) to complement Corbett's perspective. Stibbe (2015) classifies discourse into three types, which are: (1) beneficial; (2) ambivalent; (3) or harmful, based on the actual impact of the discourse on the ecosystem. These two theoretical frameworks will be applied concurrently in the analysis below:

In President Macron's speech (1), the ideology that stands out is conservationism. The reason for this is that Macron mentioned forests as:

"Je ne vais pas les répéter si ce n'est pour insister sur l'importance des forêts primaires à la fois dans la bataille pour la réduction de nos émissions parce que ce sont les puits aujourd'hui les plus efficaces de carbone terrestre et qui viennent compléter ce que mangroves et les fonds marins font. Ce sont, en plus, les plus grandes réserves de carbone irrécupérables, ce qui fait qu'à chaque fois qu'on les détruit, on recule dans notre effort de décarbonation. Ce sont des réserves les plus importantes de la biodiversité, 75% de la biodiversité terrestre est dans ces forêts primaires. Ce sont aussi des lieux, des écosystèmes de vie et d'habitat pour beaucoup de peuples autochtones."

In other words, Macron believes that nature is a resource that yields concrete benefits for humanity. On several occasions, Macron has spoken about the importance of preserving forests. He believes that forests are integral to reaching climate targets and securing economic prosperity. Reflecting on the speech (1), from an eco-critical perspective, it can be deemed as ambivalent discourse. This is because the researcher found that Macron's statement contained a positive ecological aspect. He stated that:

"Mais en même temps, préserver les forêts existantes est essentiel, à la fois en Amazonie, Président Petro en a parlé à l'instant, que nous avons un partage quelques-uns autour de cette table. Dans le bassin du fleuve Congo, le Président Tshisekedi l'a dit tout à l'heure, et je salue tous les pays aussi qui contribuent à cet effort, mais également en Asie du Sud-Est, l'envoyé spécial de l'Indonésie l'a dit, et je vois mon frère de Papouasie-Nouvelle-Guinée de l'autre côté de la table, qui participe de cet effort. Donc on doit vraiment s'assurer de cet effort complet."

Macron called on his audience to push for an end to deforestation and the conservation of primary forests in three global forest systems: the Amazon, the Congo Basin and Southeast Asia. Not only that, but Macron also committed to securing funding through to 2030 and forging international political solidarity around forest protection. This can be seen through:

"La France, au-delà du soutien politique, apportera un soutien financier en plus de ce que nous avons commencé avec le Président Lula. Il y a quelques mois, nous avons pris l'engagement d'un milliard d'euros sur l'Amazonie ensemble. L'Agence française de développement a déjà décaissé 400 millions d'euros sur ce milliard pour financer la préservation de la forêt et de la bioéconomie. Donc, sur la base des conditions et des hypothèses que je viens d'évoquer, la France apportera d'ici 2030 un soutien supplémentaire de 500 millions d'euros qui pourraient être contribué à la TFFF."

Hence, as a state actor, Macron prioritizes environmental protection and global interests. Therefore, the discourse that has ensued reproduces the notion that environmental sustainability can be achieved through technocratic management and international coordination, without fully abandoning an approach that treats nature as a commodity.

In President Macron's (2) speech, the ideologies that stand out are conservationism and preservationism. These two ideologies coexist, though with differing levels of impact. In this context, conservationism is still the dominant ideology. He mentions forests and oceans as:

“Des puits de carbone irrécupérables pour nos forêts primaires et nos océans, parce que ces deux combats sont des combats pour préserver notre biodiversité. Je rappelle que les trois quarts de la biodiversité terrestre aujourd'hui sont dans ces forêts primaires qu'on a des réserves de biodiversité extraordinaires dans nos océans.”

In other words, forests and oceans are considered valuable not for their intrinsic worth, but for their capacity to capture carbon and provide a reserve of biodiversity that benefits humanity. Reflecting on the speech (2), it can be said that from an eco-critical perspective, this speech also falls within the scope of ambivalent discourse. The speech contains a positive ecological dimension, as Macron has increased the scope of his commitments to go beyond forests to include the oceans, methane, fossil fuels and climate justice. As he stated:

“Nous devons continuer résolument à nous engager sur la sortie progressive des énergies fossiles... fixons des objectifs contraignants sur le méthane... on va mieux protéger notre haute mer... je vous invite au maximum à rejoindre l'initiative de moratoire sur le deep sea mining.”

In this situation, Macron is pushing for the gradual phase-out of fossil fuels, imposing binding methane targets, strengthening the protection of the high seas through the implementation of the BBNJ agreement, and calling on countries to join a moratorium on deep-sea mining. These commitments mirror the more systemic ecological awareness of state actors. The researcher then noticed the recurrence of phrases expressing belonging, such as *nos forêts*, *nos océans*, *notre biodiversité*, throughout the speech. At this point, it reflects the fact that nature is still treated as belonging to humans and requiring management, instead of being seen as an existence with its own inherent rights.

In President Macron's (3) speech, the ideologies that appeared were conservationism and preservationism. In this regard, conservationism can be seen in the way Macron defined biodiversity as an active solution to the climate crisis. Macron stated:

“Notre biodiversité est une des solutions aux émissions, parce que des mangroves aux forêts primaires et à nos océans, ce sont des puits de carbone, parce que ce sont aussi des sources d'innovation naturelle qui nous permettent justement de réduire les émissions et parce que ce sont des leviers aussi d'adaptation au changement climatique.”

In other words, Macron positions nature as a manifestation of efforts to mitigate and adapt to climate change. However, the researcher considers that Macron regards nature in terms of what it can provide to humanity, rather than for its intrinsic value. The presence of

preservationism in this speech is also apparent in Macron's acknowledgement of the important role of indigenous peoples and local communities. Therefore, in speech (3) Macron positions them as key actors in conservation policy who are deserving of compensation for their efforts. In this regard, Macron states that:

“accompagner les pays, mais aussi avec les peuples autochtones, les collectivités locales qui sont essentielles dans cette dynamique, pour qu'elles aient la rémunération d'une politique de préservation.”

This statement indicates that discussions regarding rights are appearing in Macron's discourse. In his two previous speeches, there was no mention of rights. Reflecting on speech (3), when viewed from an eco-critical perspective, this speech still falls under the category of ambivalent discourse. On one hand, the speech contains a positive ecological dimension, as Macron acknowledges the climate-biodiversity nexus as a foundation that cannot be overlooked. Macron states:

“Ce nexus, si je puis dire, climat-biodiversité, est absolument fondamental si on veut réussir. Là, le cœur de la bataille, c'est évidemment toutes les politiques de reforestation, mais c'est aussi les politiques de conservation des forêts primaires et des mangroves.”

In this regard, Macron speaks up by raising the fact that primary forests hold more than ¾ of the world's biodiversity and 14% of irrecoverable carbon. Thus, in his speech, Macron perceives this destruction as a major setback in global decarbonization efforts. Macron also criticizes the existence of climate injustice between wealthy nations and developing countries, where he highlights the hypocrisy of developed nations that are reopening coal power plants while lecturing developing countries:

“vous rouvrez chez vous des centrales à charbon parce que vous n'avez plus le gaz russe et vous venez nous donner des leçons.”

This statement reflects Macron's political awareness of the principle of justice within the ecological discourse. Consequently, as a state actor, the speech (3) effectively integrates the issues of climate change, biodiversity, development justice and the role of indigenous peoples within a coherent frame.

In President Macron's (4) speech, the ideologies that emerge are conservationism and preservationism. This is evident in the way Macron defines water as a basic right for all of humanity. Macron states that:

“l'accès à l'eau est normalement un droit fondamental... L'accès, la gestion de l'eau, doit être traité comme un bien commun.”

Macron's statement positions water as a fundamental right and a *bien commun* that cannot be fully controlled by national or private interests. His acknowledgment reflects traces of an ideology that prioritizes environmental ethics and values. However, the researcher observes that this rights-based framing is followed by economic logic, giving rise to a conservationist rationale. Macron states:

“Pour un dollar investi dans la résilience hydrique, ce sont quatre dollars d'économies qui sont réalisées... c'est un investissement très rentable.”

In this case, his argument for water protection is justified not because water is regarded as an inherent right, but because it is capable of generating quantifiable financial returns or being traded for profit. Reflecting on speech (4), when viewed from an eco-critical perspective, this speech still falls under the category of ambivalent discourse. It is true that the speech contains a positive ecological dimension, as Macron connects the water crisis with land degradation, forest conversion, and the loss of biodiversity as one interconnected system. Macron states that:

“Dans 9 cas sur 10, les enjeux d'adaptation sont liés à l'eau... Chaque année, 12 millions d'hectares de terres sont dégradés. Lorsque ces terres ne sont plus exploitables, elles perdent leur capacité à nous nourrir, forcent la conversion des forêts en terres agricoles et renforcent les grandes crises du climat et de la biodiversité.”

However, the researcher also identifies a bias that prevents this discourse from being fully classified as beneficial. The solutions proposed are highly technical and economic in nature, encompassing desalination, water recycling, financial consortiums, and private sector mobilization, as seen in:

“nous avons besoin... de la New Water Coalition... pour précisément apporter des solutions concrètes à tous... mobiliser les financements au plus vite pour développer ces solutions.”

At this point, desalination is a process that carries both advantages and benefits. However, the technology produced has the potential to cause serious ecological impacts on waste and marine ecosystems. In this case, it is not addressed at all in the speech.

In all four speeches, the perspective of conservatism continues to be the most prominent. However, there are also some passages that reflect a preservationist perspective, even though these appear only in specific places. This suggests that the ideology employed by Macron is not consistent or fixed, but instead is a mixture or hybrid.

5. Conclusion

Based on research conducted by the researcher, President Macron's four environmental speeches (2024–2025) employ material processes, actors and locations to reflect a discursive strategy that positions developed nations as the primary agents of climate action. In this context, the ideology of conservationism is employed to frame nature as a resource of value primarily due to its benefits for human well-being and survival. This implies that environmental conservation is promoted not for nature's own sake, but for the ecosystem services that nature can provide to humanity. This ideology drives Macron to integrate environmental arguments into the logic of development and economic growth. The speech also falls within an ambivalent discourse, in which Macron demonstrates a sincere ecological commitment, such as recognition of the right to water, protection of tropical forests, and concern for the vulnerability of developing nations, yet the solutions offered remain rooted in a neoliberal framework emphasising private financing, market mechanisms, and technocratic governance. Macron also acknowledged the structural inequalities between the North and the South, yet this acknowledgement was not followed by demands for redistribution or ecological debt. Instead, these inequalities were reframed as technical problems that could be resolved through efficiency, investment, and institutional reform. This study contributes to the field of eco-linguistic discourse analysis

through presenting how a neoliberal environmental ideology is sustained through the dominance of material processes within language. These findings remind us that narratives on climate change within global political discourse should be more oriented towards justice. Consequently, future research could compare the speeches of world leaders from various countries to identify ideological differences amongst them.

References

- Agbeleoba, S. O., Orebe, O., Adekunle-Ojo, G., & Owolabi, O. (2025). Ecolinguistic and critical discourse analysis of environmental narratives in sustainable development goal communications. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 13(5), 195–202. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20251305.12>
- Albert, J. S., Carnaval, A. C., Flantua, S. G. A., Lohmann, L. G., Ribas, C. C., Riff, D., Carrillo, J. D., Fan, Y., Figueiredo, J. J. P., Guayasamin, J. M., Hoorn, C., de Melo, G. H., Nascimento, N., Quesada, C. A., Ulloa Ulloa, C., Val, P., Arieira, J., Encalada, A. C., & Nobre, C. A. (2023). Human impacts outpace natural processes in the Amazon. *Science*, 379(6630), 000–000. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abo5003>
- Arianto, B. (2023). *Triangulasi metoda penelitian kualitatif*. Borneo Novelty Publishing.
- Banks, D. (2024). Systemic functional linguistics: Advances and applications. *Journal of World Languages*, 10(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jwl-2023-0083>
- Cabrejas-Peñuelas, A. B. (2023). Transitivity and evaluation in American and Spanish parliamentary discourse: The 2015 State of the Union Address in the US vs. the 2015 State of the Nation Address in Spain. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 20(2), 128–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2022.2041450>
- Chouliarakis, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Christensen, R. V. K., & Bentsen, N. S. (2024). Discourse developments within the public agenda on Danish nature management 2016–2021: Animal welfare ethics as a barrier to rewilding projects. *Ambio*, 53, 637–652. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-023-01964-8>
- Corbett, J. (2006). *An intercultural approach to English language teaching languages for intercultural communication and education series*, vol. 7. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Creswell, J.W. and Creswell, J.D. (2023) *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Doudaki, V., & Carpentier, N. (2025). Behind the narratives of climate change denial and rights of nature: Sustainability and the ideological struggle between anthropocentrism and ecocentrism in two radical Facebook groups in Sweden. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 30(1), 200–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2023.2196506>
- Eckersley, R. (2020). Rethinking leadership: Understanding the roles of the US and China in the negotiation of the Paris Agreement. *European Journal of International Relations*, 26(4), 1178–1202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066120927071>
- Ewick, P., & Silbey, S. S. (1994). Subversive stories and hegemonic tales: Toward a sociology of narrative. *Law & Society Review*, 29(2), 197–226. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3054010>
- Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *SAGE Journal*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926592003002004>

- Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Fox, C. (1997). *The authenticity of intercultural communication*. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 21(1), 85–103. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(96\)00012-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(96)00012-0)
- Gong, F. (2023). Analysis of ecological discourse in animal novels from the perspective of systemic functional linguistics. *Lecture Notes on Language and Literature*, 6, 53–56. <https://doi.org/10.23977/langl.2023.061008>
- Grumbach, S., & Hamant, O. (2020). How humans may co-exist with Earth? The case for suboptimal systems. *Anthropocene*, 30, 100245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ancene.2020.100245>
- Halliday, M.A.K., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M., Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203783771>
- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1995) *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. Routledge, New York.
- Hay, C. (2002). Globalisation as problem of political analysis: restoring agents to a “process without a subject” and politics to a logic of economic compulsion. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 15, 379–392. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0955757022000010935>
- Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1979). *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kashif, F., Farooqi, R., Tariq, S., Nusrat, A., Ashraf, F., & Raees, A. (2022). A transitivity analysis of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump's third presidential debate. *Heliyon*, 8(9), e10518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10518>
- Kenzhekanova, K. (2015). Linguistic features of political discourse. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(6 S2), 192–198. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n6s2p192>
- Kusmanto, H., Bahri, S., Zega, P. O., & Subhilhar. (2023). Joe Biden's confidence in addressing world security issue: An interpersonal analysis of political discourse. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13(11), 2867–2876. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1311.17>
- Laurie, J., & Thompson, M. (2025). Fossil-fueled stories: An ecolinguistic critical discourse analysis of the South African government's naturalisation of fossil fuels in the context of the climate crisis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 22(6), 589–607. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2024.2366282>
- Leipold, S., Feindt, P. H., Winkel, G., & Keller, R. (2019). Discourse analysis of environmental policy revisited: Traditions, trends, perspectives. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 21(5), 445–463. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2019.1660462>
- Leung, L. E. (2020). *The Greta effect: How does Greta Thunberg use the discourse of youth in her movement for climate justice?* (Bachelor's honours thesis, University of Calgary). [https://arts.ucalgary.ca/sites/default/files/teams/21/Leung-Hons-Thesis-April-2020%20\(1\).pdf](https://arts.ucalgary.ca/sites/default/files/teams/21/Leung-Hons-Thesis-April-2020%20(1).pdf)
- Luan, L., & Zhang, D. (2024). Ecological discourse analysis of Russian educational texts based on the transitivity system. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2399369>
- Lidicker, W. Z., Jr. (2020). A scientist's warning to humanity on human population growth. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 24, e01232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2020.e01232>

- Luan, C., Renzhi Liu, Yang Li, Qiyang Zhang. (2024). Comparison of various models for multi-scenario simulation of land use/land cover to predict ecosystem service value: A case study of Harbin-Changchun Urban Agglomeration, China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 478, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.144012>.
- Martin, D., McKenna, H., & Livina, V. (2017). The human physiological impact of global deoxygenation. *Journal of Physiological Sciences*, 67(1), 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12576-016-0501-0>
- Morris, J., & Hirst, G. (1991). Lexical cohesion computed by thesaural relations as an indicator of the structure of text. *Computational Linguistics*, 17(1), 21–48.
- Muldoon, J., Apostolidis, P., Hatzisavvidou, S., et al. (2025). New materialism and the politics of climate action: A critical dialogue. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 24, 274–297. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41296-024-00742-9>
- My Nhat, T. N., & Thu Hien, H. T. (2023). Construction of roles, obligations and values in politicians' discourses on anti-corruption. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 10(1), 2249286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2249286>
- Naz, N., Atta, A., & Hassan, A. (2022). Climate change and linguistic assistance to overcome its risks: An ecolinguistic analysis of Greta Thunberg speech. *World Journal of English Language*, 12(7), Special Issue. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4303703>
- Nesbitt-Larking, P. (2017). The ideological work of narratives: A review essay. *Political Psychology*, 38(4), 571–578. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12410>
- Parker, C. F., Karlsson, C., & Hjerpe, M. (2017). Assessing the European Union's global climate change leadership: From Copenhagen to the Paris Agreement. *Journal of European Integration*, 39(2), 239–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2016.1275608>
- Potter, L. (2016). Ideological representations and theme-rheme analysis in English and Arabic news reports: A systemic functional approach. *Functional Linguistics*, 3(5). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-016-0028-y>
- Riyanto, A., & Ardianto, A. (2023). It's nice to meet you: Contextual configuration on formal and informal introductions. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(2), 56–63. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n2p56>
- Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., & Lambin, E. (2009). Planetary boundaries: Exploring the safe operating space for humanity. *Ecology and Society*, 14(2), 32. <https://doi.org/10.1038/461472a>
- Rodman, R., Fromkin, V., & Nina Hyams, N. (1983). *An introduction to language*. Cengage Learning
- Sadi, U., Anees, Y., & Kanwal, A. (2024). Analysis of ecolinguistic discourse in Bina Shah's "the monsoon war". *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, 5(4), 319–327. [https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024\(5-IV\)30](https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024(5-IV)30)
- Saragih, T. B., Sihombing, P. S. R., & Napitupulu, S. (2026). Constructing the 'climate crisis': A critical discourse analysis of rhetorical strategies in G20 leaders' speeches. *Young Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(1), 209–220. <https://doi.org/10.66867/yjssh.v2i1.268>
- Song, X., Bakar, K., Abas, A. & Wan Abdul Halim, W. (2025). A systematic literature review on ecological discourse analysis (2014–2023). *Journal of World Languages*, 11(1), 50–74. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jwl-2024-0034>

- Stibbe, Arran (2015). *Ecolinguistics: Language, Ecology and the Stories We Live By*. Routledge.
- Telesiené, A., & Hadler, M. (2023). Dynamics and landscape of academic discourse on environmental attitudes and behaviors since the 1970s. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 8, 1136972. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2023.1136972>
- Van Dijk (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Sage Academic Books
- Walewicz, P. (2022). Studying the economization of discourse on international relations: The case for ecolinguistics. *Torun International Studies*, 2(16), 31–45. <https://doi.org/10.12775/TIS.2022.009>
- Wang, X. (2026). Deconstruct discursive power of the BRICS: A comparative legal discourse analysis on the obligations of states in respect of climate change. *Asian Review of Political Economy*, 5, 6–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44216-026-00074-y>
- Wang, G., & Huan, C. (2023). Negotiating climate change in public discourse: insights from critical discourse studies. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 21(2), 133–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2023.2198725>
- Wang, X., & Zhao, X. (2023). From growth obsession to ecological promotion: The discursive construction of party image in Chinese political discourse on ecological civilization. *Discourse & Communication*, 17(6), 741–763. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17504813231181080>
- Webster, J. J. (2019). Key terms in the SFL model. In G. Thompson, W. L. Bowcher, L. Fontaine, & D. Schöenthal (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of systemic functional linguistics* (pp. 35–54). Cambridge University Press.
- Yuliastutik, R. (2024). Analisis ekolinguistik kritis dalam video Pandawara Group pembersih sampah: Perspektif Teun A. Van Dijk. *GHANCARAN: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 184–197. <https://doi.org/10.19105/ghancaran.vi.17206>
- Zhang, L., & Jocuns, A. (2023). A multimodal critical discourse analysis of stance-taking in English news reports on the environment. *Journal of Studies in the English Language*, 18(2), 108–142.
- Zhou, J. (2024). Preferences of interpersonal metaphor of modality in academic disciplines. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11, 1546. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-04084-0>