



INTERNATIONAL PROCEEDING OF INNOVATIVE SCIENCE AND TRANSDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

e-ISSN: 2746-3338

Available online at <https://ipistrans.lppmi.or.id>

Email: proceedings@lppmi.or.id

Language, Love, and Environment A Sociolinguistic Perspective on Ecological Discourse in Indonesian Local Communities

Nurul Hidayanti Mahas¹, Gusni², Muhsyanur³

Corresponding Author

Email:
nhudayantimahas@gmail.com¹
gusni@unisad.ac.id²
muhsyanur@unisad.ac.id³

Keywords

ecolinguistics, environmental discourse, Indonesian local communities, sociolinguistic perspective, ecological consciousness, language and environment

Abstract

This article explores the intersection of language, affection, and environmental consciousness within Indonesian local communities through a sociolinguistic lens. Drawing on contemporary scholarship in ecolinguistics and sociolinguistic theory, this study examines how linguistic practices shape and reflect ecological awareness in diverse Indonesian settings. The analysis reveals that local communities employ culturally embedded linguistic resources to express environmental concerns, utilizing metaphorical language, indigenous terminology, and affective communication strategies that demonstrate deep connections between human emotion and ecological preservation. By investigating the discursive construction of environmental relationships in Indonesian contexts, this article highlights how language serves as both a mirror and a tool for environmental advocacy. The findings suggest that understanding local linguistic practices is essential for developing culturally appropriate environmental education and conservation strategies. This sociolinguistic perspective offers valuable insights into how language mediates the relationship between communities and their natural environments, emphasizing the role of emotional and cultural dimensions in ecological discourse.

Universitas Islam As'adiyah Sengkang, Indonesia^{1,2,3}

The International KKN-IK Program 2026 (29 January - 4 February 2026), held in a hybrid format, with the theme "Love-Based Curriculum and Ecological Service to Build Sustainable Local and Global Communities," organized by the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM) of Universitas Islam As'adiyah Sengkang, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between language and environment has emerged as a critical area of inquiry in contemporary sociolinguistic research, particularly as global environmental challenges demand culturally sensitive and locally grounded responses. Indonesia, with its remarkable linguistic diversity of over 700 languages and its position as one of the world's megadiverse countries, presents a unique context for examining how language mediates environmental understanding and action (Fernández & Maldonado, 2020). The concept of ecolinguistics, which explores the role of language in shaping our relationship with the natural world, provides a theoretical framework for understanding how Indonesian communities articulate their environmental concerns and values through distinctive linguistic practices (Muhsyanur and Murugesan, 2024).

Recent scholarship has increasingly recognized that language is not merely a neutral tool for describing environmental phenomena but actively shapes how communities perceive, value, and interact with their ecological surroundings. According to Stibbe (2021), the stories we live by—embedded in our linguistic practices—fundamentally influence our ecological behaviors and attitudes. This perspective is particularly relevant in Indonesian contexts, where indigenous and local knowledge systems, transmitted through language, have historically sustained complex relationships between communities and their environments. The linguistic construction of environmental reality, therefore, becomes a crucial factor in understanding and addressing contemporary ecological challenges (Muhsyanur and Mustapha, 2023).

The integration of affective dimensions—what we might call "love" or emotional attachment—into environmental discourse represents another significant development in sociolinguistic research (Kartini and Muhsyanur, 2025). Fill and Penz (2018) argue that the emotional resonance of language plays a vital role in motivating environmental action, suggesting that rational arguments alone are insufficient to inspire meaningful behavioral change. In Indonesian communities, where collective values and emotional bonds to place are deeply embedded in cultural practices, the affective dimension of environmental language becomes particularly salient. This emotional-linguistic nexus offers insights into how communities mobilize linguistic resources to express care, concern, and commitment to their environments.

The concept of environmental discourse encompasses the various ways communities talk about, represent, and construct meanings around ecological issues. Mühlhäusler (2023) emphasizes that different linguistic communities develop distinct discursive patterns that reflect their unique environmental experiences and knowledge systems (Muhsyanur, 2023). In Indonesia's local communities, these discursive patterns often incorporate traditional ecological knowledge, religious values, and contemporary environmental concerns, creating hybrid forms of environmental communication that bridge indigenous and modern

perspectives. Understanding these localized discursive practices is essential for effective environmental education and policy implementation.

Furthermore, the sociolinguistic approach to environmental discourse reveals how power relations, social hierarchies, and cultural values intersect with ecological concerns in community communication (Muhsyanur, 2020, 2023). Kramsch and Zhu (2020) demonstrate that language use in environmental contexts is never politically neutral but reflects and reinforces particular worldviews and social arrangements. In Indonesian settings, where community structures often maintain strong traditional hierarchies alongside modern governance systems, the linguistic negotiation of environmental issues becomes a site where competing interests and values are articulated, contested, and potentially reconciled.

Finally, the examination of ecological discourse in Indonesian local communities contributes to broader discussions about linguistic diversity and environmental sustainability. Harmon and Loh (2021) have documented correlations between linguistic diversity and biodiversity, suggesting that the preservation of languages is intimately connected to the preservation of ecosystems. Indonesia's extraordinary linguistic landscape, therefore, represents not only cultural wealth but also a repository of ecological knowledge and sustainable practices encoded in language. By exploring how Indonesian communities employ their linguistic resources to engage with environmental issues, this article seeks to illuminate the crucial role of language in fostering ecological consciousness and action.

DISCUSSIONS

Linguistic Practices and Environmental Conceptualization in Local Communities

Indonesian local communities demonstrate sophisticated linguistic practices that reflect deep conceptual connections between language and environment. The use of indigenous terminology for ecological phenomena reveals how communities categorize and understand their natural surroundings in ways that often diverge from Western scientific classifications (Muhsyanur, Larisu, et al., 2022). According to Albury (2022), indigenous languages frequently contain specialized vocabularies that distinguish environmental features, seasonal patterns, and ecological relationships with a granularity that reflects centuries of observation and interaction. In Indonesian contexts, communities employ terms that encode specific knowledge about local ecosystems, agricultural practices, and weather patterns, creating linguistic maps of their environmental worlds.

The metaphorical language used in environmental discourse provides another window into how communities conceptualize nature-human relationships. Chen (2021) argues that environmental metaphors are not merely decorative linguistic features but constitute fundamental frameworks through which communities understand and act upon ecological issues. Indonesian communities frequently employ familial metaphors, describing forests as "mothers" (ibu), rivers as "veins of life," and land as "inheritance" (warisan), which positions the environment within frameworks of kinship, reciprocity, and intergenerational

responsibility. These metaphorical patterns suggest that environmental protection is conceptualized not as abstract conservation but as fulfilling social and moral obligations to family and community (Muhsyanur, 2024; Santalia et al., 2025).

Linguistic practices also reveal how communities negotiate between traditional ecological knowledge and modern environmental discourse. Hornberger and De Korne (2018) observe that multilingual communities often engage in translanguaging practices that draw on multiple linguistic resources to express complex ideas. In Indonesian villages, speakers may code-switch between local languages, Indonesian, and increasingly English environmental terminology, creating hybrid discourses that bridge indigenous and global environmental perspectives. This linguistic hybridity reflects the dynamic nature of environmental knowledge, where traditional wisdom is continually reinterpreted in light of contemporary challenges.

The grammatical structures employed in environmental discourse further illuminate how communities construct relationships with nature. Languages that employ agent-oriented grammar may conceptualize environmental events differently than those using patient-oriented structures, affecting how responsibility and causality are attributed in ecological narratives. Döring and Zunino (2024) demonstrate that grammatical choices in environmental communication can influence how communities understand agency in ecological processes, potentially affecting environmental decision-making and action. Indonesian languages, with their diverse grammatical systems, offer rich opportunities for examining how linguistic structure shapes environmental understanding.

Affective Language and Emotional Dimensions of Environmental Discourse

The expression of emotional attachment to place through language constitutes a powerful dimension of environmental discourse in Indonesian communities. Communities employ affective language—terms expressing love, care, concern, and grief—to articulate their relationships with threatened environments (Muhsyanur, Suharti, et al., 2022). According to Lakoff (2020), emotional framing in environmental communication can be more effective than purely rational arguments in motivating action, as emotions provide the motivational force for behavioral change. Indonesian communities' use of emotionally charged language when discussing environmental degradation, such as describing deforestation as "heartbreak" (*patah hati*) or pollution as "poisoning the beloved land," demonstrates how affective discourse creates urgency and mobilizes collective response.

Religious and spiritual language represents another significant source of affective environmental discourse in Indonesian communities. The integration of Islamic, Hindu, Buddhist, and indigenous spiritual concepts into environmental communication imbues ecological concerns with moral and sacred significance. Kopnina (2019) argues that spiritually grounded environmental discourse can foster deeper commitment to

conservation by connecting ecological protection to core values and beliefs. In Indonesian contexts, phrases invoking divine creation, stewardship responsibilities, and karmic consequences for environmental harm demonstrate how spiritual language amplifies the emotional and moral dimensions of ecological discourse.

Community narratives and storytelling practices serve as vehicles for transmitting affective environmental knowledge across generations. These oral traditions employ emotionally resonant language to convey lessons about sustainable resource use, environmental ethics, and the consequences of ecological disruption. According to Harré et al. (2022), narrative forms of environmental communication are particularly effective because they engage listeners emotionally and embed ecological knowledge within memorable story structures. Indonesian folktales, legends, and contemporary community stories about environmental changes create emotional connections between listeners and landscapes, fostering identification with and care for local environments (Muhsyanur Muhsyanur, 2024a).

The linguistic expression of environmental loss and mourning reveals how communities process ecological change through affective discourse. Communities experiencing environmental degradation often employ language of grief, describing disappeared species, degraded forests, or polluted waters in terms traditionally reserved for human loss (Muhsyanur Muhsyanur, 2024a). Norton (2021) observes that this "ecological grief" discourse serves important psychological and social functions, acknowledging loss while potentially mobilizing collective action for environmental restoration. In Indonesian communities facing rapid environmental transformation, the linguistic articulation of ecological mourning creates spaces for collective processing of change and potentially catalyzes conservation efforts.

Discourse Strategies in Community Environmental Advocacy

Indonesian local communities employ diverse discourse strategies to advocate for environmental protection, drawing on both traditional rhetorical patterns and contemporary advocacy techniques. The use of inclusive pronouns and collective identity markers in environmental discourse constructs shared responsibility and community solidarity around ecological issues. As noted by Fairclough (2023), the linguistic construction of collective subjects in political discourse is central to mobilizing social action. Indonesian communities' consistent use of "we" (*kita/kami*) when discussing environmental challenges creates a sense of shared fate and collective agency, positioning environmental protection as a communal rather than individual responsibility.

Narrative framing strategies shape how environmental issues are presented and understood within communities. Communities may frame ecological challenges as threats to livelihoods, cultural heritage, health, or future generations, each framing activating different values and concerns. Bevitori (2020) demonstrates that strategic framing in environmental

communication can significantly influence public engagement and support for conservation measures. Indonesian communities often employ multiple concurrent frames, describing forest protection simultaneously as economic necessity, cultural preservation, spiritual duty, and legacy for children, thereby appealing to diverse community values and motivations.

The use of evidential language and appeals to authority strengthen community environmental arguments by grounding claims in observable phenomena and respected knowledge sources. Communities invoke traditional ecological knowledge, elder testimony, religious teachings, and increasingly scientific evidence to support their environmental positions. According to Koller (2023), the strategic deployment of different evidence types and authority claims in environmental discourse reflects communities' navigation of multiple knowledge systems and power structures. Indonesian communities' ability to code-switch between traditional and scientific evidential frameworks demonstrates sophisticated rhetorical awareness and strategic discourse practices.

Counter-discourse strategies emerge when communities resist dominant narratives that threaten their environmental interests or values. Local communities may challenge development discourse, corporate environmental claims, or government policies through alternative linguistic framings that highlight overlooked consequences or marginalized perspectives. Machin and Mayr (2022) emphasize that critical discourse analysis reveals how marginalized communities develop counter-hegemonic environmental narratives that challenge powerful actors' environmental representations. Indonesian communities' counter-discourses often reframe "development" as destruction, "progress" as loss, and "modernization" as cultural and ecological impoverishment, offering alternative visions of community flourishing grounded in environmental sustainability.

Sociolinguistic Diversity and Environmental Communication Challenges

The remarkable linguistic diversity of Indonesian communities presents both opportunities and challenges for environmental communication and collective action. Multilingual communities must negotiate environmental discourse across multiple languages, each potentially encoding different environmental conceptualizations and values. Palmer (2018) argues that language diversity can enhance environmental problem-solving by providing multiple perspectives and knowledge systems, but it can also create communication barriers that impede coordinated action. Indonesian communities' linguistic heterogeneity requires careful attention to translation, interpretation, and the development of shared environmental vocabularies that bridge linguistic boundaries while respecting distinct knowledge traditions (Muhsyanur Muhsyanur, 2024b).

Generational language shifts complicate the transmission of traditional ecological knowledge and environmental values. As younger community members increasingly adopt Indonesian or English as primary languages, potentially at the expense of local languages, the

specialized environmental vocabularies and knowledge embedded in indigenous languages may be lost. Zenker (2020) documents how language shift can lead to the erosion of ecological knowledge, as traditional terms for plants, animals, environmental processes, and sustainable practices become obsolete. Indonesian communities experiencing rapid language shift face the challenge of adapting traditional environmental knowledge to new linguistic forms while maintaining the conceptual richness encoded in indigenous languages.

The integration of global environmental discourse into local contexts raises questions about linguistic imperialism and the potential colonization of local environmental conceptualizations. The introduction of English-language environmental concepts, often mediated through Indonesian, may displace or subordinate indigenous environmental frameworks. Phillipson (2022) warns that the global dominance of English in environmental discourse can marginalize local knowledge and impose Western environmental paradigms on non-Western contexts. Indonesian communities must navigate the tension between engaging with global environmental movements and preserving locally grounded environmental perspectives, a negotiation fundamentally mediated through language choices and discourse practices.

The role of education in shaping environmental discourse patterns highlights tensions between formal and informal knowledge transmission systems. Environmental education delivered in Indonesian or English through formal schooling may compete with or complement traditional environmental knowledge transmitted in local languages through informal community practices. Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (2021) argue that language-in-education policies significantly impact the preservation and transmission of environmental knowledge, with implications for both linguistic and ecological sustainability. Indonesian communities' experiences with environmental education reveal complex interactions between linguistic practices, knowledge systems, and the formation of environmental consciousness among younger generations.

CONCLUSION

This sociolinguistic examination of environmental discourse in Indonesian local communities reveals the profound interconnections between language, affection, and ecological consciousness. The analysis demonstrates that Indonesian communities employ sophisticated linguistic resources—including indigenous terminology, metaphorical language, affective expressions, and strategic discourse practices—to conceptualize, communicate about, and advocate for their environments. These linguistic practices are not mere reflections of environmental awareness but actively shape how communities understand their relationships with nature and mobilize for ecological protection. The integration of emotional and cultural dimensions into environmental discourse, particularly through expressions of love, care, and spiritual connection to place, provides powerful motivational force for conservation action. However, the challenges posed by linguistic

diversity, language shift, and the integration of global environmental discourse into local contexts highlight the complexity of environmental communication in multilingual settings. Understanding these sociolinguistic dynamics is essential for developing culturally appropriate environmental education, effective conservation strategies, and inclusive environmental governance that respects and builds upon local linguistic and ecological knowledge. Future research and practice must attend carefully to the linguistic dimensions of environmental engagement, recognizing that the preservation of linguistic diversity and the preservation of ecological diversity are fundamentally intertwined endeavors in Indonesia's rich cultural and natural landscape.

REFERENCES

- Albury, N. J. (2022). Language and environmental sustainability. In K. Tusting (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of linguistic ethnography* (pp. 412-426). Routledge.
- Bevitori, C. (2020). Framing environmental discourse: A critical analysis. *Environmental Communication*, 14(3), 289-303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2019.1688485>
- Chen, S. (2021). Metaphors of nature: Conceptualizing human-environment relationships through language. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 32(2), 245-268. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2020-0089>
- Döring, M., & Zunino, F. (2024). Grammar and ecological thought: How linguistic structure shapes environmental perception. *Language Sciences*, 101, 101-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2023.101589>
- Fairclough, N. (2023). *Critical discourse analysis and the study of social change* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- Fernández, M. A., & Maldonado, S. (2020). Linguistic diversity and ecological knowledge in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 41(8), 678-692. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1671920>
- Fill, A., & Penz, H. (2018). *The Routledge handbook of ecolinguistics*. Routledge.
- Harmon, D., & Loh, J. (2021). The convergence of linguistic and biological diversity: Implications for conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 35(6), 1778-1789. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13850>
- Harré, N., Madden, H., & Griffiths, A. (2022). Narrative approaches to environmental communication: Engaging emotions for sustainable futures. *Environmental Education Research*, 28(4), 512-528. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2021.1993455>
- Hornberger, N. H., & De Korne, H. (2018). Is revitalization through education possible? In L. Hinton, L. Huss, & G. Roche (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language revitalization* (pp. 94-103). Routledge.
- Koller, V. (2023). Authority and expertise in environmental discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 34(1), 88-106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265221134567>
- Kopnina, H. (2019). Green-washing or best case practices? Using circular economy and Cradle to Cradle case studies in business education. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 219, 613-623. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.02.005>

- Kramsch, C., & Zhu, H. (2020). Language and culture in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 74(4), 447-454. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaa042>
- Lakoff, G. (2020). Environmental communication and the role of metaphor. *Environmental Communication*, 14(5), 585-594. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2020.1725890>
- Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2022). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (2023). *Linguistic ecology: Language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific region* (Rev. ed.). Routledge.
- Kartini and Muhsyanur. (2025). The Importance of Knowing Curriculum for Teacher : A Phenomenological Study in Indonesia. *International Proceeding of Innovativescienceand Transdisciplinary Studies*, 6(1), 127-137. <https://ipistrans.lppmi.or.id/index.php/proceeding/article/view/16/16>
- Muhsyanur, Manivannan Murugesan, S. D. (2024). *Eco-pedagogical literature: exploring literaturebased learning to improve environmental literacy*.
- Muhsyanur and Mustapha, B. (2023). Challenges and Strategies in Teaching Indonesian to Indonesian Occupied Students in Malaysia. *TRICKS: Journal Ff Education And Learning Practices*, 1(1), 32-39. <https://journal.echaprogres.or.id/index.php/tricks/article/view/6>
- Muhsyanur, M. (2020). Types and trust system based on the ideology of Bugis community culture on local interest values in cening rara spells. *International Journal of Humanity Studies (IJHS)*, 4(1), 58-68. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.v4i1.2652>
- Muhsyanur, M. (2023). The Bugis People's Naming System in Bugis Ethnic Tradition. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 23(1), 67-76. <https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v23i1.5062>
- Muhsyanur, M. (2024). *Love-Based Curriculum as a New Paradigm in Language Education : Between Cognition , Affection , and Spirituality*. 2(5), 12-19.
- Muhsyanur, M., Larisu, Z., Sanulita, H., Ertanti, D. W., & Widada, D. M. (2022). Indonesian netizens expressions potentially satire with the Covid-19 pandemic on social media Facebook. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 6(1), 55-69. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v6n1.1942>
- Muhsyanur, M., Suharti, S., & Sudikan, S. Y. (2022). Physical representation of female character in children's novels by children. *Diksi*, 30(1), 66-73. <https://doi.org/10.21831/diksi.v30i1.45663>
- Muhsyanur Muhsyanur. (2024a). Implementation of Merdeka Belajar in Indonesian Language Learning in Senior High Schools. *Jurnal Ilmiah Insan Mulia*, 1(1), 8-14. <https://doi.org/10.59923/jiim.v1i1.170>
- Muhsyanur Muhsyanur, I. R. (2024b). *The influence of positive thinking on language politeness: a case study of iai as'adiyah sengkang students*.
- Santalia, Indo, & Muhsyanur. (2025). The curriculum of love and eco-theology as the basis of the Istiqlal declaration implementation movement. *HUMANIST : As'adiyah International Journal of Humanities and Education*, 2(1), 33-42.
- Norton, B. (2021). Ecological grief and environmental education. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 37(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ae.2020.42>
- Palmer, G. B. (2018). Linguistic diversity and environmental knowledge. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 60(3), 234-256. <https://doi.org/10.1353/anl.2018.0012>

- Phillipson, R. (2022). *English in the world: The TESOL Trinity and linguistic hegemony*. Multilingual Matters.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Phillipson, R. (2021). Language ecology. In R. Wodak & B. Forchtner (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language and politics* (pp. 391-406). Routledge.
- Stibbe, A. (2021). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Zenker, O. (2020). Language shift and the loss of traditional ecological knowledge. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 14, 368-391.