Lire Journal (Journal of Linguistics and Literature)
https://lirejournal.ubb.ac.id/index.php/LRJ/index
P-ISSN: 2598-1803 E-ISSN: 2581-2130
Volume 10 Number 3 2026

CONSTRUCTING ECOLOGICAL MEANING IN CORPORATE SUSTAINABILITY REPORTING: A CRITICAL ECOLINGUISTICS ANALYSIS OF SINAR MAS LAND

Muhammad Munawir[1]* & Junaidi[2]
[1]*Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia*
[2]*Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia*

Corresponding Author: Muhammad Munawir, E-mail: *Muhammad.munawir@ui.ac.id*

ARTICLE INFO
Received: 20-04-2026
Revised: 12-05-2026
Accepted: 20-06-2026
Published: 30-06-2026
Volume: 10
Issue: 3
DOI: 10.33019/lire.v10i3.617

KEYWORDS
Ecolinguistics; Sustainability Reporting; Corporate Discourse; Semantic Domain Analysis; Neoliberal Environmental Governance; Indonesian Property Sector.

ABSTRACT
This study analyses the use of ecological meanings in Sinarmas Land's Sustainability Reports (2017–2024), a prominent Indonesian homebuilder. The study employs Arran Stibbe's "Stories We Live By" and Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis methodology. This study employs USAS for corpus-assisted semantic analysis. Semantic tagging helped us find 157 important words in the areas of World and Environment (W), Social Actions and Processes (S), and Government and Public (G). The study shows that three related trends have an effect on environmental discourse. Sustainability is a part of G because of rules that are in line with each other, certification, and compliance frameworks. This gives the government the power to control ecological sustainability. The corporation is an ethical environmental player in the S domain because stories about stewardship, awareness, and community empowerment make environmental duties moral and shared. The last area recognises ecological elements and processes, although they are slowly added to resource optimisation and technologically scientific management. This brings together protecting the environment with new ideas and growth. The results indicate that corporate sustainability discourse constitutes neoliberal environmental governance. This kind of government combines concern for the environment with growth.

1. INTRODUCTION

Corporate sustainability reporting has become an essential way for businesses to tell different groups of people about how well they are doing in terms of social and environmental issues. As a means of transparency and accountability, it allows organisations to show that they are financially stable, can last in the long run, and are run responsibly (Rusu et al., 2024; Christofi et al., 2012; Sun et al., 2023). From an ecolinguistic standpoint, language not only reflects environmental reality but also actively shapes it, indicating that sustainability discourse is essential in influencing perceptions of environmental responsibility. In corpus-based discourse studies, such constructions can be systematically analysed via semantic domain analysis, especially through categories like World and Environment (W), Social Actions and Processes (S), and Government and Public (G) from the UCREL Semantic Analysis System (USAS). These categories help us find lexical patterns in sustainability reports that are related to environmental representation, social practices, and governance structures. This is based on the ecolinguistic tradition started by Haugen and further developed by Stibbe, who stresses how discourse shapes the relationships between people and ecosystems.

Lire Journal (Journal of Linguistics and Literature)
https://lirejournal.ubb.ac.id/index.php/LRJ/index
P-ISSN: 2598-1803 E-ISSN: 2581-2130
Volume 10 Number 3 2026

As the global climate issue becomes worse, corporate sustainability reporting has become a strategic way for businesses to build ecologically responsible identities. More and more, sustainability reports include words and phrases that have to do with protecting the environment, green development, and being responsible for the environment. These are commonly called "green narratives." For businesses, these kinds of stories are not only ways to be open and honest, but also ways to increase the value of their assets and attract customers who care about the environment (Fuerst & McAllister, 2011; Majeed et al., 2022). Nonetheless, the widespread dissemination of these narratives prompts essential enquiries about their true capacity to foster ecological stewardship or their role as discursive tactics that validate ongoing industrial growth.
The real estate and property business is one of the sectors that has the greatest negative effects on the environment across the world. The operating phase of buildings is a major source of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, making up around 35–50% of all emissions because of fossil-based energy usage (Ascione et al., 2021; López-Guerrero et al., 2022; Sharma et al., 2011). Construction activities in Indonesia are linked to environmental harm, such as producing too much waste, poor logistics, and poor coordination (Fitriani et al., 2023). The construction process itself also causes climate change, loss of biodiversity, and depletion of resources (Auburtin et al., 2024). Because of these effects, property developers are very important not just for altering the physical environment but also for creating stories about being responsible for the environment.

In this context, it is essential to critically analyse the construction of environmental responsibility within corporate sustainability rhetoric. Language not only delineates environmental practices but also influences perceptions, legitimises behaviours, and formulates corporate identities (Fill & Penz, 2018; Stibbe, 2015). Utilising Stibbe's (2015) Stories We Live By framework, this research examines how sustainability discourse formulates ecological narratives that may either endorse life-sustaining principles or validate ongoing development.
Sinarmas Land is a good example for this research since it is one of the biggest real estate developers in Indonesia and works in a fast urbanising area. Its sustainability reports from 2017 to 2024 provide a long-term dataset that shows how environmental responsibility is defined, measured, and accepted over time. This makes the instance especially good for looking at how corporate language talks about the balance between economic development and ecological sustainability in the Indonesian property market.

Prior research on Sinarmas Land has predominantly examined internal organisational dimensions, including employee performance, competence, and work-life balance (Marzani & Dharmawan, 2017; Gulo & Widayati, 2020; Ariendra & Susilowati, 2024), as well as communication strategies and corporate image (Ridha et al., 2018; Yosephine & Diniati, 2021), marketing (Saleh et al., 2023), and program evaluation (Ambon, 2023; Elizabeth & Gunawan, 2018). In Indonesia, ecolinguistic studies have focused on tourism discourse, governmental communication, and media narratives (Isti'anah, 2020; Istianah & Suhandano, 2022; Suhandano et al., 2023; Suryani & Suhandano, 2024; Nuh & Prawira, 2023; Yuniawan et al., 2023a; Prastio et al., 2023). Nonetheless, the use of ecolinguistics in corporate sustainability reporting is still constrained. Most of the research that has been done in this field has been done in other countries. For example, Bondi and Nocella (2025) looked at CSR reports from rail firms, while Wang and Liu (2024) looked at multimodal ecological narratives in petroleum company reports. This

signifies a deficiency in research about the use of ecolinguistic methodologies to corporate sustainability discourse in Indonesia.

Consequently, this research seeks to analyse the construction of environmental meaning in Sinarmas Land's sustainability reports using an ecolinguistic framework. It aims to address the following research question: (1) What ecological narratives are produced within the sustainability discourse of Sinarmas Land's reports? and (2) How are language techniques, such framing, metaphors, and processes of salience and erasure, used to change these stories? By addressing these enquiries, this research enhances the critical comprehension of how corporate rhetoric influences the interplay between environmental responsibility and industrial progress.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Ecolinguistics and Stories We Live By

Ecolinguistics examines how language shapes relationships between humans, society, and the environment. One of the most influential approaches is Stibbe's (2015) framework of *Stories We Live By*, which explains that discourse constructs ecological narratives that can either support or damage environmental sustainability. According to Stibbe, language is not neutral; it carries assumptions, values, and ideologies that influence how people perceive nature and environmental responsibility. Stibbe (2015) identifies several discursive patterns that reveal how environmental meanings are constructed. *Ideology* refers to shared beliefs embedded in discourse, while *framing* highlights certain aspects of reality and hides others. *Metaphors* simplify complex environmental issues by representing them through familiar concepts, such as describing nature as a "resource" or "asset." *Evaluation* expresses judgments about what is considered beneficial or harmful, whereas *identity* constructs social roles and relationships between corporations, consumers, and the environment. In addition, *conviction* strengthens particular claims as unquestionable truths, *salience* determines which issues are made prominent, and *erasure* removes or minimizes ecological concerns from public attention. Through these patterns, ecolinguistics reveals how environmental discourse can normalize exploitation while simultaneously presenting it as sustainable or responsible. For example, corporations may frame environmental protection as compatible with continuous economic growth, thereby reinforcing anthropocentric and profit-oriented perspectives. This framework is useful for examining sustainability reports because it uncovers how companies construct environmental narratives and legitimize their practices through language.

2.2 Corporate Sustainability Discourse and Greenwashing

Corporate sustainability discourse refers to the way companies use language to communicate environmental and social responsibility. Sustainability reports, environmental campaigns, and corporate statements often present organizations as ethical, responsible, and environmentally conscious actors. However, scholars have argued that such discourse may function strategically to build legitimacy, maintain reputation, and gain public trust rather than reflect substantial environmental change. This phenomenon is closely related to greenwashing, which describes the use of environmental rhetoric to create a misleading image of sustainability. Through selective language choices, corporations may emphasize positive environmental actions while minimizing ecological damage or unsustainable practices. Terms such as "green growth," "net zero," or "sustainable development" can therefore operate as persuasive discourse that aligns environmental responsibility with corporate profitability.

From an ecolinguistic perspective, greenwashing can be identified through discursive patterns such as evaluation, framing, salience, and erasure. Positive evaluations of corporate actions may dominate sustainability reports, while harmful environmental impacts remain backgrounded or omitted. Consequently, sustainability discourse becomes not only a form of communication but also a tool for constructing corporate legitimacy and shaping public perception of environmental responsibility.

2.3 Corpus-Assisted Critical Discourse Analysis

Corpus-Assisted Critical Discourse Analysis (CACDA) combines corpus linguistics with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to examine recurring linguistic patterns in large collections of texts. CDA, particularly Fairclough's (1992) approach, views discourse as a social practice that reflects and reproduces power relations and ideology. Fairclough's three-dimensional framework—text, discursive practice, and social practice—provides a systematic way to analyze how meanings are constructed within broader institutional and socio-economic contexts. The integration of corpus tools strengthens discourse analysis by enabling researchers to identify consistent semantic and lexical patterns that may not be immediately visible through manual reading. Tools such as USAS and Wmatrix are especially useful because they categorize words into semantic domains and reveal dominant themes, keyword frequencies, and patterns of representation across texts. These tools help researchers systematically trace how sustainability, responsibility, and environmental issues are linguistically constructed in corporate discourse.

By combining quantitative corpus analysis with qualitative critical interpretation, CACDA allows researchers to uncover ideological tendencies embedded in sustainability reports. This approach is therefore effective for examining how environmental narratives are repeatedly framed and normalized within corporate communication.

2.4 Neoliberal Environmental Governance

Neoliberal environmental governance refers to approaches that address environmental problems through market-oriented solutions, corporate responsibility, and economic growth rather than structural ecological change. Within this perspective, environmental protection is often integrated into business strategies, efficiency, innovation, and market competitiveness. In corporate sustainability discourse, neoliberal governance frequently appears through narratives that present economic growth and environmental sustainability as mutually compatible. Concepts such as "green economy," "sustainable investment," and "responsible growth" reflect this orientation by emphasizing technological solutions and corporate management rather than reducing production or consumption. As a result, environmental responsibility becomes closely linked to corporate performance and branding.

This concept is important for analyzing sustainability reports because it explains how corporate environmental discourse may simultaneously promote ecological concern while maintaining existing economic systems. Integrating neoliberal environmental governance into the analysis helps contextualize how sustainability narratives operate within broader political and economic structures.

3. METHODOLOGY

This research utilizes a qualitative Critical Ecolinguistics Discourse Analysis to investigate the construction of ecological meanings in Sinarmas Land's sustainability reports. The research enhances analytical rigor by combining corpus-assisted semantic analysis with critical

ecolinguistic interpretation. The core data comprises Sinarmas Land Sustainability Reports released from 2017 to 2024 on the company's official portal. The reports were organized chronologically and transformed into plain-text format to guarantee interoperability with corpus processing tools. The research analyzes lexical elements within their larger discursive contexts instead of focusing just on surface-level keywords to reveal the construction of environmental responsibility and corporate identity across time.

All texts were semantically annotated using the UCREL Semantic Analysis System (USAS) via Wmatrix (Archer et al., 2002). USAS categorizes lexical items into established semantic domains, facilitating the systematic mapping of meaning fields across the corpus. The research notably did not limit itself to terms that morphologically include the prefix "eco-." Lexical items were discovered according to their categorization within ecologically linked semantic areas. Three domains were chosen for their significance in environmental discourse: W (World & Environment), encompassing references to nature, ecosystems, climate, and physical surroundings; S (Social Actions, States & Processes), which includes corporate initiatives, institutional practices, and actions related to social responsibility; and G (Government, Politics & Public Domain), covering governance, policy, regulation, and public accountability. These areas illustrate the multifaceted nature of sustainability discourse, whereby environmental representation engages with social practice and institutional governance.

The semantic annotation technique discovered 157 lexical items in the chosen domains. To maintain analytical consistency, lexical elements were classified as types instead of tokens, plural forms were standardized to their single counterparts, and morphological variants denoting the same lexical meaning were unified. This normalization guarantees that the analysis emphasizes semantic diversity and meaning formation rather than mere frequency.

Subsequent to semantic mapping, the allocation of lexical items within W, S, and G domains was analyzed to discern prevailing meaning categories and patterns of ecological representation. Collocational tendencies were analyzed to investigate the co-occurrence of environmental language with business, development, or governance discourse, suggesting possible ideological orientation. Chosen concordance lines and illustrative snippets were then analyzed via meticulous textual examination using Stibbe's methodology. This interpretive phase analyzes how certain language selections shape ecological narratives that either foster life-sustaining connections with the environment or validate ongoing industrial growth.

In accordance with Critical Discourse Analysis as defined by Norman Fairclough (1992), the examination meticulously considers linguistic specifics, acknowledging that ideology often functions indirectly via terminology that seems technical or normalized. The research emphasizes context-sensitive interpretation above only quantitative frequency patterns to reveal the underlying assumptions, value systems, and ecological orientations inherent in corporate sustainability speech.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The UCREL Semantic Analysis System (USAS) used semantic annotation to find lexical items in the Government, Politics, and Public Domain (G). Most of these items were in three subcategories: G1.1 (Government frameworks and policies), G2.1 (Law and regulatory instruments), and G2.2 (Ethics and compliance). The prevailing trend suggests a pronounced

focus on regulatory frameworks and institutional coherence, rather than on ecological interdependence itself. The findings were consistent across all data groups. (Table 4.1.).

Political Ecological Discourse *(G Domain)*

Table 4.1. *Government, Politics & Public* Domain (G)

Lexical items	USAS Tag	Semantic Tag
environmental frameworks	G1.1	Government etc.
environmental management policy	G1.1	Government policy
ESG	G1.2	Politics / governance framework
environmental impact assessment	G2.1	Law & order
environmental regulations	G2.1	Law & order
environmental standards	G2.1	Law & order
green building certification	G2.1	Regulatory certification
green standards	G2.1	Law & order
environmental compliance	G2.2	General ethics

Environmental regulations, standards, impact assessments, green building certification, and *green standards* are organised in G2.1 (Law & Order) in Table 4.1. Environmental frameworks and management policies are in G1.1 (government policy framework), and environmental compliance is in G2.2 (general ethics). According to this distribution, the reports' environmental rhetoric is mostly institutionalised via governance and legal systems. Here are a few more examples of how the G domain vocabulary shapes our understanding of the environment from an independent ecological system to one that is governed and institutionalised.

Excerpt 1

These include regulations on land acquisition, operational permits, design and construction, finance and accounting, labour laws, customer protection, and environmental frameworks.

In Excerpt 1, the phrase *environmental frameworks* is embedded within a broader bureaucratic list. Through a paratactic structure, the environment is positioned alongside administrative domains such as finance and labour, reducing its ecological specificity. The co-occurrence of *regulations, permits,* and *frameworks* (G1.1; G2.1) frames sustainability as procedural compliance rather than an ecological relationship, translating environmental complexity into a manageable administrative category.

Excerpt 2

"SML is a founding corporate member of the non-profit organisation Green Building Council Indonesia… as part of our commitment to mitigate significant impacts of climate change… The BSD Green Office Park received the Green Mark Gold Award…"

Similarly, Excerpt 2, constructs sustainability through institutional affiliation and certification. Phrases such as *founding corporate member*, *council*, and *award* foreground governance participation and external validation, shifting environmental value from ecological outcomes to institutional recognition. Climate mitigation is thus framed through alignment with standards rather than systemic ecological change, with awards functioning as symbolic capital

that converts environmental performance into reputational legitimacy—illustrating a pattern of credentialised sustainability.

Excerpt 3

"The Breeze Mall BSD City was built with reference to the importance of environmental conservation…"

In Excerpt 3, ecological concern is present but subordinated within a development narrative. The reference to conservation operates as a modifier within a description of commercial infrastructure, integrating environmental protection into expansion rather than positioning it as a limiting force. This reflects a discursive harmonisation in which ecological and economic goals are aligned.

Across these excerpts, environmental meaning is consistently mediated through governance alignment, certification, and compliance. From an ecolinguistic perspective (Stibbe, 2015), several interrelated discursive patterns emerge. At the ideological level, sustainability is constructed as regulatory conformity, reflecting managerial environmentalism where ecological problems are treated as administratively controllable. In terms of framing, the environment is positioned as a domain of risk and obligation—something to be *mitigated*, *assessed*, and *managed*—thereby restricting responses to technical and procedural solutions. The discourse also shows strong evaluative patterns, where compliance, certification, and awards are framed as indicators of success, turning sustainability into measurable corporate performance. At the same time, a process of erasure is evident, as ecological limits, biodiversity loss beyond mitigation, and non-human agency are largely absent, reducing nature to an object of assessment rather than a living system with intrinsic value.

Together, these patterns form a narrative of technocratic sustainability, in which environmental issues are presented as institutionally manageable and compatible with ongoing development. At the level of social practice (Fairclough, 1992), this discourse aligns with neoliberal environmental governance, where sustainability is embedded in ESG frameworks, certification regimes, and global benchmarking systems. Environmental protection becomes standardised and auditable, allowing ecological performance to function as reputational and financial capital. Rather than constraining development, governance mechanisms legitimise it, presenting expansion as responsible and globally aligned. This reflects a broader logic of regulatory capitalism, where environmental management operates through monitoring, reporting, and certification rather than structural limits.

Within the G domain, the environment is thus constructed as a governable object, a field of measurable compliance, and a resource for institutional legitimacy. Consequently, sustainability discourse functions less as a transformative ecological paradigm and more as a stabilising mechanism within growth-oriented development. The environmental crisis is not denied, but domesticated—translated into manageable regulatory categories that ultimately make ecological responsibility compatible with continued economic expansion.

Social Ecological Discourse *(S Domain)*

Lexical items within the Social Actions, States and Processes Domain (S) were identified through semantic annotation using the UCREL Semantic Analysis System (USAS). These items were mainly concentrated in the following subdomains: S1.1 (Action processes), S6.1 (Obligation and necessity), S7.1/S8 (Power, authority, stewardship), and S1.1.3/S5 (Participation

and community engagement). Based on the distribution, it seems that social responsibility language, rather than ecological description alone, substantially mediates environmental speech in the corpus. All groups showed similar experimental findings (Table 4.2.).

Table 4.2. *Social Actions, States & Process* Domain (S)

Representative Lexical items	USAS Tag	Semantic Tag
eco-psychology; environmental education; environmental awareness; risk; resilience; revitalisation; safe and healthy living; well-being	S1	Social actions, states & processes
minimise emissions; zero/reduction discourse; environmental management	S1.1	Social actions, states & processes
green campaign; waste bank	S1.1.3 / S5	Social actions, states & processes / Groups and affiliation
ecological responsibility; food security	S6	Obligation & necessity
stewardship; water stewardship; environmental stewardship	S7.1 / S8	Power, organizing / Helping/hindering

Environmental education, eco-psychology, resilience, environmental management, environmental awareness, and most of the items in Table 4.2 come under S1 or S1.1, suggesting that environmental discourse is mostly presented as social practice with an emphasis on action. S7.1/S8 (stewardship) and S6 (ecological responsibility, food security) follow, indicating that the sustainability narrative has a significant moral component. The S domain builds ecological responsibility as a moral and communal practice, in contrast to the G domain that institutionalises ecology via regulatory systems. Here are a few examples of how social-action lexical choices present sustainability: as an obligation, an activity in which people actively participate, and a tool for the betterment of society.

Excerpt 1

"ESG issues, especially those relating to climate change, have gained greater awareness globally in recent years."

In Excerpt 1, "ESG issues… have gained greater awareness globally," the lexical item *awareness* (S1) reframes environmental problems as matters of social consciousness rather than material ecological change. Grammatically, climate change is something that "gains awareness," shifting focus from environmental damage to human perception. As a result, the ecological crisis is mediated through cognition, foregrounding understanding and social response while backgrounding structural causes.

Excerpt 2

"Green Campaign. In 2020, KIIC conducted Green Campaign event, a seed planting activity to increase greenery in the surrounding communities. A total of 21,500 seeds were planted…"

In Excerpt 2, "Green Campaign… a seed planting activity… 21,500 seeds were planted," the term *campaign* (S1.1.3/S5) signals participation, mobilization, and collective engagement.

The corporation is positioned as the active agent (*conducted*), while communities appear as beneficiaries. Environmental action is framed as event-based and measurable, reinforcing visibility and quantification. Sustainability is thus constructed as organised, project-based community participation rather than long-term ecological restoration.

Excerpt 3

"Kampung Mantul serves as a pivotal part of SML's sustainability initiative… focusing on environmental stewardship, fostering healthy living, and ensuring food security…"

In Excerpt 3, "Kampung Mantul… focusing on environmental stewardship, healthy living, and food security," the concept of *stewardship* (S7.1/S8) introduces a moral dimension, implying caretaking authority over the environment. Its co-occurrence with *healthy living* and *food security* (S1; S6) shifts ecological focus toward human well-being, positioning the environment as a resource for resilience and self-sufficiency. The program is grammatically framed as the transformative agent, reinforcing a pedagogical narrative in which sustainability is learned and enacted through social development.

Across the data, four interrelated discursive qualities emerge. First, sustainability is moralised through lexical items such as *accountability, stewardship, awareness,* and *food security*, presenting environmental responsibility as an ethical obligation embedded in social values (Stibbe, 2015). Second, sustainability is collectivised through participation, as terms like *campaign, empowerment,* and *community initiative* (S1.1.3; S5) frame ecological action as collaborative and programmatic, repositioning the environment as a site of human coordination rather than an autonomous system. Third, the discourse reflects a strong anthropocentric orientation, as environmental protection is consistently justified in terms of human well-being, resilience, and food security (S1; S6), while non-human entities remain largely backgrounded (Stibbe, 2015). Fourth, the use of action-oriented verbs such as *reduce, revive, ensure, empower,* and *promote* (S1.1) constructs a proactive and solution-driven narrative in which the corporation is the primary agent, framing environmental problems as manageable rather than systemic.

Taken together, these patterns construct sustainability within the S domain as a collective moral project oriented toward human well-being. Environmental responsibility becomes a shared ethical commitment enacted through participatory programs and development initiatives. At the level of social practice (Fairclough, 1992), this discourse functions not only as representation but also as legitimation, positioning the corporation as an ethical actor while aligning environmental responsibility with community development and social welfare. Through localisation and participatory initiatives, sustainability is embedded within broader socio-economic frameworks, where ecological practices are justified through their contributions to health, resilience, and stability. In this way, sustainability operates as a bridging discourse that reconciles environmental care with economic growth.

From an ecolinguistic perspective, this configuration reflects a hybrid and internally contradictory narrative (Stibbe, 2015). While it promotes life-sustaining values such as care, responsibility, and participation, it simultaneously reinforces anthropocentric and growth-oriented assumptions by subordinating ecological integrity to human welfare. The environment is thus constructed as a moral obligation, a participatory social arena, and a resource for human benefit, while ecological limits and non-human agency remain largely absent. Consequently, sustainability discourse in the S domain functions not only as ecological communication but also

as a strategy of alignment, integrating environmental concerns into social development and corporate identity. Through this process, ecological responsibility enhances corporate legitimacy rather than constraining it, reframing environmental crisis as socially manageable and compatible with contemporary growth paradigms.

Physical Ecological Discourse *(W Domain)*

Lexical items within the World and Environment domain (W) were identified through semantic annotation using the UCREL Semantic Analysis System (USAS). These items were distributed across five primary subcategories: W1 (General environment and nature), W2 (Energy and natural forces), W3 (Built and physical environment), W4 (Climate and environmental processes), and W5 (Ecological systems and biodiversity). According to the distribution, there is a rich and diverse vocabulary of ecological terms used in the corpus, indicating that there is an active engagement with environmental language (Table 4.3.).

Table 4.3. The World & Our Environment Domain (W)

Representative Lexical items	USAS Tag	Semantic Tag
habitat; mangrove; Mother Nature; ozone	W1	The Universe
solar; solar panels; photovoltaic panels	W2	Light
built-up environment; green open space (RTH); hydrological balance; landfill; surface water / groundwater	W3	Geographical Terms
climate; heat island effect; flood management; rainwater	W4	Weather
biodiversity; ecosystem; wildlife conservation; forest conservation	W5	Green Issues

The W domain makes direct allusions to ecological entities, physical processes, and environmental systems, in contrast to the S domain that defines ecology via social activity. Even biocentric language is often incorporated inside developmental and management narratives, according to micro-level study.

Excerpt 1

"KIIC planted 1,000 mangrove trees… to preserve the environment and prevent sea water abrasion… the mangrove ecosystem will support the growth of marine animals… and add to sustainability tourism within the area."

Fot the Excerpt 1, lexical items such as *mangrove* (W1) and *ecosystem* (W5) initially construct nature as a living system characterized by biological interdependence. Yet, the clause structure reveals layered instrumentalisation: mangroves are planted not only for environmental preservation but also to prevent abrasion and support tourism. The phrase "add to sustainability tourism" links ecological restoration to economic value, positioning nature simultaneously as ecosystem and development asset. While biodiversity is acknowledged, it is embedded within a growth-oriented logic, where the environment appears both alive and economically productive.

Excerpt 2

"Our solar panels have reached an electricity replacement efficiency rate of over 11%, generating more than 2.1 MWp of energy…"

In Excerpt 2, "Our solar panels have reached… 11%… 2.1 MWp," lexical clusters such as *solar panels*, *electricity replacement*, and *efficiency rate* (W2) construct nature as a renewable energy resource. Natural forces are not represented as ecological entities but as calculable inputs, with numerical quantification transforming environmental action into performance metrics. This technoscientific framing integrates nature into infrastructural systems, foregrounding efficiency and expansion while reinforcing continuity of development rather than ecological restraint.

Excerpt 3

"…to reuse plastic and organic waste and minimise waste diverted to landfill… incorporate the use of green materials…"

The term *landfill* (W3) indexes environmental degradation, yet it is frequently embedded within managerial action verbs such as *minimise*, *reuse*, and *incorporate*, thereby framing ecological harm as a controllable outcome of effective waste governance. Similarly, references to *GHG inventory* and *emissions roadmap* integrate environmental processes (W4) into bureaucratic planning instruments, constructing the environment as a system requiring technical management in which climate becomes measurable risk, waste becomes logistical flow, and emissions become accounting categories.

In Excerpt 3, "…reuse plastic and organic waste… minimise waste diverted to landfill…," the term *landfill* (W3) signals environmental degradation but is embedded within managerial verbs such as *minimise*, *reuse*, and *incorporate*, framing ecological harm as controllable through governance practices. Similarly, references to *GHG inventory* and *emissions roadmap* (W4) integrate environmental processes into bureaucratic planning, where climate becomes measurable risk, waste becomes logistical flow, and emissions become accounting categories.

Across W1–W5, ecological representation operates through a layered and internally consistent configuration in which nature is constructed simultaneously as a living entity, a scientific system, and a productive resource. These representations form a chain of abstraction that progressively integrates ecological complexity into managerial rationality. At the most basic level, lexical items such as *mangrove, habitat, biodiversity,* and *ecosystem* (W1; W5) reflect life-sustaining narratives that recognise ecological interdependence (Stibbe, 2015). However, grammatical analysis shows limited non-human agency, as nature is typically positioned as the object of corporate actions (*planted, conserved, managed*) and valued in terms of utility, reinforcing an anthropocentric orientation. At a more abstract level, scientific registers such as *climate, hydrological balance, heat island effect,* and *greenhouse gas inventory* (W3; W4) transform ecological processes into calculable variables, rendering environmental complexity manageable and optimisable. At the highest level, lexical clusters such as *solar panels, energy efficiency, landfill reduction,* and *green materials* (W2; W3) incorporate nature into economic and infrastructural logic, aligning sustainability with efficiency, innovation, and performance metrics. This reflects the logic of green growth, where environmental protection is pursued through technological optimisation rather than limiting expansion.

These representations operate progressively—from recognition to systematisation and optimisation—indicating a shift from ecological perception to managerial integration. At the level of social practice (Fairclough, 1992), the W domain shows how ecological discourse is embedded within corporate governance rationalities, where environmental management is operationalised through initiatives such as emissions roadmaps, waste systems, renewable energy,

and biodiversity programs, positioning the corporation as the primary ecological manager. Ecological processes are further integrated into calculative regimes, where emissions are expressed as inventories, waste as percentages, and energy as output metrics, aligning sustainability with performance measurement and managerial control. At the same time, environmental discourse functions as a source of corporate legitimacy, as initiatives such as renewable energy adoption, mangrove restoration, and waste innovation construct an image of responsible and modern development.

Overall, this configuration reflects the integration of ecological discourse into neoliberal environmental governance (Fairclough, 1992; Stibbe, 2015), where sustainability is reframed as an opportunity for innovation rather than a constraint on growth. Environmental problems are not denied but rendered solvable, optimisable, and reportable within managerial logic, producing a reconciliatory narrative in which ecological protection and economic expansion coexist.

5. CONCLUSION

The results show that sustainability discourse is constructed through three interrelated domains of meaning: Government and Public (G), Social Actions and Processes (S) and World and Environment (W). In the G domain, environmental responsibility is primarily built through governance mechanisms such as regulations, certifications, ESG frameworks, and compliance systems, turning sustainability into an administratively feasible matter. As for the S domain, sustainability is constructed as a moral and participatory project, through narratives of stewardship, awareness, empowerment and community well-being that construct the corporation as an ethical environmental actor. However, the W domain does contain explicit ecological terminology regarding ecosystems, biodiversity, climate and renewable energy, although these ecological aspects are often framed within managerial and developmental models focused on efficiency, optimisation and innovation. The discourse thus produces a story of reconciliation, where environmental protection is presented as compatible with continued economic development.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the embeddedness of ecological narratives in broader neoliberal environmental governance in which sustainability is not only ecological concern but also an instrument of institutional legitimacy, of reputational value and of growth-oriented development. The study also contributes to Critical Discourse Analysis by showing how environmental meanings are normalized through governance, moralisation and technocratic management. Methodologically, the combination of semantic domain analysis and qualitative discourse analysis allows for a systematic identification of recurrent ecological patterns, and at the same time is sensitive to ideological and contextual meanings in corporate discourse.

However, the study only focuses on Sinar Mas Land corporation and the analysis is on corporate discourse, not on actual environmental performance or ecological outcomes. Also, sustainability reports are corporate self-portrayals that may strategically construct positive environmental identities. The corpus analysis is limited to the selected semantic domains (G, S and W). Hence, the results cannot be generalised to all Indonesian property developers or to the corporate sector in general.

Therefore, future research can enlarge the dataset by comparing sustainability reports of several corporations or industrial sectors to find broader trends of ecological discourse in Indonesia. For the greater scope, next studies may also include multimodal analysis, interview

data, or environmental performance metrics to analyze the relationship between corporate sustainability narratives and real-world ecological practices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere appreciation to the lecturers of the Discourse Analysis course and to colleagues at the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia for their uncountable knowledge, support, and encouragement throughout the development of this study. Their guidance and academic insights have greatly transmitted such huge courage to the completion of this study.

REFERENCES

Ambon, A. (2023). Pendekatan kolaboratif CSR Sinar Mas Land dalam pembinaan tata kelola lingkungan sekolah marjinal menghadapi pembelajaran tatap muka. *Ikon—Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Komunikasi, 28*(2), 129–141. https://doi.org/10.37817/ikon.v29i2.3467

Archer, D., Wilson, A., & Rayson, P. (2002). Introduction to the USAS category system. In *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2002 Conference*. Lancaster University.

Ariendra, J. M., & Susilowati, S. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan keseimbangan kehidupan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada Sinar Mas Land Surabaya. *Soetomo Management Review, 2*(3), 340–350. https://doi.org/10.25139/smr.v2i3.7953

Ascione, F., Ruggiero, S., De Masi, R. F., Tariello, F., Mastellone, M., & Vanoli, G. P. (2021). Energy performance of buildings: Improvements, limits and future perspectives during the last twenty years of energy and sustainability policies. *Energies, 14*(18), 5808.

Auburtin, P. N., Saadé, M., Manthey, M., Louërat, M., Martin, J., & Baverel, O. (2024). Going beyond carbon: Influence of structural parameters on the environmental impacts of typical building structures. *Journal of Building Engineering*, *97*, 110879. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2024.110879

Bondi, M., & Nocella, J. J. (2025). Net zero and protection: Framing environmental action in Corporate Social Responsibility reports of rail companies. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, *29*(1), 128–147. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-42984

Christofi, A., Christofi, P., & Sisaye, S. (2012). Corporate sustainability: Historical development and reporting practices. *Management Research Review, 35*(2), 157–172.

Elizabeth, M., & Gunawan, R. (2018). Evaluation of light shelf design performances to the daylight's sunlight penetration on Sinar Mas Land Plaza Building Tangerang to increase the Green Mark assessment. *Riset Arsitektur (RISA), 2*(4), 394–411. https://doi.org/10.26593/risa.v2i04.3049.394-411

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

Fill, A. F., & Penz, H. (2018). *The Routledge handbook of ecolinguistics*. Routledge.

Fitriani, H., Ajayi, S., & Kim, S. (2023). Analysis of the underlying causes of waste generation in Indonesia's construction industry. *Sustainability, 15*(1), 409. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15010409

Fuerst, F., & McAllister, P. (2011). Green noise or green value? Measuring the effects of environmental certification on office values. *Real Estate Economics, 39*(1), 45–69.

Gulo, Y., & Widayati, N. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, self-efficacy, dan karakteristik peserta pelatihan terhadap transfer pelatihan karyawan. *Media Bisnis, 12*(1), 41–48. https://doi.org/10.34208/mb.v12i1.879

Haugen, E. (1971). *The ecology of language*. Stanford University Press.

Isti'anah, A. (2020). (Re)evaluating language attitudes on Indonesian tourism website: A study on ecolinguistics. *Studies in English Language and Education, 7*(2), 622–641. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i2.16683

Istianah, A., & Suhandano, S. (2022). Appraisal patterns used on the kalimantan tourism website: An ecolinguistics perspective. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2022.2146928

López-Guerrero, R. E., Verichev, K., Moncada-Morales, G. A., & Carpio, M. (2022). How do urban heat islands affect the thermo-energy performance of buildings? *Journal of Cleaner Production, 373*, 133713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133713

Majeed, M. U., Aslam, S., Murtaza, S. A., Attila, S., & Molnár, E. (2022). Green marketing approaches and their impact on green purchase intentions: Mediating role of green brand image and consumer beliefs towards the environment. *Sustainability, 14*, 11703. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141811703

Marzani, N., & Dharmawan, D. (2017). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan kompetensi terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Sinar Mas Land Tbk Tangerang. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis Krisnadwipayana, 5*(3), 98–108. https://jurnal.unkris.ac.id/index.php/jmbk/article/view/907

Nuh, S. K., & Prawira, I. (2023). An ecolinguistic analysis of climate change news in Indonesia: The case of Mongabay. *E3S Web of Conferences*, *426*, 02119. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202342602119

Prastio, B., Santoso, A., Roekhan, Maulidina, A., Numertayasa, I. W., & Suardana, I. P. O. (2023). An ecolinguistic study: The representation of forest conservation practices in the discourse of Anak Dalam Jambi tribe, Indonesia. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2262788

Ridha, M., Harinurdin, E., & Hanan, A. A. (2018). An analysis of internal communication factors in Sinar Mas Land. *KnE Social Sciences*, 904–918. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i11.2815

Rusu, T. M., Odagiu, A., Pop, H., & Paulette, L. (2024). Sustainability performance reporting. *Sustainability, 16*, 8538. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16198538

Saleh, N. N., Evanne, L., & Pranata, J. (2023). Marketing model of Sinar Mas Land through Instagram platform. *Jurnal Komunikasi Profesional, 7*(2), 216–232. https://doi.org/10.25139/jkp.v7i2.6227

Sharma, A., Saxena, A., Sethi, M., Shree, V., & Varun. (2011). Life cycle assessment of buildings: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *15*(1), 871–875. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2010.09.008

Stibbe, A. (2015). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by*. Routledge.

Sun, H., Wang, G., Bai, J., Shen, J., Zheng, X., Dan, E., Chen, F., & Zhang, L. (2023). Corporate sustainable development, corporate environmental performance and cost of debt. *Sustainability, 15*(1).

Suhandano, S., Isti'anah, A., & Febrina, R. (2023). Contesting "growth" and "sustainability" in Indonesia's capital city relocation: A corpus ecolinguistic study. *Research Result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, 9*(3). https://doi.org/10.18413/2313-8912-2023-9-3-0-5

Suryani, D. S., & Suhandano, S. (2024). Salience and Erasure in the Indonesian Government Climate Change Discourse: A Corpus-Based Ecolinguistics Study. *Journal of Language and Literature*, *25*(1), 106–118. https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v25i1.9739

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 249–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006

Wang, J., & Liu, J. (2024). The visual stories in addressing climate change that a petroleum business tells and lives by: A multimodal critical ecolinguistic perspective. *Energy Research & Social Science*, *111*, 103483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2024.103483

Yosephine, M., & Diniati, A. (2021). Strategi public relations Sinar Mas Land dalam membangun brand image perusahaan. *PRofesi Humas, 5*(2), 208–228. https://doi.org/10.24198/prh.v5i2.26220

Yuniawan, T., Rokhman, F., Rustono, & Mardikantoro, H. B. (2023a). An eco-linguistic analysis of conservation news published by mass media in Indonesia. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2174519