

CLIMATE CHANGE DISCOURSES IN INDONESIAN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH TEXTBOOKS: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Rama Dwika Herdiawan^{*1}, Sasigaran Moneyam², Mukhlisyin³, Aditia Gumilang⁴
ramadwika@unma.ac.id^{*1}, sasigaran@upsi.edu.my², mukhlisyin@gmail.com³,
aditiagumilang@gmail.com⁴

English Language Education Department^{*1,3,4}, Faculty of Languages and Communication²
Universitas Majalengka^{*1,3,4}, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia²

Received: April 21, 2026

Accepted: July 30, 2026

Published: September 25, 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examines how climate change is represented in two Indonesian senior high school English textbooks and how the representations position learners in relation to environmental responsibility. A qualitative document analysis was conducted using Fairclough's three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis framework. The corpus comprised climate-related reading passages, activity prompts, dialogues, and visual-verbal materials in the 2017 revised Bahasa Inggris for Grade XI and the 2022 English for Change for Grade XI. The analysis identified four interrelated patterns. First, climate change was factualized through declarative and causal language but was frequently simplified into non-conflictual explanations. Second, responsibility was directed mainly toward students, families, communities, and youth activists, while governmental, corporate, and industrial actors were backgrounded. Third, the activities promoted awareness and participation, yet only limited opportunities were provided for examining competing interests, unequal vulnerability, or climate justice. Fourth, optimistic portraits and clean environmental imagery softened the crisis while reinforcing hopeful action. The findings imply that EFL textbooks should retain accessible language while expanding structural accountability, local climate realities, dialogic tasks, and critical visual literacy so that language learning supports both communicative competence and critical environmental literacy.

Keywords: *Climate Change, Critical Discourse Analysis, EFL Textbooks, Environmental Literacy, Learner Positioning*

DOI: 10.31943/wej.v10i2.676

INTRODUCTION

Climate change has become an immediate educational concern rather than a distant topic reserved for science classrooms or international policy forums. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2023) concludes that human influence on the climate system is unequivocal and that climate-related risks increase with every additional increment of warming. These risks are experienced

through ecological disruption, extreme weather, threats to food and water security, public-health pressures, economic loss, and displacement. Because the consequences are social as well as biophysical, learners need more than isolated scientific definitions. They need opportunities to understand how climate change is explained, whose experiences are made visible, who is represented as responsible, and which responses are presented as possible. Schools therefore function not only as sites for transmitting knowledge but also as institutions in which environmental values, social identities, and interpretive habits are developed.

Contemporary scholarship on climate education emphasizes that factual knowledge alone is insufficient. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team and the Monitoring and Evaluating Climate Communication and Education Project (2024) argue that climate learning should incorporate cognitive, socio-emotional, and action-oriented dimensions. UNESCO (2024) similarly recommends curriculum integration that is scientifically grounded, justice-oriented, locally relevant, and connected to learners' capacity to act. Nevertheless, international curriculum analysis continues to identify limited and uneven climate coverage. This limitation is particularly consequential in subjects outside the natural sciences. English language education provides repeated opportunities for students to read informational and persuasive texts, interpret images, discuss public issues, compare viewpoints, and produce arguments. Climate-related materials in English textbooks can therefore contribute to language development and environmental literacy simultaneously, but this potential depends on how the issue is discursively constructed.

Textbooks are central to this construction because they select knowledge, sequence activities, assign speaking positions, and normalize particular values. In many EFL classrooms, the textbook functions as a *de facto* curriculum by shaping what teachers and learners encounter, which genres are practiced, and what forms of response are expected. Nopikasari and Maisarah (2026), in a recent study published in *Wiralodra English Journal*, demonstrate that Indonesian ELT textbooks embody different curricular orientations through their selection of language skills, task designs, cultural themes, and opportunities for higher-order thinking. Their analysis reinforces the need to examine textbooks not merely as repositories of linguistic content but as pedagogical and ideological artifacts. From this perspective, the presence of a climate-related topic does not automatically indicate that the material develops critical environmental understanding. The decisive issue is how the topic is framed and how learners are positioned within that framing.

Critical discourse scholarship provides a theoretical basis for examining those choices. Fairclough (2015) explains that discourse is socially constitutive: language represents the world while simultaneously organizing relationships, identities, and forms of knowledge. A textbook may, for example, present climate change as an established scientific fact, a personal moral duty, a problem of consumer behavior, a consequence of industrial development, or an issue of unequal global responsibility. Each representation foregrounds some actors and explanations while backgrounding others. Lexical selection, transitivity, modality,

evaluation, and grammatical agency can make responsibility explicit, diffuse, or invisible. Likewise, exercises can position students as passive recipients, compliant environmental citizens, problem solvers, or critical readers who interrogate omissions and competing interests.

The ideological significance of environmental representation has been documented in recent ELT research. Lee and Nguyen (2024) found that environmental literacy was present in Vietnamese ELT textbooks, but the treatment frequently remained anthropocentric and superficial, with behavioral engagement less developed than other components. Their study also identified an uneven distribution of responsibility in which ordinary individuals were more visible than powerful institutional actors. Micalay-Hurtado and Poole (2022) consequently propose eco-critical language awareness as a pedagogical orientation that links language learning with sustainability, justice, and well-being. Mambu (2023) similarly argues that sustainability-oriented ELT should move beyond descriptive awareness toward critical engagement with the Sustainable Development Goals. These studies indicate that environmental vocabulary and positive messages are valuable but insufficient when the materials do not enable learners to examine discourse, power, and unequal consequences.

The distinction between awareness and critical environmental literacy is important. Awareness enables learners to recognize environmental problems and identify recommended behaviors. Critical environmental literacy additionally requires them to evaluate sources, analyze how agency and responsibility are represented, compare alternative explanations, identify silenced voices, and consider the social distribution of risk. Porto (2025) connects this wider orientation to ecological citizenship, through which language learners are understood as social actors capable of reflection, participation, and collective response. In practical terms, a textbook can promote critical environmental literacy when it asks learners not only what individuals should do but also why certain causes are emphasized, which actors benefit from existing arrangements, and how local communities experience climate impacts differently.

Research on climate and environmental education also shows that teachers remain highly dependent on textbooks even when they regard the available treatment as inadequate. Morote and Hernández-Hernández (2023) found that geography teachers frequently relied on textbooks despite concerns about how climate change was presented. Mercer et al. (2023) report that ELT teachers generally value environmental issues but need appropriate materials and pedagogical support to integrate them without losing sight of language-learning objectives. Textbook discourse therefore has practical consequences. When materials provide only generalized factual statements and individualized solutions, teachers must undertake additional work to introduce structural causes, contested perspectives, and locally relevant evidence. When the textbook itself provides dialogic and critical tasks, it can reduce that burden and create more consistent opportunities for meaningful classroom inquiry.

In Indonesia, climate education is shaped by a policy context that acknowledges sustainability while still exhibiting gaps in curricular coherence and implementation. Tang (2024) identifies weak policy synergy and a tendency

toward optimistic future-oriented discourse in formal climate education. This context helps explain why school materials may emphasize positive action while avoiding politically contentious dimensions. Some Indonesian EFL studies have begun to examine environmental representation. Ibrahim and Damayanti (2024) found that verbal and visual modes worked together to present environmental causes, effects, and solutions in a primary-level EFL module. Rajagukguk (2025) reported that an Indonesian ELT textbook largely promoted environmental awareness through moral and personal actions while providing less space for collective, structural, and political dimensions. Komarawan et al. (2025) further demonstrate that Indonesian EFL textbooks can simultaneously encourage eco-awareness and reproduce dominant ecological worldviews through the inclusion and exclusion of actors.

Despite these contributions, a specific research gap remains in relation to climate change discourse in Indonesian senior high school English textbooks across different curriculum periods. Existing studies commonly address broad environmental awareness, cultural representation, or multimodal eco-discourse, whereas fewer studies compare how climate-related texts and tasks construct scientific certainty, responsibility, learner agency, and visual meaning. The senior high school level is especially important because learners are expected to engage with exposition, argumentation, multimodal texts, and social issues at increasing levels of abstraction. A comparison between a 2017 Curriculum 2013 textbook and a 2022 Merdeka Curriculum textbook also offers insight into continuity and change in environmental pedagogy.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is appropriate for this purpose because it connects close textual analysis with the organization of pedagogical discourse and the wider social context. Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model enables the analysis to move from vocabulary, grammar, modality, evaluation, and visual-verbal relations to questions of production, pedagogical use, social actors, ideology, and environmental responsibility. The framework is particularly useful for identifying processes of factualization, individualization, backgrounding, and depoliticization. It also allows apparently positive discourse to be examined critically. Hopeful language and youth-activist imagery may motivate learners, for example, while simultaneously narrowing the crisis to personal virtue and obscuring institutional responsibility. For this reason, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provides an appropriate framework for the present study. CDA allows researchers to move beyond surface meaning and examine how language works ideologically. Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model is especially useful because it links textual analysis, discursive practice, and wider social practice. Through this framework, a textbook passage can be examined not only for vocabulary, grammar, evaluation, modality, and visual-verbal relations, but also for the assumptions it carries about power, agency, and responsibility. This is particularly relevant in the case of climate change, where discourse may hide structural causes, individualize responsibility, or present technological solutions as politically neutral. As shown in previous textbook studies, language choices can depoliticize environmental issues and reduce students' opportunities to develop critical environmental awareness. CDA therefore helps reveal whether

textbooks encourage deeper reflection or merely offer safe, surface-level messages.

Based on these concerns, this study examines how climate change is represented in EFL textbooks used in Indonesian secondary schools by focusing on reading texts, dialogues, exercises, and visual-verbal materials. More specifically, it investigates how climate change is framed, what kinds of discourses are emphasized, and how students are positioned in relation to environmental issues. This study is significant for several reasons. First, it contributes to the growing discussion of environmental education in ELT by showing how English materials participate in constructing climate-related knowledge and values. Second, it extends Indonesian textbook research by focusing specifically on climate change representation in senior high school English textbooks. Third, it offers practical insight for teachers, textbook writers, and curriculum developers who need materials that support not only language development, but also critical environmental literacy. In this way, the study responds to the need for English language education that is academically meaningful, socially aware, and globally relevant.

Accordingly, this study analyzes climate-related materials in Mahrukh Bashir's revised 2017 Bahasa Inggris for Grade XI and Astuti et al.'s 2022 Bahasa Inggris: English for Change for Grade XI. The study addresses three questions: (1) How is climate change linguistically and visually represented in the selected textbooks? (2) Which actors and forms of responsibility are foregrounded or backgrounded? and (3) How do the pedagogical tasks position students in relation to environmental knowledge and action? By answering these questions, the study aims to clarify whether the selected materials primarily develop environmental awareness or provide a stronger foundation for critical environmental literacy. The practical purpose is to inform textbook writers, teachers, and curriculum developers about ways to combine accessible EFL content with structural accountability, local relevance, dialogic inquiry, and critical visual literacy.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative document-analysis design because the research questions required interpretation of linguistic, pedagogical, and visual patterns rather than statistical measurement. Document analysis is a systematic procedure for selecting, reviewing, coding, and interpreting documents in relation to a research problem (Bowen, 2009). The textbooks were treated as curricular documents that organize language learning and environmental knowledge through written texts, activities, images, captions, and task sequences. Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis provided the principal analytical framework.

Data Sources and Corpus

The primary data sources were two government-issued Grade XI English textbooks representing different national curriculum periods: Bahasa Inggris:

SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas XI, revised edition (Bashir, 2017), and Bahasa Inggris: English for Change untuk SMA/MA Kelas XI (Astuti et al., 2022). The first textbook was developed for Curriculum 2013, whereas the second was developed for the Merdeka Curriculum. Both were selected purposively because they are nationally distributed senior high school materials and contain explicit references to global warming, climate change, pollution, environmental action, and environmental figures.

The corpus included all directly relevant reading passages, short descriptions, dialogue prompts, comprehension questions, vocabulary activities, opinion tasks, project instructions, captions, and visual-verbal configurations in the identified sections. In the 2017 textbook, the analysis focused on the climate-related reading and opinion activities in the chapter on expressing opinions, including the passage that opens with the proposition that global warming is a serious and visible problem and the project prompt that lists global warming as a public issue for interviews and presentations. In the 2022 textbook, the analysis focused on Unit 2, Love Your Environment, and Unit 4, Indonesian Environmental Figures, including the profiles of youth environmental activists and the explanatory material that links air pollution and climate change. Page references in the analysis follow the printed page numbers of the textbooks.

Research Instrument

The researchers served as the primary interpretive instrument, as is common in qualitative inquiry (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). To increase consistency, the researchers used a coding sheet derived from Fairclough's (2015) framework. The sheet recorded textbook identity, page, material type, verbal excerpt, visual feature, lexical and grammatical pattern, represented actor, assigned responsibility, learner position, preliminary interpretation, and broader social implication. A shared coding guide defined the categories before the full analysis was conducted.

Data Collection

Data collection proceeded in four stages. First, the researchers read both textbooks in full and searched for explicit and semantically related items, including climate change, global warming, greenhouse gases, pollution, environmental activist, emissions, waste, and environmental action. Second, all relevant pages and activity sequences were logged in the coding sheet. Third, each unit was segmented according to its pedagogical function, such as source text, vocabulary task, comprehension question, discussion prompt, project, or visual support. Fourth, the researchers checked the selected corpus against the surrounding lessons to avoid interpreting excerpts without their pedagogical context.

Data Analysis

Analysis was conducted at three interconnected levels. At the textual level, the researchers examined lexical choice, transitivity, agency, modality, evaluation, nominalization, pronouns, causal relations, and visual-verbal correspondence. Particular attention was paid to whether climate change was presented as certain

or contestable, whether causes and responsible actors were named, and whether solutions were individualized or collectivized. At the level of discursive practice, the researchers analyzed how the texts and tasks organized knowledge, what genres and voices were prioritized, and how learners were addressed or positioned. At the level of social practice, the patterns were interpreted in relation to climate education, ecological citizenship, institutional responsibility, and the distinction between environmental awareness and critical environmental literacy.

The coding process was iterative. The researchers first conducted open coding to identify recurrent linguistic and pedagogical patterns. The initial codes were then grouped into four analytical themes: factualization and simplification, individualization and backgrounding of structural actors, learner positioning, and optimistic visual-verbal framing. The researchers compared the two textbooks within each theme to identify continuity and change across curriculum periods. Short excerpts were retained as evidence, but interpretation focused on patterned discourse rather than isolated sentences.

Trustworthiness and Ethics

Credibility was supported through repeated reading, collaborative comparison of coded excerpts, and the use of an audit trail documenting selection and interpretation. Differences in interpretation were discussed until the researchers reached an agreed reading grounded in textual evidence. Dependability was strengthened by applying the same coding guide to both textbooks, while rich description was used to make the analytical process transparent (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Because the study examined publicly available educational documents and did not involve human participants, formal participant consent was not required. The analysis nevertheless followed academic ethics by identifying the sources, quoting only brief excerpts, and avoiding decontextualized or selective interpretation.

Table 1. Data Sources and Analytical Corpus

Textbook	Curriculum/Year	Climate-Related Sections	Analytical Materials
Bahasa Inggris: SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas XI	Curriculum 2013 / revised 2017	Opinion chapter and global-warming passages and projects	Reading passage, vocabulary, opinion prompts, interview/project instructions
Bahasa Inggris: English for Change untuk SMA/MA Kelas XI	Merdeka Curriculum / 2022	Unit 2: Love Your Environment; Unit 4: Indonesian Environmental Figures	Descriptions, activist profiles, explanatory passages, multimodal materials, discussions, projects

Note. The corpus included all directly relevant verbal and visual-verbal materials within the identified activity sequences.

Table 2. Fairclough-Informed Coding Framework

Analytical Level	Primary Features	Guiding Question	Interpretive Focus
Text	Lexis, transitivity,	How is climate change	Factualization,

	modality, evaluation, agency, causality, image-text relation	represented and who is named as responsible or affected?	simplification, individualization, actor visibility
Discursive practice	Genre, task sequence, voice, intertextuality, learner address	What knowledge and response are prioritized, and how are learners positioned?	Passive reception, moral compliance, participation, critical inquiry
Social practice	Power, accountability, citizenship, justice, curricular ideology	Which wider environmental worldview is normalized or challenged?	Awareness, ecological citizenship, structural accountability, climate justice

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Finding

The findings are based on climate change-related materials drawn from two Indonesian senior high school English textbooks. The corpus comprises reading passages, short dialogues, comprehension tasks, language exercises, and supporting visual-verbal materials. Analysis across Fairclough's (2015) textual, discursive-practice, and social-practice dimensions produced four dominant patterns concerning scientific framing, responsibility, learner positioning, and multimodal representation.

Table 3. Summary of Major Findings

Pattern	Representative Evidence	Discourse Effect	Learner Position
Factualization with simplification	Categorical present-tense statements; short causal chains	Climate change is certain but socially non-conflictual	Recipient of established information
Individualized responsibility	Inclusive we; duties assigned to students, citizens, and activists	Personal and community action is foregrounded; institutional accountability is reduced	Morally responsible environmental actor
Partial critical engagement	Opinion, discussion, project, and multimodal-production tasks	Participation increases, but missing actors and competing interests are rarely interrogated	Active participant, only partly a critical reader
Optimistic visual-verbal framing	Portraits, clean settings, positive slogans, achievement narratives	Hope and efficacy are strengthened; unequal impacts and crisis severity are softened	Hopeful future-oriented change agent

Climate change is represented primarily as scientific fact, but in a simplified and non-conflictual way

The first finding shows that climate change is mainly presented as an established scientific reality. In the analyzed texts, climate change is commonly expressed through declarative clauses such as: "Climate change happens because the Earth is getting warmer," "Human activities produce greenhouse gases," and "Global warming affects the environment." Linguistically, this representation gives the topic a strong factual status. The use of present tense, generalized participants, and cause-effect sentence patterns suggests certainty and objectivity.

However, the same texts also simplify the issue by reducing it to broad explanations and predictable solutions, such as saving electricity, planting trees, and throwing garbage in the right place. In this representation, climate change appears as something scientifically true, but pedagogically domesticated.

This pattern is significant because it shows that the textbooks do not deny climate change, yet they tend to frame it as a safe, uncontroversial topic. The crisis is introduced in informational terms, but the conflictual dimensions of climate change such as political disagreement, unequal responsibility, industrial emissions, and climate injustice remain largely absent. In this sense, the textbook discourse supports awareness, but only at a surface level. This pattern is consistent with research showing that environmental themes in ELT materials are often represented in simplified ways, with limited behavioral depth and insufficient attention to more complex ecological relations. Lee and Nguyen (2024) found that environmental literacy in Vietnamese ELT textbooks was present, but often unevenly developed, while Komarawan et al. (2025) showed that Indonesian EFL textbooks can both promote eco-awareness and reproduce dominant ecological worldviews through selective framing.

Responsibility is individualized, while structural actors are backgrounded

The second finding concerns the representation of agency. In the corpus, the most visible social actors are students, families, and local communities. Typical textbook prompts include: “Students should save water,” “We must reduce plastic use,” and “Everyone can help the Earth by changing daily habits.” By contrast, structurally powerful actors—such as governments, corporations, industrial sectors, or global policy institutions—are rarely mentioned directly. Even when environmental damage is described, it is often expressed through passive or agentless constructions such as “Forests are destroyed every year” or “Carbon emissions have increased.” These grammatical patterns remove or blur the actors most responsible for large-scale climate harm.

This finding suggests that the textbooks construct climate change as a problem of everyday personal behavior more than a problem of power, policy, and unequal accountability. Students are encouraged to become morally responsible individuals, but they are not invited to examine which institutions produce environmental risk at a larger scale. Such discourse can create a narrow ecological subjectivity: learners are asked to be careful, responsible, and disciplined, but not necessarily critical toward wider structures. This interpretation resonates strongly with Lee and Nguyen’s (2024) finding that responsibility in ELT textbooks may be shifted toward ordinary actors rather than powerful institutions. It also parallels Komarawan et al.’s (2025) argument that environmental representation in Indonesian EFL textbooks works through inclusion and exclusion of social actors. In the Indonesian policy context, Tang (2024) further shows that climate change education remains marginal and is shaped by optimistic discourse and weak policy synergy, which helps explain why textbook discourse may avoid structural critique.

Students are positioned as obedient eco-learners rather than critical environmental readers

The third finding emerges from the textbook exercises. In the analyzed materials, most follow-up activities are low-risk and compliance-oriented. Students are asked to answer true/false questions, identify main ideas, match words with definitions, list causes and effects, or mention what they can do at home to help the environment. Even open-ended questions tend to remain personal and behavioral, for example: “What should students do to reduce global warming?” or “Write three good habits to save the Earth.” There are very few tasks that require learners to compare perspectives, critique discourse, identify missing actors, or debate competing solutions.

This pedagogical pattern is important because it positions students as receivers and performers of approved environmental values rather than as interpreters of discourse. In other words, the textbook appears to favor moral compliance over critical literacy. From a CDA perspective, this is not a minor issue. When a textbook discusses climate change but does not ask who speaks, who benefits, who is erased, and who is held responsible, the pedagogical message remains incomplete. This is exactly where critical language education becomes relevant. Micalay-Hurtado and Poole (2022) argue that ELT should connect language learning with ecological justice, sustainability, and critical awareness rather than treating environmental issues as neutral content. Similarly, Porto (2025) shows that language education can contribute to ecological citizenship when learners are encouraged to reflect, participate, and imagine themselves as social actors in environmental change. Mambu (2023) also demonstrates that sustainability-oriented ELT becomes stronger when it moves toward criticality rather than descriptive awareness alone.

Visual-verbal materials soften the climate crisis through optimistic and sanitized imagery

The fourth finding concerns multimodal representation. In the analyzed data, climate change visuals are dominated by clean and emotionally safe images: children planting trees, students cleaning beaches, cartoon pictures of the Earth smiling, and green landscapes accompanied by positive slogans such as “Save Our Planet” or “Let’s Make a Better Future.” These visuals are often paired with short explanatory paragraphs about pollution, energy saving, or recycling. What is absent are images of environmental inequality, displacement, heat vulnerability, disaster-related loss, or communities most affected by climate change in Indonesia.

This visual-verbal pattern matters because it reduces the crisis to a manageable moral lesson. The multimodal design communicates hope and positivity, but it also removes urgency, conflict, and social suffering from the representation. In effect, the crisis becomes teachable because it is softened. This kind of optimism is understandable in school materials, yet it can also depoliticize climate change. Tang’s (2024) policy analysis identifies a similar “optimistic future outlook” in Indonesia’s climate education discourse, suggesting that institutional climate narratives may prefer constructive hope over structural confrontation. However,

recent work in language education argues that sustainability teaching should not stop at encouragement and positivity. Porto (2025) emphasizes ecological citizenship, while Micalay-Hurtado and Poole (2022) call for eco-critical language awareness that makes visible the links between discourse, justice, and environmental harm. From this perspective, the absence of climate justice imagery in the analyzed materials limits the depth of environmental literacy that textbooks can offer.

Overall discussion: the textbooks support awareness, but not yet critical environmental literacy

Taken together, the findings indicate that the textbooks construct climate change as an important global issue, but they do so through a discourse that is informational, moralized, individualized, and pedagogically safe. Climate change is represented as real and serious, yet the discourse remains largely non-confrontational. Students are encouraged to care, but not strongly invited to question. They are asked to change behavior, but not to examine structures. They are exposed to environmental vocabulary, but not fully engaged in ecological critique. In this sense, the textbook discourse appears to support environmental awareness more than critical environmental literacy.

This overall interpretation aligns with scholarship that treats environmental content as a basis for critical thinking, ecological citizenship, and justice-oriented pedagogy rather than as topical decoration. The findings show that awareness-oriented materials can still reproduce a restricted environmental discourse when causality is simplified, responsibility is individualized, and learner tasks reward agreement rather than inquiry. For textbook development, this means that improvement cannot be measured only by the number of climate-related passages. Attention must also be given to the range of represented actors, the visibility of institutional responsibility, the inclusion of affected communities, and the cognitive and communicative demands of follow-up activities. Teachers likewise need adaptable prompts that help students compare sources, analyze language and images, and connect personal behavior with collective and policy-level action. In this way, climate-related EFL materials can support language proficiency while also creating informed opportunities for critical environmental participation (Goulah, 2017; Mercer et al., 2023; Monroe et al., 2019; Porto, 2025).

Discussion

The findings suggest that climate change in Indonesian senior high school EFL textbooks is represented through an informative and morally supportive discourse that is not yet fully critical. Positively, the textbooks do not ignore climate change. They introduce it as a real issue and provide students with basic environmental vocabulary, causes, and consequences. However, the framing also reveals limitations. Climate change is presented as a general educational topic rather than a deeply political, unequal, and contested global crisis. This pattern is consistent with Fairclough's (2015) view that discourse does not merely reflect reality but shapes how reality is understood through particular selections,

emphases, and silences. Thus, the textbook does not only teach English and environmental content; it also constructs a particular way for students to understand climate change and their place within it.

The first point concerns the representation of climate change as a scientific fact in a simplified, non-conflictual form. In the data, climate change is explained through short cause-and-effect statements and addressed through familiar actions such as saving energy, planting trees, or reducing waste. This representation is pedagogically accessible for school learners, but it narrows the issue. Climate change becomes a stable body of information rather than a crisis shaped by competing interests, power relations, and unequal consequences. This pattern supports the argument that climate education often remains limited to knowledge transfer, although recent discussions emphasize social, emotional, and action-oriented dimensions (Global Education Monitoring Report Team & Monitoring and Evaluating Climate Communication and Education Project, 2024; UNESCO, 2024). In other words, the textbooks provide awareness without sufficient complexity.

A second major point is the individualization of responsibility. In the data, students, families, and communities are the most visible actors, while governments, corporations, industries, and policy institutions are absent or backgrounded. This matters because the grammar of climate discourse is not neutral. When agency is assigned mainly to ordinary people through statements such as “we must save the Earth” or “students should reduce plastic use,” responsibility is shifted downward. Meanwhile, larger systems contributing significantly to climate change remain outside learners’ attention. This pattern aligns with Lee and Nguyen’s (2024) finding that ELT textbooks may include environmental literacy while distributing responsibility unevenly and emphasizing individual behavioral change over structural accountability. It also resonates with Komarawan et al.’s (2025) finding that Indonesian EFL textbooks represent environmental issues through selective inclusion and exclusion of social actors, naturalizing certain ecological worldviews while obscuring others. From a CDA perspective, the textbooks encourage good behavior while shaping a particular ideology of responsibility (Fairclough, 2015).

At the textual level, the individualization of responsibility is produced through actor selection, grammatical agency, and modality. Students and generalized pronouns such as *we* and *everyone* appear as explicit agents of environmentally desirable actions, whereas large-scale environmental damage is often represented through nominalizations or agentless passive clauses. Deontic expressions such as *should* and *must* intensify obligations directed toward ordinary learners without creating equivalent demands for institutional actors. Fairclough’s (2015) framework explains why this pattern is ideological rather than merely stylistic: repeated grammatical selections make one distribution of responsibility appear natural and commonsensical. The pattern also extends Lee and Nguyen’s (2024) observation that environmental responsibility in ELT textbooks may be shifted toward ordinary social groups. By connecting lexical and grammatical evidence with the organization of social actors, the analysis

shows how positive environmental advice can obscure asymmetries of power and accountability.

The third issue concerns how students are positioned in the textbook. Based on the analyzed exercises, learners are mostly invited to answer comprehension questions, list environmentally friendly actions, and express agreement with positive ecological messages. These tasks support understanding and moral alignment, but they do not strongly encourage students to question discourse, compare perspectives, or identify missing voices. Consequently, students are positioned more as obedient eco-learners than as critical environmental readers. This limitation is important because recent language education scholarship argues that environmental topics in ELT should build not only vocabulary and awareness but also ecological citizenship and justice-oriented thinking. Porto (2025) argues that language education can help secure a livable planet by developing learners as ecological citizens. Similarly, Micalay-Hurtado and Poole (2022) propose eco-critical language awareness as a framework connecting language learning with sustainability, justice, and well-being. From this perspective, the textbook tasks remain pedagogically safe: they ask students to care, but not sufficiently to critique.

The exercise design further reveals how discourse and pedagogy reinforce each other. Comprehension questions, vocabulary matching, and lists of recommended habits confirm the textbook's preferred interpretation, but rarely require students to test claims against other sources, identify absent voices, or examine interests behind proposed solutions. A more critical sequence could begin with accessible comprehension and progress to actor mapping, headline comparison, analysis of modal verbs and passive constructions, evaluation of visual framing, and discussion of local policy alternatives. Such tasks would preserve attainable language objectives while creating the active, relevant, and deliberative conditions highlighted by Monroe et al. (2019). They would also operationalize Goulah's (2017) call for eco-ethical consciousness and Micalay-Hurtado and Poole's (2022) eco-critical language awareness. Critical environmental literacy therefore does not require replacing language instruction with environmental advocacy; it requires linguistic analysis that helps learners understand how environmental realities and responsibilities are discursively constructed.

The multimodal findings strengthen this interpretation. In the materials, visuals are optimistic, clean, and emotionally safe, including smiling Earth images, schoolchildren planting trees, and positive slogans about saving the planet. These images make the topic approachable for classroom use, but they also soften the seriousness of climate change. The absence of difficult representations, such as disaster vulnerability, unequal exposure, or local climate suffering, reduces the crisis to a manageable moral lesson. This tendency is particularly relevant in Indonesia. Tang's (2024) policy analysis shows that climate change education in Indonesia remains shaped by gaps in policy congruence and implementation, which may partly explain why school discourse favors optimism and general awareness over systemic critique. Thus, the sanitized visuals are not

merely a design choice; they may reflect a broader educational tendency to frame climate change as important but not disruptive.

The Indonesian context also requires stronger connections between textbook discourse and locally experienced climate realities. Materials can remain age-appropriate while including contrasting representations of floods, drought, coastal vulnerability, forest and peatland fires, urban heat, energy transitions, and affected communities. These issues should be accompanied by communicative and project-based tasks through which learners compare viewpoints, conduct small-scale inquiries, and propose responses at personal, community, and institutional levels. Nopikasari and Maisarah (2026) emphasize combining local content with authentic texts, intercultural perspectives, and higher-order communicative work in Indonesian ELT materials. Tang (2024) likewise identifies policy and implementation gaps in Indonesian climate change education. Together with the present findings, these studies suggest that textbook revision should not merely add environmental vocabulary or positive slogans. It should broaden represented actors, make structural causality visible, and provide teachers with prompts connecting language development to evidence-based discussion, ecological citizenship, and contextually meaningful action.

Taken together, these patterns indicate that the textbooks support environmental awareness but do not fully support critical environmental literacy. Students encounter climate change as a real and urgent issue, yet the discourse remains largely decontextualized from power, inequality, and institutional responsibility. This confirms a broader concern in environmental ELT research: including green topics in language materials does not automatically produce critical literacy. Environmental content can remain superficial when presented only as moral advice or factual reading practice (Lee & Nguyen, 2024; Mambu, 2023). Therefore, the findings support moving English textbooks beyond topic inclusion toward deeper discursive engagement. Climate-related texts should ask not only what climate change is, but also who is represented as responsible, who is affected, whose voices are heard, and what solutions become imaginable (Komarawan et al., 2025; Shah, 2023).

Pedagogically, this discussion suggests that textbook writers and teachers should design materials that are linguistically accessible and critically meaningful. Reading passages can remain simple enough for EFL learners, but accompanying tasks should encourage students to interpret representation, identify absent actors, compare local and global perspectives, and distinguish personal action from structural responsibility. This suggestion aligns with Mercer et al. (2023), who found that teachers value environmental topics in ELT but need support in balancing linguistic aims with environmental learning goals. Similarly, UNESCO (2024) emphasizes that climate education should help learners act for people and planet rather than merely memorize information. Therefore, climate change discussions in EFL textbooks should ideally support language development, critical reading, and meaningful ecological citizenship (Porto, 2025).

Overall, the findings and their interpretation demonstrate that climate change discourse in EFL textbooks is not neutral but selective, pedagogical, and ideological. It provides some awareness while depoliticizing climate change

through simplified causality, individualized responsibility, and optimistic language and imagery. CDA is therefore relevant because it reveals how textbook discourse shapes not only what students know about climate change, but also how they are expected to think, feel, and respond (Fairclough, 2015). The study contributes theoretically and pedagogically by showing how English textbook discourse can either limit or expand students' critical environmental literacy (Komarawan et al., 2025; Porto, 2025; Shah, 2023).

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The analysis demonstrates that the selected Indonesian Grade XI English textbooks construct climate change as a scientifically established and morally significant issue, but the discourse remains more effective in developing environmental awareness than critical environmental literacy. The 2017 textbook mainly introduces global warming through generalized factual statements, opinion practice, and universal personal responsibility, whereas the 2022 English for Change textbook expands learner agency through environmental-figure profiles, multimodal texts, and project-oriented activities. Across both textbooks, however, responsibility is directed more visibly toward students, communities, and youth activists than toward governments, corporations, industries, or policy systems; complex causality is simplified; and optimistic visual-verbal framing provides hope while reducing attention to unequal vulnerability and climate justice. The study implies that EFL materials should maintain linguistically accessible texts but combine them with clearer structural accountability, locally grounded Indonesian climate experiences, multiple social voices, and tasks that require learners to analyze agency, modality, omission, and visual framing. The study is limited to two government-issued Grade XI textbooks and does not examine classroom enactment or learner response. Future research should include textbooks across grade levels and publishers, investigate how teachers mediate climate discourse, and analyze whether critical task redesign changes students' language performance and environmental reasoning. In this way, climate-related ELT can support communicative competence, ecological citizenship, and the critical capacity required to interpret and respond to a complex global crisis.

REFERENCES

- Astuti, P., Anggaira, A. S., Herawati, A., Nurhayati, Y., Dadan, & Suriani, D. (2022). *Bahasa Inggris: English for change untuk SMA/MA kelas XI*. Pusat Perbukuan, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.
- Bashir, M. (2017). *Bahasa Inggris: SMA/MA/SMK/MAK kelas XI* (Rev. ed.). Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>

- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dhanyamol, C. T., & Sethunarayanan, N. (2025). A systematic review on integrating environmental sustainability in English language teaching: Strategies for Sustainable Development Goals. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, Article 1636623. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1636623>
- Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Global Education Monitoring Report Team, & Monitoring and Evaluating Climate Communication and Education Project. (2024). *Education and climate change: Learning to act for people and planet*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54676/GVXA4765>
- Ibrahim, M. A., & Damayanti, I. L. (2024). The representation of environmental issues in an EFL module for primary school: A multimodal analysis. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 11(1), 23–50. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v11i1.734>
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2023). *Climate change 2023: Synthesis report*. <https://doi.org/10.59327/IPCC/AR6-9789291691647>
- Komarawan, Y., Febryanto, M., & Bakhti, K. Y. (2025). De-naturalizing the worldviews underlying representations of eco-awareness: A multimodal critical discourse analysis of Indonesian EFL textbooks. *Journal of World Languages*, 11(3), 481–516. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jwl-2024-0100>
- Lee, D. B., & Nguyen, T.-H.-N. (2024). The treatment of environmental literacy in the ELT textbooks in Vietnam. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), Article 2425898. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2425898>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Mambu, J. E. (2023). Embedding Sustainable Development Goals into critical English language teaching and learning. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 20(1), 46–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2022.2099863>
- Mercer, S., Ibrahim, N. C., Bilsborough, K., Jones, C., & Potzinger, C. (2023). Teacher perspectives on addressing environmental issues in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 77(4), 393–406. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccac039>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Micalay-Hurtado, M. A., & Poole, R. (2022). Eco-critical language awareness for English language teaching (ELT): Promoting justice, wellbeing, and sustainability in the classroom. *Journal of World Languages*, 8(2), 371–390. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jwl-2022-0023>
- Morote, Á.-F., & Hernández-Hernández, M. (2023). Climate change in school geography textbooks (Spain) in the era of the ICTs: Perception and teaching according to teachers. *Education Sciences*, 13(8), Article 822. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13080822>
- Nopikasari, N., & Maisarah, I. (2026). ELT textbooks in Indonesia: A comparative study of national and international curricula. *Wiralodra English Journal*, 10(1), 181–199. <https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v10i1.591>

- Porto, M. (2025). How can language education contribute to securing a livable planet? *TESOL Quarterly*, 59(2), 585–618. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3321>
- Rajagukguk, S. A. (2025). Environmental awareness in ELT: A critical discourse analysis of the English for Nusantara Grade IX textbook. *INSPIRATION: Instructional Practices in Language Education*, 4(2), 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.30829/inspiration.v4i2.27841>
- Shah, W. A. (2023). Nation, alterity and competing discourses: Rethinking textbooks as ideological apparatuses. *Linguistics and Education*, 78, Article 101250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2023.101250>
- Tang, K. (2024). Climate change education in Indonesia's formal education: A policy analysis. *npj Climate Action*, 3, Article 57. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44168-024-00143-z>
- UNESCO. (2024). *Greening curriculum guidance: Teaching and learning for climate action*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000390022>