Parallèles

Representations of nonhuman animals: An eco-translation investigation of English-Indonesian ecotourism articles

Aditya A. Soeta Bangsa
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

Wening Sahayu
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

Ingrid A. Gavilan Tatin
Independent Researcher

Abstract

This paper investigates the representation of nonhuman animals in ecotourism articles featured in the *Colours* magazine, published by Garuda Indonesia Airline. Utilizing a combination of corpus-assisted analysis and ecolinguistic analysis using the nine forms of stories (Stibbe, 2021) and cultural filters (deletion, distortion, and generalization) in translation (Katan, 2016), this study analyzes a parallel corpus of English-language source texts and Indonesian-language target texts from seven selected ecotourism articles. The findings reveal that the deletions, distortions, and generalizations observed in the Indonesian target texts significantly transform how nonhuman animals are represented in the ecotourism articles, resulting in a reduced ecological significance and potentially misleading portrayal compared to the English source texts. The importance of considering an ecocentric approach in translation practices is highlighted, particularly in the context of ecotourism, where accurate and respectful representation of the natural world is crucial for promoting conservation and environmental awareness.

Keywords

Tourism translation, nonhuman animals, ecotourism, ecolinguistics, in-flight magazine

1. Introduction

The translation of tourism-related texts has become a significant area of interest in translation studies. Several aspects of interest include linguistic accuracy and cultural representation (Agorni, 2018), and how translators achieve a delicate balance between attracting tourists and providing accurate information (Agorni, 2012; Manca, 2016; Sulaiman & Wilson, 2019). Moreover, tourism texts present unique challenges for translators with their varying textual conventions, as well as the differing goals of tourism domains (Kelly, 1998; Togaev & Paluanova, 2021). These differing focuses demand translators pay close attention to terminological choices, genre conventions, and domain-specific knowledge of different types of tourism (Durán-Muñoz & Jiménez-Navarro, 2023; Giampieri & Harper, 2022; Hasmira et al., 2023).

Ecotourism texts, unlike other touristic promotional materials, require a distinct emphasis on environmental protection and education (Fennell, 2015; Ramírez & Santana, 2019). A large body of research has explored various types of tourism (Amenador & Wang, 2023; Durán-Muñoz & Jiménez-Navarro, 2023; Khye Ling et al., 2018; Li & Ng, 2024; Maci, 2019; Napu & Pakaya, 2021; Sulaiman & Wilson, 2018; Turzynski-Azimi, 2021; Veselica Majhut, 2021). However, the focus has primarily been on the cultural and promotional aspects of tourism, leaving a gap in understanding how different types of tourism texts, such as ecotourism texts, are translated and how they contribute to environmental protection and sustainable tourism practices (Gursky et al., 2022; Huynh et al., 2024). This study addresses this gap by examining the translation of ecotourism articles, focusing on the representation of nonhuman animals.

By combining translation theory with ecolinguistics, this study investigates the cultural filters—deletion, distortion, and generalization (Katan, 2016)—apparent in translating the portrayal of nonhuman animals and their ecological significance, informed by ecolinguistic stories (Stibbe, 2021). This study analyzes a parallel corpus of English-Indonesian ecotourism articles to address the question how do cultural filters in translation—deletion, distortion, and generalization— impact the representation of nonhuman animals when translating English-language ecotourism articles into Indonesian?

This study contributes to the growing body of literature on tourism translation and provides valuable insights into the role of language in shaping our understanding and appreciation of the often-silenced voices of nature in translation (Badenes & Coisson, 2015), revealing how language shapes our relationship with the natural world and its inhabitants (Stibbe, 2005). Ultimately, it advocates for more ecocentric translation practices in the tourism industry, practices that foster respect, empathy, and environmental sustainability.

2. Theoretical frameworks

2.1. Nonhuman animals in ecotourism

Nonhuman animals play a crucial role in ecotourism, yet they are often reduced to mere attractions or sources of entertainment (Dilek & Dilek, 2023). While these nonhuman animals, or "being[s] other than a human being" (Merriam-Webster, 2024), contribute significantly to biodiversity conservation and generate substantial tourism revenue, their well-being frequently takes a backseat to human interests (Fennell, 2022; Samal & Dash, 2023). Several studies highlight how ecotourism discourse tends to prioritize tourist comfort and green marketing narratives over genuine environmental concerns and biodiversity conservation (Buonvivere, 2023; Chakraborty, 2019; Dang, 2023; Lamb, 2021; Shannon et al., 2017). This oversight extends to translation practices, where ecological elements, including nonhuman animals, are often overlooked or erased in target texts (Hastürkoğlu, 2020; Mliless et al., 2023; Tekalp, 2021). Correcting this necessitates a more ecologically conscious translation

practice that cultivates ecological connections and dynamics across languages and cultures (Badenes & Coisson, 2015; Cronin, 2017; Diamanti, 2022; Lynes, 2012; Scott, 2023). This is particularly important in ecotourism, where the texts should not only address linguistic and cultural contexts to attract tourists, but also convey genuine ecological messages that promote pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors (Lee et al., 2023; Li & Ng, 2024; Valero Garcés, 2017; You, 2022, 2024), which emphasize sustainability, responsibility, and a green perspective towards the earth we share with other species (Zhao & Geng, 2024).

2.2. Cultural filters in tourism translation

Kelly (1998) defines tourism texts as publications created by public or private organizations to inform, attract, and encourage people to visit tourist attractions or destinations. These texts serve three communicative functions, which Katan (2012) categorizes as the *vouloir* (promotional), which aims to stimulate the reader's interest, the *savoir* (informative), which aims to give the reader knowledge, and the *pouvoir* (persuasive), which aims to empower the reader to act and do something in a certain manner.

However, for translators, achieving a fully functional and adequate translation of tourism texts can be challenging, as they extend beyond preserving the author or authors' intended message in the original text (MacKenzie, 2019) to encompass fundamental differences in how worldviews and cultural perceptions are conveyed across languages (Katan, 2016). To address these challenges, Katan (2016) proposes three cultural filters: deletion, which involves omitting particular information in the communication; distortion, which entails replacing or equating perceived worldviews and experiences with others that are more familiar or, indeed, completely different; and generalization, which presents any particular world experience as something generic or universal.

Katan and Taibi (2021) explain that these filters serve multiple purposes in translation. Deletion can aid target audience accessibility by removing references to taboo or sensitive topics in the source culture to avoid offense in the target culture. Distortion can adapt the content to a target readership by altering complex references or concepts to make them more understandable or relatable for general target audiences. Lastly, generalization can aid by simplifying complex concepts or references to avoid burdening the target audiences with large quantities of specific information they may find too unusual or that cannot be fully represented in the target culture. These purposes imply a need for intervention or filtering, at either a textual or cross-cultural level (Agorni, 2012), to ensure the written or spoken materials are recognizable, comprehensible, and relevant to the particular needs of recipients. Therefore, translators can pay attention to the extent to which the gaps between the source and the target text's readers need to be mediated (Agorni, 2018; Katan, 2020; Nord, 2000), as both readerships have different privileges for accessing not only the language but also the perceived and shared cultural filters (Katan, 2016).

2.3. Ecolinguistics and stories we live by

Ecolinguistics is described by the International Ecolinguistics Association (IEA, n.d.) as a discipline that "explores the role of language in the life-sustaining interactions of humans, other species, and the physical environment." As a discipline, its primary objective is to develop linguistic theories that can be applied to address critical ecological issues, ranging from climate change and biodiversity loss to environmental justice. In this aspect, Stibbe, in his book *Ecolinguistics: Language, Ecology and the Stories We Live By* (2021), proposes nine forms of stories we live by to explore and discuss these pressing issues (see Table 1), delving into the various stories and linguistic frameworks through which human societies perceive and interact with other species and the physical world.

Forms of story	Definition	Manifestation in texts
Ideology	A story centers on shared beliefs within a group about how the world works and how it should be.	Clusters of linguistic features characteristically used by a group.
Framing	A story uses a frame (a packet of knowledge about an area of life) to structure another area of life.	Trigger words which bring a frame to mind.
Metaphor	A story uses a frame to structure a distinct and clearly different area of life.	Trigger words which bring a clearly distinct frame to mind.
Evaluation	A story centers on judgments, whether good, bad, or both, about a specific area of life.	Appraisal patterns that represent an area of life positively, negatively, or both at the same time.
Identity	A story centers on what it means to belong to certain categories or groups.	Forms of language that define characteristics of certain kinds of people.
Conviction	A story centers on whether a particular description of the world is true, uncertain, or false.	Patterns of language that represent description about the world as true, uncertain, or false.
Erasure	A story centers on whether an area of life is unimportant and therefore unworthy of consideration.	Patterns of linguistic features which fail to represent a particular area of life at all, or which background or distort it.
Salience	A story centers on whether an area of life is important or worthy of consideration.	Patterns of language which give prominence to an area of life.
Narrative	A story centers on a structure that involves a sequence of logically connected events.	Narrative text, i.e., specific oral telling, written work, or other expressive form which recounts a series of temporally and logically connected events.

Table 1. Nine forms of stories we live by (modified from Stibbe, 2021, p. 17)

Stibbe (2021, p. 6) defined stories as "cognitive structures in the minds of individuals which influence how they think, talk and act" and stories we live by as "stories in the minds of multiple individuals across a culture." Importantly, these nine forms of story manifest themselves through various linguistic features, including vocabulary, lexical relationships, grammatical structures (e.g., activization vs. passivation), transitivity (e.g., processes and participants in a clause), assumptions and presuppositions, relationships between clauses (e.g., in terms of reason, consequence, and purpose), the representation of events and participants (e.g., abstraction vs. concretization; individualization vs. an aggregated mass), intertextuality, genres, and figures of speech (Stibbe, 2021).

2.4. Ecolinguistic stories, translation filters, and ecotourism

The integration of ecolinguistic stories (Stibbe, 2021) and cultural filters in translation (Katan, 2016) offers a comprehensive framework for understanding how nonhuman animals are represented in multilingual ecotourism discourse, revealing how seemingly small linguistic changes, analyzed through ecolinguistic stories and cultural filters in translation, can ripple through conservation messaging, tourist experiences, and cross-cultural understandings of the natural world. This analysis seeks to uncover whether the ecotourism texts preserve or alter the ecological and cultural narratives when adapted for diverse audiences. To illustrate how these stories manifest themselves in ecotourism discourse, consider the following passage from touristic promotion "Borneo Orangutan Tour in Tanjung Puting" (Local Guides, 2017):

> The main reason people visit Tanjung Puting is because of the Orangutans, the [sic.] park is also home to the bizarre-looking proboscis monkey [*Evaluation: unusual appearance as a defining characteristic*] with its "Jimmy Durante" nose [*Ideology: Use of "its" not "their" says that the monkeys are objects, not sentient beings; Metaphor: comparing an animal feature to a human celebrity*], as well as seven other primate species [*Erasure: unnamed animals are reduced to numbers*] [*Ideology: the passage positions the nonhuman animals as a primary ecotourism commodity*]. (Local Guides, 2017)

The passage above demonstrates how multiple ecolinguistic stories are interwoven to create meaning. This construction has the potential to shape tourists' attitudes, perceptions, and behavior towards nonhuman animals within ecotourism discourse, where they are represented in a way that aligns with either anthropocentric (human-centered) or ecocentric (nature-centered) perspectives. Alternatively, it reinforces beneficial, ambivalent, or destructive discourse that goes in accord with or against the ecological philosophy (ecosophy) of "how organisms (including humans) depend on interactions with other organisms and a physical environment to survive and flourish, and also an ethical framework to decide why survival and flourishing matters and whose survival and flourishing matters" (Stibbe, 2014, p. 119). In this case, the commodification of nonhuman animals as a tourism allure reflects an anthropocentric, i.e., human-centered, perspective where wildlife is primarily viewed as a resource for human enjoyment rather than as integral members of an ecosystem (Dilek & Dilek, 2023).

As the text moves between languages and cultures, e.g., from English to Indonesian, filters such as deletion, distortion, and generalization can influence how nonhuman animals are represented, positively or negatively. For instance, their ecological significance, which hints at anthropocentric Ideology, may be further downplayed in favor of highlighting aspects that appeal to Indonesian readers' entertainment preferences. The Metaphor of the proboscis monkey's physical characteristic using Jimmy Durante could be deleted or replaced with a more biologically accurate description, as this cultural reference may not resonate with Indonesian readers as it does with English-speaking readers. The subjective Evaluation of "bizarre-looking" might also be deleted or distorted into a neutral (e.g., "well-known"), positive (e.g., "beloved"), or more negative (e.g., "ugly"). Finally, the presence of Erasure in "seven other primate species" might be replaced with a more abstract "seven other animals" or more concrete presentation "seven other primate species, including long-tailed macaques, gibbons," etc.

3. Corpus and methodology

This study employed a corpus-assisted analysis to help examine individual language features in the texts made by the original authors and translators that reflect their ideological orientations. Informed by Poole's (2022) corpus-assisted ecolinguistic analysis on a small yet specialized corpus to analyze how nonhuman animals are represented within a discourse, and grounded

in the theories of ecolinguistic stories (Stibbe, 2021) and cultural filters in translation (Katan, 2016), this study aims to demonstrate how various linguistic features in ecotourism discourse concerning nonhuman animals were transformed when translated from the source text (English) to the target text (Indonesian).

For this purpose, the study complied seven selected ecotourism articles from *Colours* magazine (retrieved from www.garuda-indonesia.com): (1) Rinca Island (RCI, 2013), (2) Tanjung Puting National Park (TNTP, 2014), (3) Way Kambas National Park (WKNP, 2014), (4) Wasur National Park [Merauke] (WNP, 2014), (5) Kerinci Seblat National Park (KSNP, 2014), (6) Palangkaraya (PLKR, 2018), and (7) Sebangau National Park (SNP, 2019). The selection was based on their relevance to conservation and natural protected areas, aligning with ecotourism themes and criteria (Fennell, 2015; Ramírez & Santana, 2019); their focus on Indonesia's famous ecotourism destinations (e.g., national parks, wildlife encounters, and nature reserves); and their availability in English and Indonesian. A total of 31,605 words and 316 segments (i.e., paragraphs in both English and Indonesian) were compiled into a parallel corpus document and analyzed with the help of a web-based corpus tool Sketch Engine (Kilgarriff et al., 2004, 2014).

3.1. Data collection and analysis

Using Sketch Engine, the study identified key terms or phrases related to names, characteristics, features, and descriptions of nonhuman animals in English source texts and their Indonesian translations. This included searches for lexical patterns, collocations, and concordances to reveal how nonhuman animals were linguistically represented in each language. The results gained from these searches were systematically categorized into different types of ecolinguistic stories informed by Stibbe's (2021) theory.

After data collection, the representations of nonhuman animals in the English texts were compared with their Indonesian translations. The analysis was informed by Katan's (2016) cultural filters in translation, specifically focusing on the application of the filters of deletion, distortion, and generalization in the Indonesian translations. The final phase of analysis examined how translation filters impact the representation and ecological significance of nonhuman animals and how these changes might influence the ecological narratives conveyed to Indonesian audiences.

To ensure reliability, the two researchers conducted the data collection independently (assigned as Coder 1 and Coder 2) following the adapted theoretical frameworks used in this study. Any discrepancies in the classifications (i.e., the ecolinguistic stories and translation filters) were discussed and resolved by consensus. Furthermore, to address ethical considerations, the study only used ecotourism articles that are publicly available from Garuda Indonesia through their official online platform and no personal identifying information was collected or used in the analysis.

4. Results

4.1. Auditory descriptions

Nonhuman animals were often described in the texts through their distinctive calls and sounds that primarily aimed to evoke vivid imagery and immerse readers in nature's atmosphere. Several instances of these auditory experiences from the source text (ST), however, were found to be significantly transformed in the target text (TT) (See Table 2).

English (ST)		Indonesian (TT)
(1) The **gentle cacophony of calls** from birds, frogs, cicada and countless other insects **provides** a soothing backdrop for a restful night's sleep in the jungle (PLKR, 2018, p. 118).	→	**Suara** burung, katak, jangkrik dan bermacam serangga **menjadi** latar belakang yang menenangkan untuk tidur malam yang nyenyak di tengah hutan (PLKR, 2018, p. 118).
(2) I sense our guide is listening intently to the forest, the **strange language** of the insects and the rustling of leaves... (SNP, 2019, p. 101)	→	Pemandu mendengarkan dengan saksama suara hutan, **suara serangga** dan gemerisik dedaunan ... (SNP, 2019, p. 103)
(3) One of the most distinctive sounds you'll hear in the park is the **loud call** of the siamang, a black-furred gibbon that likes to hang out high in the trees. (WKNP, 2014, p. 129)	→	Salah satu suara paling spesific yang dapat didengar di Taman Nasional adalah **suara** Siamang, kera berbulu hitam yang gemar bergelantungan di pohon. (WKNP, 2014, p. 129)
(4) As we hike doggedly up a root-strewn ridge, the local gibbon troop keeps pace with us, whooping their **shrill territorial siren call**, drowning out the **morning chirping** of a billion cicadas. (KNSP, 2014, p.124)	→	Saat kami mendaki jalan setapak yang penuh akar pohon, sekawanan siamang mengikuti kami sambil mengeluarkan **suara** lengkingan sebagai peringatan batas wilayah mereka, mengalahkan **suara** jutaan tonggeret. (KNSP, 2014, p. 130)

Table 2. Excerpts of auditory descriptions

Table 2 presents Salience stories with several elements of Metaphor that give prominence to the visibility of nonhuman animals. Awny (2023) pointed out that Salience stories can be revealed by portraying nonhuman animals as active participants or initiators of actions. For instance, ST (1) uses the description "**gentle cacophony**", referring to the "**calls**" as loud and dissonant yet gentle and soothing, and the activation of "**provides**" to present the birds, frogs, cicadas, and countless other insects as the sayers of the verbal processes. However, TT (1) deleted the "**gentle cacophony**", generalized the "**calls**" into "**Suara**" (sounds), and distorted "**provides**" into "**menjadi**" (becomes), which significantly reduces the representation of nonhuman animals' verbal processes in the Indonesian translation.

These transformations could be attributed to the translator's attempt to avoid presenting the readers with overwhelming details (Agorni, 2018) or to different cultural preferences for either explicit or implicit forms of informational details (Kelly, 1998). However, similar transformations evident in the three other excerpts suggest an underlying belief that the target-text audiences may not need, or may not engage with, the same level of auditory details as the source-text audiences. It can be seen that TT (2) deleted the Metaphor from "**strange language** of the insects" and generalized it into "**suara** serangga" (sound of insects); TT (3) deleted the "**loud call** of the siamang" and generalized it into "**suara** Siamang" (sound of siamang); and TT (4) deleted the Metaphor of a local gibbon troop's "**siren call**" and generalized it into "**suara**" (sound), as well as deleted the "**morning chirping**" of a billion cicadas, generalizing it into "**suara**" (sound). These transformations in the Indonesian target texts result in a reduced Salience story manifested in comparison to the English source texts, especially regarding the activation of nonhuman animals and presenting them as sayers of the verbal processes.

4.2. Interchangeable identities

Nonhuman animals in the corpus primarily constitute great apes (orangutans), lesser apes (gibbons), tarsiers, slow lorises, proboscis monkeys, and macaques, with some additional species represented. However, the analysis identified several instances of Erasure stories, where nonhuman animals' identities were generalized and treated as interchangeable in the Indonesian translation, especially between apes and monkeys. For example, "a fast-moving gibbon" is translated into "seekor monyet datang dengan gerakan yang cepat," or a monkey comes with fast movement in English (TNTP, 2014), and "a gang of long-tailed macaques" into "sekelompok kera berekor panjang," or a group of long-tailed apes in English (WKNP, 2014). These generalizations occurred throughout the corpus, as seen in Table 3.

English (ST)		Indonesian (TT)
(1) Pay close attention and with luck, you could see **gibbons**, **tarsiers**, Malay civets (TNTP, 2014, p. 131).	→	Amati sekitar Anda dan jika beruntung Anda dapat melihat **monyet ungka**, **monyet tarsier,** musang malay (TNTP, 2014, p. 135).
(2) Way off in the distance we can just make out a very faint sound, which our guide identifies as the call of **a southern pig-tailed macaque** (SNP, 2019, p. 102).	→	Dari kejauhan, kami bisa mendengar suara samar-samar, yang menurut pemandu kami adalah suara **kera ekor babi** (SNP, 2019, p. 103).
(3) … in tow, we've spotted the brilliant blue of a soaring blue-eared kingfisher, **a single silver langur**, the bright red beak of a stork-billed kingfisher … **more silver langurs** (WKNP, 2014, p. 119)	→	kami … berturut-turut melihat burung Raja Udang Meninting yang memiliki warna biru di sekitar telinganya, **seekor langur perak**, burung Pekaka Emas … **beberapa jenis kera yang disebut langur** (WKNP, 2014, p. 125)

Table 3. Excerpts of inaccurate identifications

Table 3 presents an element of Salience, where the presence of nonhuman animals lies at the center of the narratives (Awny, 2023). However, it can be seen that TT (1) translated "**gibbons**" and "**tarsiers**" as "**monyet ungka**" (ungka monkey) and "**monyet tarsier**" (tarsier monkey) respectively. In contrast, TT (2) translated "**southern pig-tailed macaque**" as "**kera ekor babi**" (pig-tailed ape). Although the addition of "monyet" (monkey) may help those unfamiliar with these animals, the inconsistency between apes and monkeys creates a problematic generalization by misclassifying these primates. The more problematic identification is illustrated in the third excerpt; TT (3) translates "**silver langur**" as "**kera**" (ape) along with an additional explanation of "**beberapa jenis kera yang disebut langur**" (some types of apes called langurs).

Stibbe (2021, pp. 144–145) refers to this type of Erasure as "*the mask*". In this case, the translation transforms the specific mentions of nonhuman animals in the ST into colloquial generalizations in the TT, altering their identity as interchangeable from one another within the semantic domain of a primate. A similar case also occurred in Li and Ng (2024), where nonhuman animals are introduced inaccurately in the translation due to the translators' ignorance toward the scientific identification of animal species. Juergens (2018) argues that humans and nonhuman animals share similarities in having unique personalities and abilities, as well as perceiving and experiencing reality in distinct ways. By generalizing nonhuman animals' identities, translators inadvertently minimized this uniqueness. This over-generalization

could also perpetuate stereotypes as it diverges from the original intent to simplify complex information (Katan & Taibi, 2021), and thus fosters an inaccurate and harmful presentation of conservation and animal welfare (Rizzolo, 2023). Studies have highlighted the importance of accurate information about animal identification, particularly for conservation management (Blair et al., 2011), understanding biogeography features (Beusterien, 2023), and minimizing disease transmission (Schultz, 2016). Therefore, inaccurate identification of specific nonhuman animals can harm both humans and animals, while also misleading target readers about the original text's educational and conservation goals.

4.3. Conservational messages

Another presentation of nonhuman animals within the corpus was through conservational messages, in which nonhuman animals are described as vulnerable. These messages manifest Conviction stories and may shape the audience's perception of environmental issues by instilling a sense of responsibility and immediacy. However, such conservational messages were often presented differently in the translation (see Table 4).

English (ST)		Indonesian (TT)
(1) Camp Leakey, a research centre in Tanjung Puting National Park, one of the few remaining homes for **the endangered orangutan** (TPNP, 2014, p. 131).	→	Camp Leakey, sebuah pusat riset yang terkenal di taman nasional Tanjung Puting, salah satu dari beberapa habitat **orangutan** yang tersisa (TPNP, 2014, p. 135).
(2) The park [Way Kambas National Park], with around 40 per cent of its primary forest remaining, provides a sanctuary for several species of **critically endangered animals**, including the Sumatran tiger, Sumatran rhinoceros and Sumatran elephant (WKNP, 2014, p. 119).	→	Taman Nasional tersebut, dengan 40% dari hutan utamanya yang masih tersisa menyediakan surga bagi beberapa spesies **satwa yang sangat langka**, termasuk harimau Sumatera, badak Sumatera dan gajah Sumatera (WKNP, 2014, p. 125).

Table 4. Excerpts of conservational messages

Table 4 presents two excerpts about the conservation status of nonhuman animals marked by the source texts' mention of "**endangered**" (*terancam punah* in Indonesian). This emphasis carries high facticity from scientific authority that manifests true Conviction stories, alerting readers about the species' critical condition. However, TT (1) deletes the "**endangered**" status of orangutans. While the core message of ST (1) remains intact in the TT, the deleted "**endangered**" presents a different sense of urgency, from both the habitat's and the orangutans' threatened survival in the ST to only the fact about the habitat loss in the TT. Meanwhile, ST (2) presents the conservation message with "**critically endangered**", emphasizing the critical status of Sumatran tigers, Sumatran rhinoceroses, and Sumatran elephants. However, TT (2) generalized "**critically endangered**" to "**sangat langka**" (very rare). While in terms of the semantic domain the use of "very rare" closely corresponds to "**endangered**" and suggests scarcity, it lacks the scientific precision and conservational impact of the original term.

Rizzolo (2023) highlights that different cultures may respond differently to information on animal conservation. According to Małecki et al. (2021), this response involves different attitudes towards endangered species within the affective, cognitive, and behavioral components. In Table 4, the ST clearly conveys an urgent message that these animals are on the brink of

extinction. However, in the TT, the deletion or generalization of terms like "**endangered**" alters the conservation message, creating a false sense of security and potentially undermining conservation efforts. These transformations in the translation, while still maintaining Conviction stories, result in different appealing effects on readers' sense of responsibility and encouraging action.

4.4. Physical and emotional evaluations

Evaluation stories, in which evaluative elements communicate value judgments toward nonhuman animal portrayals through adjectives and adverbial phrases, also reveal instances of translation filters. Notably, these filters occurred in several descriptions of nonhuman animals' physical ability and emotional capacity (see Table 5).

English (ST)	Indonesian (TT)
(1) It is clear that this creature [the Komodo dragon] is **as spectacularly adept** at running as it is at swimming (RCI, 2013, p. 136). →	Tampak jelas bila makhluk ini **mampu** berlari dan juga berenang (RCI, 2013, p. 139).
(2) You won't actually be permitted to touch the orangutans [...] but one look into an orangutan's gaze and this won't matter – your heart will be touched by **these soulful creatures** who share around 97 per cent of their genetic material with humans (TPNP, 2014, p. 139). →	Anda biasanya tak akan diizinkan untuk menyentuh orangutan [...] tapi hati Anda akan tersentuh dengan sorot mata **makhluk** yang berbagi gen 97% dengan manusia (TPNP, 2014, p. 139).

Table 5. Excerpts of physical and emotional evaluations

ST (1) uses the phrase "**spectacularly adept**" to convey a positive Evaluation of the Komodo dragon's physical abilities. The adverb "**spectacularly**" intensifies the description, while "**adept**" highlights the mastery of running and swimming. Moreover, ST (1) uses a parallel structure ("at running as it is at swimming"), emphasizing the Komodo dragon's dual abilities equally. However, these elements are removed in TT (1), resulting in a transformed Evaluation from the exceptional performance into just focusing on the fact that the Komodo dragon "**mampu**" or *able* to perform both activities. A similar deletion was also observed in the evaluation of orangutans. Here, ST (2) used "**soulful**" to convey the orangutans' emotional depth, intelligence, and capacity for empathy. It portrays orangutans not just as sentient beings, but also as creatures with profound emotional lives, suggesting that they also possess a similar Identity as humans. While the core message remains intact, TT (2) deletes this Evaluation of "**soulful**", leading to a more detached understanding of humans and orangutans' shared Identity.

These deletions illustrate how seemingly superficial omissions can reduce the evaluative language present in the ST. While the deletion in excerpt (1) can be attributed to the translator's attempt to overcome challenges in finding equivalent expressions in the target language (Zhulavska, 2022), excerpt (2) could strip away the significance of the emotional capacity of the orangutans. This reduces the TT readers' ability to emotionally connect with them as sentient beings capable of eliciting empathy (Zhdanava et al., 2021). Hanni-Vaara (2022) explains that empathy plays a crucial role in ethical and moral behavior as it involves understanding and sharing the feelings of others. Thus, by minimizing this emotional depth, the translation risks reinforcing the assumptions that "feelings, communicative capacity, and ethics apply only to humans and not to nonhuman animals" (Price, 2019, p. 1).

4.5. Humans and nonhuman animals' conflicts

Distinct patterns were identified in how human-animal relationships are framed across English source texts (ST) and Indonesian target texts (TT). The prominent Framing identified in the corpus was human and nonhuman animal conflict, where translation filters significantly transform the ideological positioning and emotional impact presented in the original texts (see Table 6).

English (ST)	Indonesian (TT)
(1) We left the village shortly after dawn with three rangers **armed** with the long forked staffs that are the only **defense** against **dragon charges** (RCI, 2013, p. 134). →	Kami meninggalkan kampung tak lama setelah subuh bersama tiga orang polisi hutan yang **bersenjata** kayu panjang dengan ujung bercabang sebagai satu-satunya **pertahanan** terhadap **komodo** (RCI, 2013, p. 137).
(2) Guards set up along the perimeter of the park at certain times of year try **to stop** wild elephant herds from **stomping into** their fields and **tearing up** their plants. It's **an uneasy truce** that can easily break into **battle** (WKNP, 2014, p. 120). →	Gardu dan penjaganya yang dibangun di sekililing perbatasan dari Taman Nasional selama beberapa kali dalam setahun dilakukan untuk **mencegah** gajah-gajah liar **memasuki** ladang mereka dan **mencabuti** pohon yang sudah ditanam. **Kesepahaman** antara gajah dan manusia ini **sangat rentan** dan bisa berkembang menjadi **pertikaian** (WKNP, 2014, p. 126).

Table 6. Excerpts of human-animal conflicts

ST (1) creates a high-stakes narrative through conflict vocabulary, including "**armed**", "**defense**", and "**charges**", while using the dramatic term "**dragon**" instead of Komodo dragon to emphasize danger and frame the encounter as a thrilling adventure. While TT (1) faithfully renders "**armed**" with "**bersenjata**" (armed) and "**defense**" with "**pertahanan**" (defense), it deletes the aggressive terminology "**charges**" and uses a generalized species-specific "**komodo**" instead, presenting the encounter as a controlled, routine procedure. This translation choice is particularly significant given the statistical context: only 30 recorded Komodo attack incidents occurred from 1974-2017 (Fajar, 2021). While the source text amplifies the adventure appeal, the target text opts for a more measured portrayal. Meanwhile, ST (2) uses more aggressive vocabulary, such as "**to stop**", "**stomping**", and "**tearing up**"; frames the relationship in militaristic terms, using words like "**uneasy truce**" and "**battle**"; and positions the elephants as deliberate adversaries. However, TT (2) employs more neutral verbs, "**mencegah**" (to prevent), "**memasuki**" (entering), and "**mencabuti**" (plucking); generalizes the incident as "**Kesepahaman**" (mutual understanding); and distorts the conflict as a gradual development with "bisa berkembang menjadi **pertikaian**" (could develop into a dispute), rather than an immediate threat that "can easily break into **battle**" presented in ST (2).

These deletions, distortions, and generalizations from the observed translations reveal a different human and animal conflict Framing that encourages empathy and coexistence while reducing unnecessary fear, threats, or antagonism toward wildlife. However, such transformations also carry potential drawbacks. Understating real dangers and challenges may create unrealistic expectations about human-wildlife interactions and could hamper the development of effective conflict management strategies. Katan (2016) points out that translation is not merely a linguistic process but a form of cultural negotiation. From an ecolinguistics perspective,

translators therefore have a responsibility to reveal ecological realities beyond the confines of the target culture, as their ecological perspectives influence the survival of the ecosystem in a different cultural context (Tekalp, 2021). These transformations demonstrate how translation choices can potentially influence public perception and understanding of the reality of wildlife conservation challenges, potentially affecting both tourism experiences and conservation efforts in protected areas.

4.6. Figurative descriptions

The analysis also identified various Metaphors and figurative expressions depicting nonhuman animals. These variations reflect distinct cultural frameworks and anthropomorphic tendencies in wildlife representation (see Table 7).

English (ST)	Indonesian (TT)
(1) [Author name] sets out to track down **Sumatra's king of the jungle**, and the dedicated conservationists who are **protecting him**. (KNSP, 2014, p. 121)	[Author name] mengikuti jejak kaki **raja hutan Sumatera** ini, dengan ditemani sejumlah ahli konservatorium yang **menjaganya dari sang harimau**. (KNSP, 2014, p. 129)
(2) [the guide] spies a gang of more than 20 proboscis monkeys... **the white behinds** of the males reminiscent of **sumo wrestlers** (TNTP, 2014, p. 131).	[the guide] mengamati sekitar 20 ekor bekantan... **seekor bekantan putih di belakang** para pejantan tampak seperti **pegulat sumo** (TNTP, 2014, p. 135).

Table 7. Excerpts of figurative descriptions

ST (1) uses the Metaphor of "**Sumatra's king of the jungle**" and the masculine pronoun "**him**" to impose human social structures and gender binaries onto wildlife, reflecting a deeply anthropocentric worldview. While TT (1) maintains this hierarchical Metaphor through "**raja hutan**" (king of the forest)— despite tigers often being referenced as mystical and respected elders in Indonesian culture through the honorific term "Datuak" or "Inyiak", meaning grandparents (Muhammad, 2023)—a significant distortion also occurs as the TT renders the description about tigers being protected by conservationists into "**menjaganya dari sang harimau**" (protecting him [the author] from the tiger), recasting the tiger from a protected subject to a potential threat. Similar distortion occurs in the second excerpt. Here, ST (2) employs creative imagery by comparing "**the white behinds**" of male proboscis monkeys to sumo wrestlers' loincloths, creating a vivid and culturally specific Metaphor that draws on Japanese cultural references to describe the distinct coloration of the male proboscis monkeys' body parts. However, TT (2) significantly alters this description by rendering it as "**seekor bekantan putih**" (a white proboscis monkey behind the males), presenting a single white male proboscis monkey within the group who was similar to a sumo wrestler.

It can be seen that the target texts present distorted portrayals of nonhuman animals. Ramli (2019) pointed out such instances as a misinterpretation of lexical choices in the source language. While misinterpretation and inaccuracy are inevitable in translating ecological perspectives (He & Zhang, 2024), Tekalp (2021) argues that translators should not reduce or even mislead the profound ecological force present in the original texts. In this case, despite the anthropomorphic elements of the Metaphor being retained in the target texts, the observed distortions can significantly impact the portrayal of the wildlife, potentially influencing tourists' expectations and understanding of the animals they encounter.

5. Conclusion

This study illuminates the significant role of translation filters (deletion, distortion, and generalization) in transforming the representation of nonhuman animals in English-Indonesian ecotourism articles. Through ecolinguistic stories, the analysis highlights how linguistic transformations often reduce the ecological significance and visibility of nonhuman animals, resulting in representations in the target texts that may prioritize anthropocentric narratives over ecocentric perspectives (Stibbe, 2021). Such shifts in representation have implications for the target text audiences' perceptions, as reduced salience or misrepresentations may impact attitudes towards biodiversity conservation and environmental responsibility fostered by ecotourism (Huynh et al., 2024; Lee et al., 2023; Oktawirani et al., 2019). In this case study, translators could ideally improve the target texts from an ecocentric perspective, as they have more privileged access to Indonesia's biodiversity and ecotourism contexts. Therefore, the study suggests that a more ecocentric approach in translating ecotourism texts is necessary, as translation plays a critical role in promoting accurate and respectful portrayals of the natural world.

Although using a restricted corpus allows for an in-depth case study, it may limit the generalizability to other ecotourism contexts. Furthermore, the study did not incorporate all nine forms of ecolinguistics stories in detail, but focused only on those that present significant challenges from a translation perspective. Based on these limitations of the study, future research could extend these findings by exploring translations on various tourism platforms and with additional language pairs, which may present distinct ecological narratives and cultural translation challenges. Ultimately, this study serves as a call to action for translators, practitioners, and researchers to collaborate in developing and implementing translation practices in ecotourism discourse that prioritize ecological considerations and contribute to a more sustainable future. In this regard, Stibbe (2021) proposes that modern nature writing combines scientific accuracy with vivid sensory details, blending precise scientific language with first-hand experiences. Similarly, Thomsen et al. (2023) suggest approaching topics regarding animal voices more ethically and compassionately, recognizing that language is a fundamental variable in shaping the realities of animal representation.

Acknowledgments

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

6. Primary sources

Eveleigh, M. (2013). Rinca Island. Colours, October 2013, 132–140. https://www.agencyfish.com/Garuda_Colours_Magazine/2013/October/#p=134

Brown, S. (2014). Tanjung Puting. Colours, April 2014, 128–139. https://www.agencyfish.com/Garuda_Colours_Magazine/2014/April/#p=130

Eveleigh, M. (2014). Kerinci Seblat National Park (I. Tanjung, Trans.). Colours, December 2014, 120–132. https://www.agencyfish.com/Garuda_Colours_Magazine/2014/December/#p=122

Mcdonald, H. (2014). Way Kambas. Colours, May 2014, 116–129. https://www.agencyfish.com/Garuda_Colours_Magazine/2014/May/#p=118

Orchard, S. J. (2014). Merauke (Vikaria Lestari, Trans.). Colours, August 2014, 112–121. https://www.agencyfish.com/Garuda_Colours_Magazine/2014/August/#p=114

Richardson, A. (2018). Palangkaraya. Colours, August 2018, 110–118. https://agencyfish.com/Garuda_Colours_Magazine/2018/August/index.html#p=112

Brookes, S. (2019). Sebangau. Colours, March 2019, 98–107. https://www.agencyfish.com/Garuda_Colours_Magazine/2019/March/index.html#p=101

7. Secondary sources

Agorni, M. (2012). Tourism communication: The translator's responsibility in the translation of cultural difference. *PASOS. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, *10*(4), 5–11. https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2012.10.048

Agorni, M. (2018). Cultural representation through translation: An insider-outsider perspective on the translation of tourism promotional discourse. *Altre Modernità*, *20*, 253–275. https://doi.org/10.13130/2035-7680/10843

Amenador, K. B., & Wang, Z. (2023). The image of China as a destination for tourist: Translation strategies of culture-specific items in the Chinese-English food menus. *SAGE Open*, *13*(3), 21582440231196656. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231196656

Awny, N. (2023). An ecolinguistic analysis of the salience of non-human beings in children's literature as represented by Katherine Applegate's Wishtree. *Journal of Languages and Translation*, *10*(4), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.21608/jltmin.2023.323509

Badenes, G., & Coisson, J. (2015). Ecotranslation: A journey into the wild through the road less travelled. *ESJ*, *11*(10), 356–369.

Beusterien, J. (2023). What's in a Name? Animals and Humanities Biogeography. In L. I. Prádanos (Ed.), *A Companion to Spanish Environmental Cultural Studies* (1st ed., pp. 119–124). Boydell and Brewer Limited. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800108677.011

Blair, M. E., Sterling, E. J., & Hurley, M. M. (2011). Taxonomy and conservation of Vietnam's primates: A review. *American Journal of Primatology*, *73*(11), 1093–1106. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.20986

Buonvivere, L. (2023). Lexical innovation in ecotourism discourse: The case of eco(-)lodge. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *13*(7), 105. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v13n7p105

Chakraborty, A. (2019). Does nature matter? Arguing for a biophysical turn in the ecotourism narrative. *Journal of Ecotourism*, *18*(3), 243–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2019.1584201

Cronin, M. (2017). *Eco-translation: Translation and ecology in the age of the anthropocene*. Routledge, an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group.

Dang, T. K. P. (2023). Green nature or green fantasies: Representations of ecotourism in Vietnam. *Sustainability*, *15*(5), 4601. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054601

Diamanti, L. (2022). Eco-translation: Raising ecolinguistic awareness in translation. *mediAzioni*, A184–A198. https://doi.org/10.6092/ISSN.1974-4382/15556

Dilek, N. K., & Dilek, S. E. (2023). Commodification of labor in tourism: Human and non-human animals. In B. Çıvak & E. Bayraktaroğlu (Eds.), *Advances in Hospitality, Tourism, and the Services Industry* (pp. 125–154). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-9255-0.ch006

Durán-Muñoz, I., & Jiménez-Navarro, E. L. (2023). Motion verbs in adventure tourism: A lexico-semantic approach to fictive meaning. *Int. j. Engl. Stud.*, *23*(1), 27–48. https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.532851

Ecolinguistics. (n.d.). IEA. Retrieved October 31, 2024, from https://www.ecolinguistics-association.org

Fajar, J. (2021, January 25). Konflik komodo dengan manusia di Taman Nasional Komodo. Kenapa masih terjadi? [Komodo conflict with humans in Komodo National Park. Why is it still happening?] *Mongabay.co.id*. https://www.mongabay.co.id/2021/01/25/konflik-komodo-dengan-manusia-di-taman-nasional-komodo-kenapa-masih-terjadi/

Fennell, D. A. (2015). *Ecotourism* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Fennell, D. A. (2022). An animal welfare literacy framework for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *96*, 103461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2022.103461

Giampieri, P., & Harper, M. (2022). Tourism translation: From corpus to machine translation (and back). *Umanistica Digitale*, *14*, Article 14. https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2532-8816/15109

Gursky, S. L., Supriatna, J., & Achorn, A. (Eds.). (2022). *Ecotourism and Indonesia's Primates*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-14919-1

Hanni-Vaara, P. (2022). Human or nonhuman agent?: Experiences of empathy in a digital customer tourism journey. In *Empathy and Business Transformation*. Routledge.

Hasmira, M. H., Barlian, E., Frinaldi, A., Dewata, I., Fatimah, S., & Putra, A. (2023). 7 Bottoms towards an ecotourism icon: Environmental communication studies in ecotourism areas. *J. Environ Manag Tour*, *14*(3), 872–882. https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v14.3(67).25

Hastürkoğlu, G. (2020). Transferring ecology-related culture-specific items: A diachronic and quantitative approach. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *18*, Article 18. https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.706463

He, H., & Zhang, W. (2024). Ecological discourse analysis of the English translations of song of Peach Blossom Land from the perspective of transitivity. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *14*(3), 76. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v14n3p76

Huynh, D. V., Duong, L. H., Duong, K. Q., & Nguyen, T. T. (2024). Examining interpretation services and pro-nature conservation behaviours in guided ecotours: Do tour guides and tourists share the same lens? *Journal of Ecotourism*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2024.2366933

Juergens, U. M. (2018). Human and nonhuman animals: Equals in uniqueness. *Animal Sentience*, *3*(23). https://doi.org/10.51291/2377-7478.1378

Katan, D. (2012). Translating the tourist gaze: From heritage and 'culture' to actual encounter. *PASOS. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, *10*(4), 83–95. https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2012.10.055

Katan, D. (2016). Translating for outsider tourists: Cultural informers do it better. *Cultus: The Journal of Intercultural Mediation and Communication*, *2*(9), 63–90.

Katan, D. (2020). Translating tourism. In E. Bielsa & D. Kapsaskis (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Globalization* (1st ed., pp. 337–350). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003121848

Katan, D., & Taibi, M. (2021). *Translating cultures: An introduction for translators, interpreters and mediators* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Kelly, D. (1998). The translation of texts from the tourist sector: Textual conventions, cultural distance and other constraints. *TRANS: Revista de Traductología*, *2*, 33–42. https://doi.org/10.24310/TRANS.1998.v0i2.2354

Khye Ling, S. K., Dagusti, O., Amini, M., & Rabbani, M. (2018). English to Malay translation of culture-specific items in selected Penang tourist brochures. *Studies in Linguistics and Literature*, *3*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.22158/sll.v3n1p1

Kilgarriff, A., Baisa, V., Bušta, J., Jakubíček, M., Kovář, V., Michelfeit, J., Rychlý, P., & Suchomel, V. (2014). The Sketch Engine: Ten years on. *Lexicography*, *1*, 7–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40607-014-0009-9

Kilgarriff, A., Rychlý, P., Smrž, P., & Tugwell, D. (2004). The Sketch Engine. *Proceedings of the 11th EURALEX International Congress*, 105–116.

Lamb, G. (2021). Spectacular sea turtles: Circuits of a wildlife ecotourism discourse in Hawai'i. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *12*(1), 93–121. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2019-0104

Lee, T. H., Jan, F.-H., & Chen, J.-C. (2023). Influence analysis of interpretation services on ecotourism behavior for wildlife tourists. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *31*(5), 1233–1251. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1949016

Li, Q. J., & Ng, Y. (2024). Effective Chinese-to-English biotic interpretation in ecotourism destinations: A corpus-based interdisciplinary study. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2024.2322129

Local Guides. (2017, October 24). *Borneo orangutan tour in Tanjung Puting*. https://www.local-guides.org/indonesia/tanjung-puting/

Lynes, P. (2012). Ecologies of translation, translations of ecologies: Between ecolinguistics and translation studies. *Language & Ecology*, 1–43.

Maci, S. (2019). "The church was built on a basilica plan." Translating and mistranslating Italian churches' panels. *Altre Modernità: Rivista Di Studi Letterari e Culturali*, *21*, 140–157.

MacKenzie, I. (2019). Translatability, interpretation, and construals of experience. *Parallèles*, *31*, 28–41. https://doi.org/10.17462/para.2019.01.04

Małecki, W. P., Weik von Mossner, A., Sorokowski, P., & Frackowiak, T. (2021). Extinction stories matter: The impact of narrative representations of endangered species across media. *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, *30*, 846–864. https://doi.org/10.1093/isle/isab094

Manca, E. (2016). *Persuasion in tourism discourse: Methodologies and models*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Merriam-Webster. (2024, November 6). *Nonhuman*. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nonhuman

Mliless, M., Cherkaoui, D., Azzouzi, L., & Aqachmar, S. (2023). Ecotranslation in Moroccan ecodocumentary interlingual and intralingual pitfalls. In *Proceedings of the Transformations of Meaning and Investments in the Field of Applied Linguistics: The Doha Historical Dictionary of Arabic Language as a Case* (pp. 55–92). School of Arts and Humanities.

Muhammad, F. (2023, March 10). Inyiak, hubungan masyarakat Minangkabau dengan harimau [Inyiak, the relationship between the Minangkabau people and tigers]. *KOMPASIANA*. https://www.kompasiana.com/fadhillmhmd/640a152c4addee293a113f93/inyiak-hubungan-masyarakat-minangkabau-dengan-harimau

Napu, N., & Pakaya, U. (2021). Examining translation problems in indonesian tourism brochures: A case from Gorontalo. *Premise: Journal of English Education*, *10*(1), 65. https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v10i1.3104

Nord, C. (2000). What do we know about the target-text receiver? In A. Beeby, D. Ensinger, & M. Presas (Eds.), *Investigating Translation: Selected papers from the 4th International Congress on Translation, Barcelona, 1998* (pp. 195–212). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.32.24nor

Oktawirani, P., Hsiao, T.-Y., & Kholiq, N. (2019). An interpretation model for turtle conservation: A case study of Sukamade Coastal Area, Meru Betiri National Park, Indonesia. *Revista Turismo & Desenvolvimento*, *31*, Article 31. https://doi.org/10.34624/rtd.v0i31.8105

Poole, R. (2022). *Corpus-assisted ecolinguistics*. Bloomsbury Academic. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350138582

Price, C. (2019). Human and nonhuman animals: Towards equality. *Animal Sentience*, *3*(23). https://doi.org/10.51291/2377-7478.1414

Ramírez, F., & Santana, J. (2019). *Environmental education and ecotourism*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01968-6

Ramli, R. (2019). Lexical distortion: A study on Indonesian-English translation. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, *5*(1), 11. https://doi.org/10.24252/Eternal.V51.2019.A2

Rizzolo, J. B. (2023). Wildlife tourism and consumption. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *31*(5), 1181–1194. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1957903

Samal, R., & Dash, M. (2023). Ecotourism, biodiversity conservation and livelihoods: Understanding the convergence and divergence. *International Journal of Geoheritage and Parks*, *11*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgeop.2022.11.001

Schultz, R. (2016). Killer conservation: The implications of disease on gorilla conservation. *BioRisk*, *11*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3897/biorisk.11.9941

Scott, C. (2023). The ecological force and function of literary translation. *The Translator*, *29*(4), 421–434. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2023.2283972

Shannon, G., Larson, C. L., Reed, S. E., Crooks, K. R., & Angeloni, L. M. (2017). Ecological consequences of ecotourism for wildlife populations and communities. In D. T. Blumstein, B. Geffroy, D. S. M. Samia, & E. Bessa (Eds.), *Ecotourism's Promise and Peril* (pp. 29–46). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58331-0_3

Stibbe, A. (2005). Counter-discourses and the relationship between humans and other animals. *Anthrozoös*, *18*(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.2752/089279305785594289

Stibbe, A. (2014). An ecolinguistic approach to critical discourse studies. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *11*(1), 117–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2013.845789

Stibbe, A. (2021). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Sulaiman, M. Z., & Wilson, R. (2018). Translating adventure tourism: From action to relaxation. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *18*(3), 1–16. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2018-1803-01

Sulaiman, M. Z., & Wilson, R. (2019). *Translation and tourism: Strategies for effective cross-cultural promotion*. Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6343-6

Tekalp, S. (2021). Ecocriticism and translation: A descriptive study on Elif Shafak's Bit Palas. *Çeviribilim ve Uygulamaları Dergisi*, *2021*(30), Article 30. https://doi.org/10.37599/ceviri.903813

Thomsen, A. M., Borrie, W. T., Miller, K. K., & Cardilini, A. P. A. (2023). Listen to Us: Perceptions of Animal Voice and Agency. *Animals*, *13*(20), 3271. https://doi.org/10.3390/ani13203271

Togaev, B., & Paluanova, K. (2021). Types of tourism and translation of some words related to tourism. *Общество и Инновации*, *2*(4/S), Article 4/S. https://doi.org/10/gs9hkp

Turzynski-Azimi, A. (2021). Constructing the image of Japan as a tourist destination: Translation procedures for culture-specific items. *Perspectives*, *29*(3), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2020.1758734

Valero Garcés, C. (2017). Ecocriticism and translation. *ODISEA. Revista de Estudios Ingleses*, *12*, Article 12. https://doi.org/10.25115/odisea.v0i12.333

Veselica Majhut, S. (2021). Did you try our good smoked ham? Assessing the quality of translation as cross-cultural mediation on Croatian tourist board websites. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, *18*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.18.1.151-167

You, C. (2022). Who speaks for nature? Genre, gender and the eco-translation of chinese wild animals. *Children's Literature in Education*, *55*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10583-022-09484-x

You, C. (2024). Re-engendering the genre: Critical anthropomorphism in the eco-translation of Chinese wild animal stories. In *Translation Studies and Ecology*. Routledge.

Zhao, M., & Geng, J. (2024). What can translation do for the endangered earth? – An overview of ecocritical translation studies. *Trames. Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, *28*(1), 37. https://doi.org/10.3176/tr.2024.1.03

Zhdanava, A., Kaur, S., & Rajandran, K. (2021). Representing nonhuman animals as equals: An ecolinguistic analysis of vegan campaigns. *Journal of World Languages*, *7*, 26–57. https://doi.org/10.1515/jwl-2021-0003

Zhulavska, O. (2022). Removal and omission of fiction synesthetic metaphors in English-Ukrainian translation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *12*(5), Article 5. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1205.02

Aditya A. Soeta Bangsa
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
Jl. Colombo, No. 1
55281, Special Region of Yogyakarta
Indonesia
adityaalam0@gmail.com

Biography: Aditya A. Soeta Bangsa graduated with a Bachelor's degree in English Language and Education in 2021 from Universitas Lambung Mangkurat in Banjarmasin, South Kalimantan, Indonesia. He also holds a Master's Degree in Applied Linguistics with a specialization in Translation Studies from Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia. His research interests focus on tourism translation, including ecotourism discourse translation and cultural tourism translation.

Wening Sahayu
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
Jl. Colombo, No. 1
55281, Special Region of Yogyakarta
Indonesia
weningsahayu@uny.ac.id

Biography: Wening Sahayu pursued studies in the field of Social and Humanities at Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Since 1987, she has been working as a lecturer at Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta. Language and culture are among the themes she is interested in researching, including topics such as naming culture, gender, and ecology. She has also co-authored several articles on ecology, particularly those related to textbooks, with her team.

Ingrid A. Gavilan Tatin
Independent Researcher
Tegualda s/n
4780000 Temuco, La Araucanía
Chile
igavilantatin@gmail.com

Biography: Ingrid A. Gavilan Tatin is a graduate in Translation from Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile, and Applied Linguistics from Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Her research explores how language shapes environmental awareness, focusing on ecolinguistics, translation, and education. As a translator and language educator, she aims to inspire eco-consciousness and sustainable actions by fostering meaningful conversations and promoting environmental responsibility through language.