AL-AASAR Journal
Quarterly *Research Journal*
www.al-aasar.com

Vol. 2, No. 4 (2025)
Online ISSN: 3006-693X

Print ISSN:3006-6921

ECO-LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF G7 COMMUNIQUÉS (2020-2023): A TRANSITIVITY-BASED STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY DISCOURSE

Qurat Ul Ain Khan
MPhil, Dept. of Applied Linguistics, GC University, Faisalabad, Pakistan.
Email: kquratulain57@gmail.com
Dr. Muhammad Javed Iqbal
(Corresponding Author)
Lecturer, Centre for Languages and Translation Studies, University of Gujrat, Pakistan.
Email: dr.javediqbal188@gmail.com
Dr. Hafiz Muhammad Qasim
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Applied Linguistics, GC University, Faisalabad, Pakistan.
Email: muhammadqasim@gcuf.edu.pk

Abstract
This research analyzes linguistic formats in G7 communiques from 2020 to 2023 through the lens of the Systemic Functional Linguistics framework, emphasizing material processes and mental processes, and relational processes. The study demonstrates how language patterns have evolved since the beginning of the analysis period. The 2020 and 2021 communiqués mainly utilized destructive language to stress obstacles and difficulties at the expense of constructive environmental initiatives. The 2022 and 2023 communiqué documents displayed a different outlook toward environmental concerns through their focus on commitments along with pledges and collaborative initiatives to address these issues. The research investigation uses qualitative along quantitative methods to analyze the distribution and situational employment of different linguistic processes. Statistical data reveal that G7 nations are using more optimistic and action-oriented expressions when discussing their environmental responsibilities. This indicates a growing change in their environmental attitude. Language maintains a vital position in creating policy stories while it determines how public audiences understand them. The study recommends educating stakeholders while promoting positive wording and raising public environmental consciousness to develop effective environmental dialogue. This analysis demonstrates through ecolinguistic methods that environmental communication depends heavily on linguistic decision-making. The research demands additional investigation to develop effective language strategies that can streamline policy creation along with its execution.

Keywords*: Eco-linguistics, G7 communiqués, Environmental policies, Systemic Functional Linguistics, Hallidayan perspective*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Fascination with climate change, global warming, and conservation has caused environmental communication to become a field of interest. The Group of Seven (G7) communiqués are a critical space of discourse for the leading economies to position their environmental policy stances. This study aims to analyze the eco-linguistic aspects of G7

communiques (2020–2023) by combining Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Stibbe's (2015) eco-linguistic framework. According to Stibbe (2015), Eco-linguistics studies how language frames, advances, and amplifies ecological talks affecting environmental ways of communication and environmental policies.

Based on Khan (2024) this study, through Halliday's SFL, seeks to understand environmental governance through the G7 discourse using a threefold framework: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. This research studies how language in G7 communiqués rhetorically constructs environmental realities, engages in international cooperation, and shapes ecology in policy discourse. The analysis is situated within broader global events, and focused on the heightened attention of climate emergencies and the global pandemic, COVID-19.

1.2 Why Eco-Linguistics?

It is eco-linguistics that merges language, ideology, and environmental sustainability (Stibbe, 2015). According to scholars such as Haugen (1971) and Halliday (1992), language is also seen to play a role in constituting an ecological perspective, and Halliday criticizes the anthropocentric discourses. Trampe (2006) points out the historical dissonance between linguistics and environmental problems and claims that linguistic approaches need to be employed to spot ecological count. On the one hand, Steffensen and Fill (2014) say that Eco-linguistics serves to reorient linguistics towards environmental worries that are real, and on the other, Kravchenko (2020) is downplaying this claim by stating that Eco-linguistics turns the grammar into a science of life.

It is particularly appropriate for analyzing the G7 communiqués because Stibbe's (2015) framework separates between discourses that support or undermine ecological sustainability. It shows how metaphors, framing, and word use can distort public views of environmental issues. Secondly, the model also reflects Halliday's SFL, especially in the analysis of transitivity to look at agency and responsibility in environmental discourse.

1.3 Why the Hallidayan Perspective?

That said, Halliday's (1992) systemic functional linguistics, particularly transitivity analysis, is used to decode how G7 communiqués construct environmental narratives. Thus, transitivity analysis uncovers linguistic patterns that construct the problems of the environment through the identification of agency and the distribution of responsibility. The G7's policy-making power means that these communiqués are worth analyzing, and they reveal how language either reinforces or challenges environmental commitments.

This research furthers knowledge of how language affects the formulation of environmental policies at the highest levels (supranational governance. It also employs Halliday's SFL and Stibbe's eco-linguistics in order to shed light on how linguistic choices shape environmental discourse, advocacy, and policymaking.

1.4 Why G7 Communiqués?

The United States, Japan, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom form the G7, an organization that has a significant impact on the economy as well as politics. Key documents and their communiqués are shared policies and commitments on global issues about environmental sustainability. They influence discussions in the major global forums (i.e., UN, G20), and policies are shaped by international practices. Analyzing them tells us about the trends of global environmental policy as major powers coordinate or diverge on high-priority issues.

Environmental governance in the G7 goes beyond the scope of the influence on regulations, technologies, and market trends. It is because of understanding the language in these communiqués that we can use the communiqués to assess their role in the shaping of global environmental discourse. Because crises like the COVID-19 pandemic have interfered with environmental policy priorities, particularly in the years 2020–2023, they are especially important. By studying communiqués from this period, we see shifts in discourse and a change in policy commitments. Secondly, the language of the G7 reflects standards that many other nations then follow, and so analyzing the language of the G7 provides a benchmark for assessing global environmental policies.

1.5 Purpose of the Study

By means of the analysis of transitivity, this study addresses the ideological stance and language patterns in G7 communiqués from 2020 to 2023 to see how language shapes environmental policy. The research analyzes policy representation in terms of agency, action, and reci-pient roles and explains how choices in language can affect them. The study further considers how transitivity patterns shape public perception and frame policy issues in the rhetorical strategies used to promote environmental initiatives.

The research also seeks to uncover how ideology is infused in the G7 communique's environmental governance discourse. The role of language in shaping policy narratives, shaping public opinion, and governing policy discussions is examined. This study contributes to eco-linguistics and environmental discourse analysis by identifying discourse types, ideological structures and linguistic features, and provides practical insights for policymakers, environmentalists, and researchers.

1.6 Research Gap

Language in G7 Communiqués and Environmental Discourse has been an area of existing research concerning the use of language in policy documents, but it does not include a comprehensive transitivity analysis. There have been some studies on the ideological framing of foreign policy discourse, but few of them deal with environmental policy specifically in terms of how the G7 communiqué language constructs it. The important thing to know about these documents is the ideological underpinnings that render them a useful tool for the analysis of global geo-governance.

Rhetorical studies of international policy discourse have also considered the deployment of rhetorical strategies, yet comparatively, hardly any research has been conducted on the relationship between ideology and types of discourse in G7 environmental statements. Focusing on the strategic use of language to shape perceptions and environmental governance priorities will help us understand the role discourse plays in building power to shape policy priorities. This will yield more nuanced perspectives of the linguistic and ideological structures within G7 communiqués, within which to address these gaps.

1.7 Objectives

The current research's objective is to,

1. Identify the transitivity patterns in G7 communiqués.
2. Analyze the transitivity patterns in G7 communiqués, providing a structured approach to understanding the linguistic construction of environmental discourse.
3. Explicate the constructs of ideology in G7 communiqués

4. Identify discourse type in G7 communiqués with a particular emphasis on uncovering how linguistic choices affect the way environmental policies are constructed and communicated.

1.9 Research Questions

1. What transitivity patterns are utilized in G7 communiqués (2020-2023)?
2. To what extent is the portrayal of environmental policies influenced by the employed transitivity choices?
3. How are the constructs of ideology employed in G7 communiqués to shape perceptions and decisions related to global environmental policies?
4. How does ideology contribute to the identification and understanding of discourse patterns within G7 communiqués concerning environmental policies?

1.10 Significance of the Research

Regarding academic as well as practical importance, this research matters in linguistics, environmental policy, and international relations. It uses Halliday's systemic functional linguistics to examine how language creates environmental discourse in the G7 context at the global policy level.

The study extends the field of eco-linguistics in an academic contribution that investigates transitivity patterns in G7 communiqués and marks out how language constructs environmental realities. The contribution values the notion of uncovering ideological structures sealed in policy discourse.

The results may practically aid policymakers in improving communication strategies in line with sustainability objectives. These insights can be used to critique and influence policy narratives by environmental advocates and to better understand how language plays a role in building international cooperation among diplomats.

This research also serves to raise public awareness of how language impacts environmental perception, and indeed, with this, to enable citizens to speak on sustainability discourse. Therefore, it serves as a novel source for environmental communication insights for scholars, policymakers, and activists, helping to deliver better environmental communication and advocacy.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Language

Language is a complex and changing system of communication of ideas, emotions, and cultural identity. It changes with cultural, social, and historical changes, and it borrows from other languages, adding to it what it acquires from other languages. Scientific, or linguistic, study of language, including its structure, meaning, and cognitive underpinnings, makes use of the methodological perspectives of psychology, ethnography, and artificial intelligence. In literature, music, and drama, as well as every day, language is not only a means of communication, but also a means of artistic expression. Additionally, it significantly contributes to one's cognition, perception, and problem-solving abilities. Language is a very crucial element of our interaction with one another, especially as we are approaching a human society in which human beings are communicating in multiple languages all over the globe.

2.2 The Role of Language in Climate Change

Eco-linguistics studies how language affects environmental discourse, and sometimes focuses on how language impedes or aids in ecological awareness. Sapir and Whorf argued for

linguistic relativity theories, and Halliday (1992) claimed that some grammatical structures restrict us from perceiving Earth as a living being, echoing this. Scholars like Goatly (1996) and Chawla (2001) argue that English grammar separates actors from affected participants, making it difficult to see the whole picture of the ecological damage when it comes to environmental degradation (e.g., how consumer choice contributes to that damage). Mühlhäusler (2001) goes further in critiquing standard average European (SAE) languages, which he says do not encapsulate ecological interconnectivity.

To overcome these, some suggest changing terminology. For instance, Kemmerer (2006) proposes "animal" in place of "animal," to underline both the human biological relationship with other species. Schultz (2001) suggests that phrases such as "clearing" of land for deforestation should change to more specific terms such as "native vegetation removal." However, as noted by a few critics, such as Blackwell (2002), these linguistic interventions may be excessive, but certainly, they provide a way in which language may influence environmental consciousness.

Language also does a lot in climate change communication. According to Penz (2017), organizations use language to obscure environmental exploitation, while Fill and Penz (2017) advocate the use of language to bring the issues surrounding climate into the public eye. As with climate-related language, Nerlich et al. (2010) note that politicians often use climate-related language strategically to gain public support. This study finds that metaphors, narratives, and framing can influence public perception of climate policies.

2.3 Language in the Political Realm

Language also influences political discourse, shaping the public perception and policymaking. Martin (2021) emphasizes the association between social, ecological, and political phenomena by acknowledging the human dependency on ecosystems in their environmental issues. The argument, made by Chilton (2004), stresses that political actors come to see all politics as based around discourse, and that there is tremendous value in using language.

Girnth (2015) indicates that 'the political lexicon,' which is a specialized vocabulary about political language, is shared with the terminology from other social science subjects. The political discourse of language can be strategically used to shape society's attitude and direction of the policy, thereby making it an important area of research in eco-linguistics and discourse analysis.

Human identity, cognition, and communication are all dependent on language, which is a fundamental aspect of human identity. It also acts beyond daily interactions into an arena that includes the expression of art, discourse on the environment, and political rhetoric. Linguistic structures and terminology regarding atmospheric change affect the way that environmental problems are perceived and treated. Altering language can't avert the earth's problems — but the knowledge they have on the language's power should encourage more sustainable attitudes and practices.

2.4 Eco-linguistics

Haugen (1971) conceived of this as eco-linguistics, the study of the relationship between language and its environment; a relationship, according to Haugen, which may exist between an individual, a social process, and the natural world (LeVasseur, 2015). Central, in fact, to the coherence between language and these factors themselves is this relationship, the language whereby one thing affects and is affected by another, this relationship in which language is both shaped and shapes these factors. Halliday's (Khan & Mustafa 2023) work delineated a bridge

between linguistic and environmental concerns, which has had a maximal impact on making accommodations for the new foray in the field.

As a major contributor to eco-linguistics, Stibbe defines it as the study of how language affects the relationship of humans with species and the physical environment (Alexander & Stibbe, 2014). According to Stibbe (2015), there are three types of discourse, namely, beneficiary (such as nature poetry), destructive and ambivalent. It extends past the study of environmental texts and instead calls for an ecological appraisal of all the discourses (Wu, 2018).

According to Furnaz (2023), as what say Dash (2019: cited in Furnaz, 2023) eco-linguistics deal with environmental sustainability and have an ecological view, to create linguistic theories that are ecologically oriented with people and societies and ecosystems seen as one system, thereby considered as one entity.

2.5 Eco-linguistics and "Stories We Live By"

Eco-linguistics also deals with how language ideologies influence the values and perceptions of the environment. Ma and Stibbe (2022), the authors argue that society's industrialization and growth model is not sustainable, and we need to work toward changing 'the stories we live by,' that is, the stories in which we live our lives, which shape our values and behavior. Their tales are spread in language and shape how we understand the world around us as it relates to our relationship with the environment. Such a change in these narratives is important for creating a more ecologically conscious society (Klein, 2015).

The concept of "stories we live by" was developed by Stibbe (2015), which are cognitive structures serving to shape thought, speech, and behavior. The goal of eco-linguists is to make visible ecologically harmful discourses and promote sustainable ways of thinking. Similarly, this is from the socio-cognitive point of view, which is focused on how discourse influences society's mental representations and language as the extension of the environment (van Dijk, 2017).

2.6 Transitivity

Transitivity is central to the consideration of how speakers and writers represent their experiences at the level of grammar in a system that is a framework of the Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). SFG differs from the traditional view of transitivity in that, while transitivity does traditionally consist of whether a verb requires an object, in SFG, transitivity is related to experiential function, that is, how events and processes are communicated. Transitivity in this context looks at how the representation of experience through these grammatical choices, who participates (participant), and what the process involves (process), through which it takes place (Halliday, 1976 & 1985; as cited in Qasim, 2019). Transitivity analysis was primarily concerned with the participants, processes, and circumstances relationship to find out how the language structure represents reality and how the language structure influences the perspective (Fairclough, 1992).

In labeling participants in events, transitivity is crucial to distinguishing between mental processes (such as thinking or wishing) and physical actions (such as kicking or running) (Thompson, 2013). Using transitivity analysis on these elements of clauses allows us to bring to the surface the social, cultural, and ideological forces at work in the utterance (Bloor & Bloor, 2013). This is in line with understanding that language not only reproduces reality but also constructs and portrays it. For this reason, a detailed analysis of the language at the level of the clause, in which the Subject, Predicator, and Complement are taken into account, is enough to

understand how the events and relationships are presented (Babaii and Ansary, 2005). They further enhance the understanding of the clause structures (Halliday, 1985, as cited in Qasim, 2019) by identifying these groups as transitivity and relativity systems.

Transitivity categories are six: material, mental, relational, behavioral, verbal, and existential (Martin et al., 1997). But they are foundations upon which to understand how language can express varied types of experiences. Another one among them is Material processes, which focus on what the physical action or change does and includes 'actors' and 'goal'. A sensor and phenomenon are involved in mental processes that concern cognitive or emotional states. A relational process is an attribute or relationship between entities, e.g., a Carrier and an Attribute. Involuntary actions, i.e., behavioral processes, are being referred to, while verbal processes are associated with the sayer and message. By contrast, on the level of existential processes, the existence or occurrence of something is underlined, often at the expense of a dummy subject, as in there. Such categorization of processes allows linguists to study different types of experiences and meanings that are reflected in the linguistic processes.

In transitivity analysis, the study of these process types allows an understanding of how the language represents reality. Researchers categorize and analyze processes, participants, and circumstances, and find patterns in how people describe various experiences and events. Thus, this systematic approach offers valuable hints about how language figures order up and explicate human experience, and how the ideological and social contexts are woven into language use. Analysis of transitivity can be used by researchers to enrich their examination of how linguistic structures are implicated in meaning-making and respond to the perceptions, values, and influence of power in communication.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1 Type of Research

The research study uses the mixed-method research design, which offers a detailed analysis of the G7 communiqués through analytical and categorical analyses. Whereas, in a brief sense, qualitative research explores the descriptive analysis of these data, the quantitative analysis gives out frequency indices and statistically significant results.

3.2 Data Collection

As a purposeful sampling procedure, relevance and accuracy are valued; therefore, only documents closely related to the study subject, which is G7 environmental policies, are selected. Ethical issues are met by acquiring data only from official G7 websites to guarantee the data's authenticity and adherence to certain norms and standards.

3.3 Central Approach

This eco-linguistic study will examine the G7 communiqués from 2020 to 2023 using Halliday's Transitivity System in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). According to Stibbe (2015), those who are interested in examining environmental and ecological discourse may be able to use linguistic frameworks to analyze the data. These frameworks may include examining the vocabulary, word relationships, grammatical structures, intertextuality, and transitivity.

3.4 Instrument

The UAM corpus tool used in this study was the 3.3 version. In the current research, the name transitivity strategy was derived from the built-in strategy developed by computational linguist Mick O'Donnell in 2009. The processes of text segmentation and annotation were

supported by the use of UAM. Text mining encompasses such elements as text encoding, tagging schemes, text processing, and text analysis, among others.

4. RESULTS & DISCUSSION

4.1 Results

Text is a matrix of 18,626 items, which could be as small as parts of a sentence, clauses, or as large as a full sentence. The text comprises a total of 149,554 tokens. Tokens are collections of characters separated by whitespace or punctuation, which can comprise words, numbers, and punctuation marks. 139,274 of these tokens are words, while the rest are punctuation or other non-word features. As shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1

General Statistics of the Dataset

Length:	
- Number of segments:	18626
- Tokens in segments:	149554
- Words in segments:	139274
Text Complexity:	
- Av. Word Length:	5.78
- Av. Segment Length:	7.48
- Min. Segment Length:	1
- Max. Segment Length:	55
Lexical Density:	
- Lexemes per segment:	4.61
- Lexemes % of text:	61.63%
Subjectivity:	
- Subjective Positivity:	0.396
- Subjective Strength:	0.168
Reference Density:	
- 1p Reference:	3.10%
- 2p Reference:	0.00%
- 3p Reference:	0.69%

Text complexity is measured with an average word length of 5.78 and an average segment length of 7.48. The lexical density was 61.63%. This indicates a high level of information content, suggesting the communicative nature of the G7 texts is formal, technical, and policy-oriented. and subjective positivity was 0.396. Statistics for each file show an increase in segments, tokens, and words from 2020 to 2023. Subjective strength increased over the years. Reference density showed a decrease in first-person references and a slight increase in third-person references.

AL-AASAR Journal
Quarterly *Research Journal*
www.al-aasar.com

Vol. 2, No. 4 (2025)
Online ISSN: 3006-693X

Print ISSN:3006-6921

The statistical examination of the transitivity characteristics in the dataset yields precise information about the types and frequency of grammatical components and processes involved. Table 4.3, which follows.

Table 4.3

Coding of Each File

	Texts/G-7_2020.txt		Texts/G-7_2021.txt		Texts/G-7_2022.txt		Texts/G-7_2023.txt	
Feature	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
GRAMMATICAL-RANK	N=412		N=5748		N=5134		N=7341	
Participant	108	26.21%	1353	23.54%	1191	23.20%	1758	23.95%
Process	115	27.91%	1475	25.66%	1307	25.46%	1848	25.17%
Circumstance	58	14.08%	896	15.59%	906	17.65%	1187	16.17%
Configuration	105	25.49%	1402	24.39%	1247	24.29%	1781	24.26%
CLAUSE-TYPE	N=412		N=5748		N=5134		N=7341	
Material	92	22.33%	1156	20.11%	1062	20.69%	1537	20.94%
Mental	4	0.97%	63	1.10%	37	0.72%	81	1.10%
Verbal	5	1.21%	45	0.78%	47	0.92%	82	1.12%
Relational	4	0.97%	42	0.73%	36	0.70%	43	0.59%
Modal	0	0.00%	25	0.43%	5	0.10%	9	0.12%
Existential	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	0.06%	3	0.04%
MATERIAL-TYPE	N=412		N=5748		N=5134		N=7341	
Intransitive	13	3.16%	156	2.71%	140	2.73%	212	2.89%
Monotransitive	67	16.26%	851	14.81%	788	15.35%	1157	15.76%
Ergative	11	2.67%	113	1.97%	116	2.26%	129	1.76%
Ditransitive	1	0.24%	36	0.63%	18	0.35%	39	0.53%
MENTAL-TYPE2	N=412		N=5748		N=5134		N=7341	
mental-active	3	0.73%	52	0.90%	26	0.51%	60	0.82%
mental-passive	1	0.24%	11	0.19%	11	0.21%	21	0.29%
VERBAL-TYPE	N=412		N=5748		N=5134		N=7341	
VERBAL-TYPE2	N=412		N=5748		N=5134		N=7341	
verbal-active	4	0.97%	40	0.70%	42	0.82%	79	1.08%
verbal-passive	1	0.24%	5	0.09%	5	0.10%	3	0.04%
RELATIONAL-TYPE	N=412		N=5748		N=5134		N=7341	
Attributive	4	0.97%	38	0.66%	32	0.62%	39	0.53%
Circumstantial	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%

Possessive	0	0.00%	4	0.07%	4	0.08%	4	0.05%

The present analysis of the G-7 texts of the years 2020 to 2023 shows a preponderance of material processes, especially the mono-transitive ones, indicating a focus on verbs of action and happening to objects. Significantly fewer of them are mental and verbal; two of these types' subcategories are completely missing, which demonstrates a lower utilization of thinking and speaking actions. The last one is a relational process, which is the rarest one included in the framework and is usually expressed by attributive clauses that connect participants with certain qualities. The grammatical patterns remain fairly consistent across the four years, with a gradual increase in the average word and segment length and lexical density.

The transitivity analysis shows the G7 communiqués focusing on actions and outcomes. The discussion addresses how transitivity choices affect the representation of environmental policy, with participants, processes, and circumstances used to assign roles, responsibilities, and context. The G7 is shown to frame its role in addressing environmental issues, using material processes to highlight actions and commitments. It also explains how transitivity choices contribute to a strategic representation of the G7's leadership. The analysis reveals how economic and environmental objectives are integrated within the communiqués. The 2020 communiqué focuses on economic growth, whereas the 2021 communiqué emphasizes sustainable development. The 2022 communique shows active engagement by the G7. The analysis of the 2023 communiqué emphasizes positive actions for environmental preservation.

4.2 Discussion

The research uses transitivity analysis to study how G7 communiqués from 2020 to 2023 describe actions along with obligations and contextual circumstances. The research conducts quantitative, structural, and clausal analysis of process patterns to show how G7 officials use these patterns to communicate environmental policies through official documents.

Results show uniform distribution among participants and processes, and circumstances and material processes represent the most significant category between 20% to 22%. The G7 demonstrates a commitment to specific, measurable action and outcome methods due to its policy-oriented nature. The majority of material processes contain single-transitive clauses, which represent between 14% and 16% of the total clauses, while highlighting straightforward purposeful actions. The communiqués display an overall low occurrence of mental and verbal, along with relational processes, because they prioritize formal and action-based communication.

Text complexity evolves through extensive segments, denser lexical choices, and additional informative content throughout the four years. The data shows an adjustment to address expanding global obstacles as well as improvements in G7 communication methods.

The examination demonstrates how politicians use different transitivity choices to establish how societies view their environmental policy commitment and their responsibilities in this domain. The grammatical elements representing participants who are usually governments or international organizations make up 23% to 26% of the total and maintain clarity about responsibility. The study indicates material processes constitute between twenty-five and twenty-eight percent of the text by focusing on measurable actions, including greenhouse gas reduction efforts, combined with biodiversity defense initiatives and clean power system transformation. The

provision of contextual details through circumstances amounts to 14% to 17% of the text base yet supports transparency and public understanding.

The research demonstrates how the G7 uses language strategically to preserve its position as the leading organization in global environmental management. Through the prominence of material processes alongside clear participant identification, the G7 exhibits dedication to implementable policies, along with the growing sophistication of its communique, demonstrating its advanced engagement with worldwide matters. Through these particular language choices, the G7 establishes itself as a genuine actor in tackling climate change and sustainability problems while increasing the impact of its environmental statements.

Environmental and economic policies are undergoing transformation based on the content found in G7 communiqués from 2020 to 2023. The 2020 communiqué demonstrates that environmental protection is ties to economic stability through financial instruments that the private sector can use to achieve stability. The text uses transitivity analysis to focus on economic action terms ("mobilize," "support," and "coordinate") to illustrate environmental preservation methods that drive economic growth. The 2020 document does not explicitly mention climate change while omitting direct environmental sustainability points, but it prioritizes economic growth as its central goal.

The 2021 communiqué combines a "green and resilient future" message with environmental policies that follow economics-driven and technology-oriented standards. According to Stibbe's (2015) model, the G7 uses destructive patterns that value monetary instruments over actual environmental execution. The document shows a preference for economic matters through its substitution of "mobilize," and "invest" and "leverage" over well-defined environmental regulations. The subject (G7 nations) is pledging to take actions that are associated with a green transition and reversal of biodiversity loss. However, the specific actions are quite general and are usually connected to economic theories. This corroborates Fernández-Vázquez's (2021) observation that the enactment of technical solutions preserves economic stakes. What the G7 communiqués suggest is that environmental sustainability is achievable by economic and technological growth and by integrating ecological policy into an economic framework. The techno-centric approach often underlines the secondary ways of contributing to environmental enhancement, which can overshadow the primary ecological results. The discourse of the communique often tends to focus on economic development and stability at the cost of the environment, which is a representation of the major players' concerns. It conforms to Alexander's (2017) study, where it was observed that language is used to maintain the power structure and exclude radical environmental activism.

A combination of material processes in the 2022 communiqué helps the G7 assume its position as a prominent driver of global climate initiatives through its adoption of language elements, which include "commit," "highlight," and "support." Note-taking and adverse effect recognition serve as cognitive and relational processes to develop environmental awareness for the G7. The document bases its policy framework on economics but connects sustainability objectives to modern technology and financial prosperity to demonstrate an operational mechanism that protects biodiversity as it facilitates economic growth.

The G7 Hiroshima Leaders' Communiqué of 2023 presents environmental sustainability through direct action verbs like "conserve," "protect," "restore," "reverse," and "combat." In this

discourse, the authors promote an inclusive approach by using collective pronouns together with language that supports vulnerable groups. The communiqué includes references to Paris Agreement terms as well as establishes concrete targets, like an aim to lower worldwide greenhouse gas emissions by 43% through 2030.

The 2023 communiqué implements transitivity methods to uphold Stibbe's (2015) beneficial discourse model that focuses on environmental sustainability and ecological improvement. The embedded actions in material processes function as commitments, although mental and relational processes display active awareness together with intentional actions. International teamwork receives promotion through verbal discourse since it requires worldwide participation in climate change initiatives.

The G7 communiques have evolved to shift their focus from pure economic interest to both economic development and environmental sustainability goals for international economic policies. The original financial documents have developed into subsequent communiques that protect the combination of economic methods with environmental regulations.

5. Conclusion

The research shows that language complexity has increased because environmental policies have developed more complex approaches over the years. Economic growth emerges as the primary concern throughout the 2020 and 2021 communiqués, since environmental risks exist, while the 2022 and 2023 statements show proactive environmental strategies that align with beneficial discourse principles. A proposed solution implements material processes to clarify actions, combines mental and relational processes to connect policy goals, establishes continuous economic-environmental alignment, together with more accessible language, and counteracts misinformation attacks. The environmental policies of the G7 group will demonstrate better results when member countries enhance their shared work approaches alongside improved transparency measures.

References

Alexander, R. J. (2017). Investigating texts about environmental degradation using critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistic techniques. In *The Routledge Handbook of Eco-Linguistics* (pp. 196-210). Routledge.

Alexander, R., & Stibbe, A. (2014). From the analysis of ecological discourse to the ecological analysis of discourse. *Language Sciences*, *41*, 104-110.

Babaii, E., & Ansary, H. (2005). On the effect of disciplinary variation on transitivity: The case of academic book reviews. *Asian EFL journal*, *7*(3), 113-126.

Blackwell, S. (2002). Linguists and other animals. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *6*(4), 589-597.

Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2013). *The functional analysis of English: A Hallidayan approach*. Routledge.

Chawla, S. (2001). Linguistic and philosophical roots of our environmental crisis. *The eco-linguistics reader. Language, ecology and environment*, 115-23.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and social change. *(No Title)*.

Fernández-Vázquez, J. S. (2021). Analysing the environmental websites of the world's greatest polluters: a multimodal eco-linguistic approach. *Economic research-Ekonomska istraživanja*, *34*(1), 2692-2711.

Fill, A. F., & Penz, H. (2017). Eco-linguistics in the 21st century: New orientations and future directions. In *The Routledge Handbook of Eco-Linguistics* (pp. 437-443). Routledge.

Furnaz, R. (2023). Transitivity Analysis of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of United Nations (UN). *UCP Journal of Languages & Literature*, *1*(1), 43-73.

G7 Communiqué (2020). G7 leaders' statement, March 16, 2020. https://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/files/100021631.pdf

G7 Communiqué (2021). Our shared agenda for global action to build back better. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/50361/carbis-bay-g7-summit-communique.pdf

G7 Communiqué (2022). G7 leaders' communiqué. https://www.g7germany.de/resource/blob/974430/2062292/fbdb2c7e996205aee402386aae057c5e/2022-07-14-leaders-communique-data.pdf

G7 Communiqué (2023). G7 hiroshima leaders' communiqué. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/64497/g7-2023-hiroshima-leaders-communiqué.pdf

Girnth, H. (2015). *Sprache und Sprachverwendung in der Politik: eine Einführung in die linguistische Analyse öffentlich-politischer Kommunikation* (Vol. 39). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Goatly, A. (1996). Green grammar and grammatical metaphor, or language and the myth of power, or metaphors we die by. *Journal of pragmatics*, *25*(4), 537-560.

Halliday, M. A. (1992). New ways of meaning: The challenge to applied linguistics. *Thirty years of linguistic evolution*, 59-95.

halliKhan, M. Y., & Mustafa, M. (2023). Exploration of Ecological elements: An Eco linguistic Investigation of climate change Reports in Pakistan. *Journal of Policy Research*, *9*(1).

Haugen, E. (1971). The ecology of language. *Linguistic Reporter*.

Kemmerer, L. (2006). Verbal Activism:" Anymal". *Society & Animals*, *14*(1), 9-14.

Khan, Q. U. A. (2024). . Eco-linguistic analysis of G7 communiqués (2020-2023) in shaping environmental policies: A Hallidayan perspective. Unpublished Mphil Thesi submitted to GC University, Faisalabad Pakiastan

Klein, N. (2015). *This changes everything: Capitalism vs. the climate*. Simon and Schuster.

Kravchenko, A. V. (2020). Why eco-linguistics?. *Ecolinguística: Revista brasileira de ecologia e linguagem (ECO-REBEL)*, *6*(2), 18-31.

LeVasseur, T. (2015). Defining "Eco-linguistics?": Challenging emic issues in an evolving environmental discipline. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, *5*, 21-28.

Ma, C., & Stibbe, A. (2022). The search for new stories to live by: A summary of ten eco-linguistics lectures delivered by Arran Stibbe. *Journal of World Languages*, *8*(1), 164-187.

Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M., & Painter, C. (1997). Working with functional grammar. *(No Title)*.

Martin, M. (2021). *Ecological modernisation? An ecolinguistic analysis of German, Canadian and European techno-fix approaches to climate change* (Master's thesis, University of Waterloo).

Mühlhäusler, P. (2001). Talking about environmental issues. *The eco-linguistics reader: Language, ecology and environment*, 31-42.

Nerlich, B., Koteyko, N., & Brown, B. (2010). Theory and language of climate change communication. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, *1*(1), 97-110.

Penz, H. (2017). 'Global Warming'or 'climate change'?. In *The Routledge Handbook of Eco-Linguistics* (pp. 277-292). Routledge.

Qasim, H. M. (2019). *A transitivity analysis of Mohsin Hamid's fiction* [Doctoral dissertation, Bahauddin Zakariya University].

Schultz, B. (2001). Language and the natural environment. *The Eco-linguistics Reader. London: Continuum*, 109-114.

Steffensen, S. V., & Fill, A. (2014). Eco-linguistics: the state of the art and future horizons. *Language sciences*, *41*, 6-25.

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

Thompson, G. (2013). *Introducing functional grammar*. Routledge.

Trampe, W. (2006). Language and ecological crisis. *Eco-linguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment*, 232.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2017). Socio-cognitive discourse studies. *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies*, 26-43.

Wu, Y. (2018, September). Ecological discourse analysis. In *2018 4th International Conference on Social Science and Higher Education (ICSSHE 2018)*. Atlantis Press.