

An Ecolinguistic Analysis of Frames of LA Wildfires in National Geographic's Environmental Reporting

Famala Eka Sanhadi Rahayu¹, Wilma Prafitri^{1,*}, Ahmad Mubarak²,
Muhammad Alim Akbar Nasir¹, Aris Setyoko³

¹Department of English Literature, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, University of Mulawarman, Indonesia
²Department of Indonesian Literature, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, University of Mulawarman, Indonesia
³Department of Ethnomusicology, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, University of Mulawarman, Indonesia

Received April 27, 2025; Revised August 1, 2025; Accepted August 21, 2025

Cite This Paper in the Following Citation Styles

(a): [1] Famala Eka Sanhadi Rahayu, Wilma Prafitri, Ahmad Mubarak, Muhammad Alim Akbar Nasir, Aris Setyoko, "An Ecolinguistic Analysis of Frames of LA Wildfires in National Geographic's Environmental Reporting," *Environment and Ecology Research*, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 586 - 593, 2025. DOI: 10.13189/eer.2025.130411.

(b): Famala Eka Sanhadi Rahayu, Wilma Prafitri, Ahmad Mubarak, Muhammad Alim Akbar Nasir, Aris Setyoko (2025). *An Ecolinguistic Analysis of Frames of LA Wildfires in National Geographic's Environmental Reporting. Environment and Ecology Research*, 13(4), 586 - 593. DOI: 10.13189/eer.2025.130411.

Copyright©2025 by authors, all rights reserved. Authors agree that this article remains permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License

Abstract Wildfires have become more common, fierce, and devastating worldwide, especially those that happened recently in Los Angeles, California, USA. These phenomena signify both environmental catastrophes and media phenomena that influence public perception of climate change and ecological hazards. The core concept of the ecolinguistics approach is how media influence public perception through language. This study examines the framing of the Los Angeles wildfires in National Geographic's Environment section from an ecolinguistic perspective by utilizing a qualitative analysis employing Stibbe's ecological discourse framework to classify linguistic patterns in a focused selection of six articles published on June 8th, 2025 and the later ones into thematic categories, including Destruction, Sustainability, Erasure, Resilience, and Othering. The analysis uncovers a notable pattern in which National Geographic formulates narratives around the LA wildfires. Although the source presents itself as an advocate for environmental consciousness, the framing decisions in these articles largely exhibit an anthropocentric perspective. The predominant frames—Destruction, Sustainability, and Resilience—primarily emphasize human suffering, community recovery, and anthropogenic climatic factors, whereas non-human ecological effects are consistently underrepresented. An important conclusion is that the Erasure and Othering Frames highlight a silence about non-human life. Despite California's ecological sensitivity,

biodiversity, animal loss, and habitat deterioration are rare. These omissions demonstrate ecological erasure, which marginalizes non-human entities in environmental discourses. There are national Geographic reports on wildfires both scientifically and emotionally, but the language used often promotes technocratic, anthropocentric, and resilience-focused ideologies rather than fostering profound ecological contemplation or relational consciousness. These findings show how altruistic environmental journalism might fail to promote multi-species fairness and ecocentric attitudes. The implications for environmental journalism, public understanding, and ecological advocacy are enormous. They illustrate how prevailing stories in elite media can inadvertently make climate disasters seem normal, non-human beings insignificant, and anthropocentrism inevitable. This research emphasizes the necessity of ecologically informed and ecocentric discourses that foster ecological literacy, multi-species justice, and transformative values and practices of sustainability. While this study provides an in-depth analysis of these specific articles, the conclusions drawn are primarily applicable to this focused dataset and serve as a basis for further broader inquiry.

Keywords Ecolinguistics, Frames, LA Wildfires, National Geographic Magazine, Environmental Reporting

1. Introduction

In recent years, wildfires have become more common, fierce, and devastating worldwide, with the western United States—especially California—experiencing some of the most severe and notable incidents [1,2]. The 2024–2025 Los Angeles wildfires, encompassing the Eaton and Palisades fires, signify both environmental catastrophes and media phenomena that influence public perception of climate change and ecological hazards.

National Geographic occupies a distinctive place among several media channels covering such events [3]. Renowned for its authoritative stance in environmental journalism and extensive global influence, National Geographic is instrumental in shaping narratives around ecological events [4,5,6]. Consequently, it is essential to examine how this platform depicts wildfires, encompassing both factual data and the discursive frameworks that influence readers' perceptions, attitudes, and reactions to ecological catastrophes.

This study employs an ecolinguistic approach, utilizing Stibbe's [7] ecological discourse framework, to analyze how National Geographic articles in its Environment section portray the recent wildfires in Los Angeles. Ecolinguistics offers tools for uncovering both detrimental and beneficial linguistic patterns related to the environment, highlighting how texts shape or distort ecological realities. This analysis identifies frameworks such as Destruction, Sustainability, Resilience, Erasure, Othering, and Reconnection, demonstrating how linguistic choices shape the ideological construction of wildfire events. The primary research question directing this research is: In what manner do National Geographic articles depict the LA wildfires, and which ecological narratives are either built or excluded in this context?

This study utilizes ecolinguistics, an interdisciplinary framework that investigates the connection between language and ecological concepts. Ecolinguistics aims to elucidate how linguistic patterns either promote or detract from the welfare of the natural environment and its inhabitants, encompassing both human and non-human entities. It develops upon systemic functional linguistics, critical discourse analysis, and cognitive linguistics by incorporating ecological values and environmental ideologies [7].

The primary analytical framework in this study is Stibbe's ecological discourse framework, which detects repeating discursive patterns, or frames that either promote or hinder ecological sustainability. Stibbe presents a taxonomy of detrimental and advantageous frames, encompassing, but not limited to: Destruction Frames (language that normalizes or glorifies environmental degradation), Erasure Frames (language that excludes or suppresses ecological agents or issues), Sustainability Frames (language advocating for stewardship, conservation, or equilibrium), Resilience Frames (language emphasizing recovery and adaptive capabilities), Reconnection Frames (language nurturing emotional,

ethical, or spiritual connections with nature), and Othering Frames (language creates a divide between human and nature).

Stibbe's ecolinguistic theory offers a comprehensive analytical framework for examining how National Geographic's wildfire narratives mirror, uphold, or challenge prevailing environmental ideologies, especially regarding climate change, disaster resilience, and human-nature interactions.

Recent researchers have employed ecolinguistic analysis to examine diverse discourses, including news articles [8,9], UN narratives [10], presidential speeches [11], vegan campaign posters [12], and public debates [13]. Research has demonstrated that specific discourses embody varying ideologies, ideas, attitudes, or messages that can either harm or benefit the environment. Many of these studies examine unilateral narratives, showcasing a singular party's viewpoint regarding the environment [9,10,11,12] whereas Zhang [8] offers a comparative analysis of two international media ideologies, and Poole [13] presents a debate involving two factions concerning mining in Arizona. Nonetheless, no studies have been undertaken to elucidate how environmental narratives frame a natural disaster like LA wildfire. This research aims to fill the gap by employing Stibbe's ecolinguistics framework to elucidate the frames constructed by National Geographic Magazine regarding the LA wildfire. It is essential to note that this study provides a focused analysis of a specific set of articles related to the LA wildfires within a defined period, offering an in-depth exploration rather than a generalized assessment of National Geographic's entire environmental reporting. The frames may serve as propaganda or campaigns that might be detrimental, ambiguous, or advantageous for the environment. This heightened awareness will illuminate the extent to which those discourses seek to influence readers regarding the topic matters.

2. Materials and Methods

This present research is a qualitative critical discourse analysis (CDA) methodology using an ecolinguistic perspective to examine the framing techniques utilized in constructing narratives around the LA wildfires on January, 8th 2025. The study is based on the premise that language not only mirrors reality but also actively influences ecological awareness and legitimizes specific ideas.

2.1. Source of Data

The source of data consists of six articles from National Geography Magazine in 'Environment' section which were published after January, 8th 2025 and directly related to the LA wildfires. This specific number of articles was chosen because, within the defined timeframe (after January 8th, 2025), these were the only six articles found in the Environment section that directly addressed the Los

Angeles wildfires. While a total of nine wildfire-related articles were published, three were excluded as they pertained to other wildfire phenomena, ensuring the dataset's direct relevance to our research question. Those articles are as shown in Table 1.

2.2. Data Collection and Analysis

For collecting the data, the researchers manually analyse the six articles from NatGeo Magazine to uncover how they frame LA wildfire in their narrative. Frames were discovered and classified according to recognized frameworks from ecolinguistics [7].

The identification process involved a systematic, step-by-step qualitative analysis, as follows:

1. Researchers read the six articles thoroughly to gain a general understanding of the content and narratives focusing on the LA wildfires.
2. Researchers then performed a close reading, sentence by sentence, to identify specific linguistic patterns, lexical choices, metaphorical expressions, and themes related to environmental discourse. This involved noting recurring words, phrases, and broader narrative structures.
3. The identified linguistic patterns were then categorized according to Stibbe's ecological discourse framework [7]. This was an iterative coding process where linguistic manifestations were matched against the definitions of the identified frames: Destruction Frames (language normalizing environmental degradation), Erasure Frames (language excluding non-human entities), Sustainability Frames (language advocating for stewardship or equilibrium), Resilience Frames (language emphasizing recovery and adaptation), and Othering Frames (language creating a human-nature divide).

4. Each identified linguistic pattern was analyzed within its broader textual context to ensure accurate categorization and understanding of its ideological function. This allowed for a nuanced interpretation of how specific choices contributed to the overall framing.
5. Finally, the coded frames were tabulated into a comprehensive table (Table 2) to clearly show which frames were present in each article and to delineate the linguistic manifestations contributing to their construction. This systematic approach aimed to ensure the consistency and reliability of the frame identification across the dataset.

Acknowledging the qualitative nature of this research, the researchers recognized the inherent potential for researcher interpretation to influence the analytical process. To mitigate potential subjective bias and enhance the objectivity and reliability of our findings, several methodological steps were rigorously followed. First, the analysis strictly adhered to the theoretical tenets and definitions provided by Stibbe's ecological discourse framework, ensuring that frame identification was systematically grounded in established concepts rather than personal impressions. Second, multiple careful readings of each article were conducted by the researchers to ensure comprehensive data capture and consistent application of the analytical framework. Third, throughout the coding process, regular discussions were held among the research team. This collaborative approach facilitated the validation of interpretations and promoted a shared understanding of how specific linguistic manifestations align with the defined ecolinguistic frames, thereby strengthening the inter-coder consistency and the overall credibility of the analysis.

Table 1. Source of Data

Title	Date of Publication	Label
How wildfires can grow deadly overnight	09-Jan-25	Article 1 [14]
Here's what really caused L.A. fire hydrants to run out of water	10-Jan-25	Article 2 [15]
What the images of Los Angeles's fires don't show	18-Jan-25	Article 3 [16]
How did these 'miracle' homes survive L.A.'s wildfires?	23-Jan-25	Article 4 [17]
Climate change made the L.A. wildfires 35 percent more likely	29-Jan-25	Article 5 [18]
Wildfires are making their way east—where they could be much deadlier	04-Mar-25	Article 6 [19]

Table 2. Frame Types Found in Environmental Narratives in NatGeo Magazine

Data Source	Key Frames Identified
Article 1	Destruction, Sustainability, Resilience
Article 2	Destruction, Sustainability, Erasure
Article 3	Resilience, Erasure
Article 4	Resilience, Erasure, Sustainability
Article 5	Destruction, Sustainability, Erasure, Resilience
Article 6	Destruction, Erasure

3. Findings

The findings from this study identify and categorize the dominant ecolinguistic frames present in National Geographic's narratives after the LA wildfires. Utilizing Stibbe's ecological discourse paradigm [7], six frames were discerned across the six articles: Destruction, Sustainability, Resilience, Erasure, and Othering. Each frame was identified through recurrent linguistic patterns, thematic focus, or deliberate exclusion. Table 2 delineates the distribution of these frames throughout the articles, accompanied by a thematic analysis of the construction of each frame and its ideological function within the discourse.

Table 2 illustrates that each article exhibits a combination of ecolinguistic frames. A quantitative distribution overview of the frames reveals their distribution:

- Destruction Frame is present in 4 out of 6 articles (Article 1, 2, 5, 6)
- Sustainability Frame is present in 4 out of 6 articles (Article 1, 2, 4, 5)
- Erasure Frame is present in 5 out of 6 articles (Article 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), making it the most frequent frames identified.
- Resilience Frame is present in 4 out of 6 articles (Article 1, 3, 4, 5)
- Othering Frame is present in 1 out of 6 articles (Article 1)

As demonstrated, Destruction, Sustainability, and Erasure appear most frequently throughout the sample, with Erasure being particularly pervasive. Some frames are consistently present in multiple articles, whereas others, like Othering, are utilized more selectively. The subsequent part presents a thematic analysis of each frame to elucidate its linguistic and ideological construction. Each component comprises illustrative textual excerpts, contextual analysis, and an examination of how particular lexical and discursive patterns influence public perception of the LA wildfires.

3.1. Destruction Frame

The destruction frame is how language normalizes or glorifies environmental degradation. In all six articles, it can be seen there is a normalization act towards the LA wildfire since it is a regular natural disaster in LA as can be seen from the following excerpt:

Fires are **a natural feature** of Western ecosystems, but they have become larger and deadlier in recent years. [14]

By saying that, **fires are a natural feature**, indicating that they are accepted as part of human life. The lexical choice of using the word "features" which means a distinctive attribute, says a lot about how fires are not only

seen as a natural disaster but a feature that is embedded in the Western ecosystem. It has already been there so the people should know that fire is the consequence they have to bear to live in a Western ecosystem. There is also a similar frame of how this devastating natural disaster is accepted as a regular thing as mentioned in Article 5 [18].

"While Southern California **regularly experiences** wildfires, "the impact of these fires and the timing of these fires in the core of what should be the wet season differentiate this event as an extreme outlier," John Abatzoglou, a climatology researcher at the University of California, Merced, and another of the paper's coauthors, said in a statement. [18]

Choosing the word "regular" is a similar lexical choice when Article 1 chooses the word "feature" to represent that the fires in LA are accepted as inevitable. Both Articles are resigning to the occurrence of the fires since it has already been a part of their life. Another similar lexical choice is found in Article 2 [15] which said that LA wildfire is a foreseeable result as quoted below:

But experts say this failure isn't easily pinned on one issue or failure—instead, it's **the foreseeable result** of a system that was never ready for the sort of climate change-fueled fires we now face in urban areas. [15]

The previous excerpt stated that LA wildfire is a **foreseeable result** which means that this natural disaster is likely to be expected to happen. Blaming the unprepared system on the climate change-induced factor which makes the natural disaster more vulnerable, is what makes the disaster likely to happen. However, there is no pointing out to a specific agent who might be responsible for the devastating result of this expected disaster behind the system. Those statements show that wildfire is a regular phenomenon that happens in California. However in LA wildfire case, the climate change makes the wildfire even worse. It is found in three articles [14,18,19] which put the blame on climate change as the main actor the the wildfire become worse and deadlier in LA as shown in the following excerpt:

Because much of the U.S. is expected to get hotter and drier with **climate change**, wildfire risk is **generally expected to rise**. [14]

This statement then is supported by another excerpt from Article 5.

Climate change made the conditions that drove **the devastating fires** some 35 percent more likely than they would have been and had the fires occurred before the Earth began warming in the industrial age. [18]

Similar to the previous statement, Article 6 also puts the blame of how devastating the wildfire is to the climate

change as follows:

But the authors (researchers who published *Geophysical Research Letters*) speculate that warmer, drier conditions brought on by **a changing climate** combined with a lack of prescribed fires have led to a proliferation of woodier plants, trees, and shrubs that provide the fuel for fires to burn in greater strength and numbers. [19]

Climate change is mentioned in the whole narrative (Article 5) with 10 occurrences throughout the article as the determining factor in LA wildfires by stating that the warmer the earth is, the more it leads to overriding other natural phenomena, implicitly saying it increases the likelihood of natural disasters happening. By claiming that climate change is the prime factor, the phenomenon of LA wildfires becomes more normalized, as can be seen from the phrases "natural features" [14], "generally expected" [14], and "regularly experienced wildfires" [18]. In the US, especially in California, people expect wildfires to occur and frame them as a natural part of human life. However, frequent mentions of climate change and warmer temperatures make the wildfire more deadly and dangerous.

3.2. Sustainability Frame

The sustainability frame is represented when language is used to advocate for stewardship, conservation, or equilibrium. It can be in the form of a direct encouragement to save nature, prohibition of naturally destructive activities, or admitting the problems and pursuing a better management of nature. In this research, sustainability frames are found in the form of uncovering the problems and admitting human mistakes that contribute to nature degradation to seek the solution. It does not talk about how to sustain nature, but by pointing out where is the mistake so that people can be aware that nature surrounds them and protects it. Admitting the contribution of human in environmental degradation might increase the people's awareness that as human being, they should stop doing destructive activities which might cause a vulnerable disaster as the excerpt below:

Though they are classified by the Environmental Protection Agency as natural disasters, only 10 to 15 percent of wildfires occur on their own in nature. The other 85 to 90 percent result **from human causes**, including unattended camp and debris fires, discarded cigarettes, and arson. [14]

Using statistical data that 85-90 percent of the devastating fires have resulted from human activities may raise people's awareness to act more wisely and carefully to avoid the same disaster from taking place. In the same article, there is also a sustainability frame that points out that climate change is a human-driven phenomenon as seen in the following quotation:

California has gotten about 3 degrees Fahrenheit hotter since **humans began producing** greenhouse gas emissions from burning fossil fuels. [14]

This statement points out explicitly that humans are the actors behind the rising in temperature in California, as humans are the ones who create greenhouse gas emissions by driving vehicles or creating industries that use fossil fuels. The failed system in the list actors responsible for LA wildfire is mentioned in Article 2 as follows:

But experts say this failure isn't easily pinned on one issue or failure—instead, it's **the foreseeable result of a system** that was never ready for the sort of climate change-fueled fires we now face in urban areas. [15]

The combination of natural disasters, reckless human activities, human-driven climate change, and an unprepared system for worst-case scenarios has turned an anticipated wildfire into a hazardous catastrophe in Los Angeles. By mentioning those actors, the articles expect to call out the responsible actors and desire a repaired system, and most responsible human activities to prevent the same disaster from happening. This is recalled in Article 4 [17],[18] that to solve this big issue, it needs many parties to work together and solve the problems as described in the following excerpt:

But experts, including Barrett and Maranghides, believe the L.A. fires are also the latest sign that **researchers, policymakers, and the public** need to look beyond modifying individual buildings to address the crisis of urban fires. [17]

By calling out all parties who are responsible for the natural disaster, it is expected to express a desire for systemic improvements and more accountable human behavior to prevent similar disasters in the future.

3.3. Erasure Frame

All six National Geographic articles demonstrate the erasure framing by consistently omitting the wildfire's effects on non-human life. Although the articles comprehensively detail the devastation of residences, infrastructure, and human populations, they mostly neglect to address the impact of the fires on animals, biodiversity, and plant ecosystems. It is proven by how there is not any single word such as "biodiversity", "animal", "habitat loss", and "ecosystem degradation". This quiet is significant considering the extensively recorded ecological fragility of Southern California, where wildfires displace or exterminate numerous species and devastate essential ecosystems.

While plants and vegetation are referenced throughout the texts, they are predominantly characterized as fuel sources that amplify fire intensity, rather than as living ecological entities impacted by the tragedy. Vegetation is

characterized by its function in fire propagation, although there is an absence of discourse regarding ecosystem degradation, wildlife displacement, or habitat destruction. This linguistic omission illustrates a human-centric viewpoint, wherein the environment is perceived primarily as a context or backdrop to human suffering, rather than as an entity that is also impacted. According to Stibbe [7], this discursive pattern illustrates a type of ecological erasure, wherein non-human voices and experiences are rendered imperceptible in predominant environmental narratives.

3.4. Resilience Frame

The resilience frame is the frame in which language depicts nature as being able to recover by itself. The resilience frame can be found in Article 1 [14] and Article 3 [16], which show that after the devastating disaster occurred, there is still a benefit to it. Through the process of succession which commonly follows the wildfire, nature can reset itself to return all that belongs to it as the following excerpt describes:

Although they can be dangerous to humans, **naturally occurring wildfires play an integral role in nature**. By burning dead or decaying matter, they can **return** otherwise trapped nutrients to the soil. They also act as a disinfectant, removing disease-ridden plants and harmful insects from an ecosystem. [14]

The previous statement showed how the succession happens as the parts of nature become resilient in their own way. Another resilience frame is also found in Article 3 which shows the condition of LA after ten days apart from the vulnerable wildfire as excerpted below:

The skylines east and west of my apartment are **no longer** filled with smoke. [16]

The statement shows that the sky returns to what it should be before the wildfire. Using a lexical presupposition through the use of phrase “no longer” the sentence indicates the return of a previous condition. The return may indicate that the wildfire is no longer happening or nature can deal with it so that the sky returns to blue. The resilience frame is not only depicted from the nature's well-being but also from the resilience of the people impacted by the wildfire as shown by the following quotation:

Los Angeles will **rebuild**, if we always do. New buildings will go up where old ones stood, and they'll be different—we may not be able to **replace** icons of mid-century architecture, but we can design structures to better withstand future burns. And hopefully, when the fires **return**, all the linking arms and memory-making of this moment will leave us stronger and better prepared. [16]

The morpheme re- in "rebuild" serves as a lexical

presupposition, indirectly suggesting previous devastation and the potential for restoration. This anticipated recovery reinforces the Resilience Frame, creating a narrative where calamity serves not as a conclusion, but as a prerequisite for transformation and preparedness for the future. The phrase “we always do” emphasizes a shared identity based on persistent endurance, thereby normalizing resilience as an ingrained cultural characteristic in response to environmental crises.

3.5. Othering Frame

The Othering Frame is represented when language creates a divide between human and non-human in environmental narratives. The othering frame in this study also indicates the erasure frame that non-human creatures are not taken into consideration in the environmental narratives in National Geographic Magazine. They put human affairs on top of the discussion, neglecting any impacts on other non-human species. A clear separation showed othering frame can be found in the following excerpt:

Although they can be dangerous to humans, naturally occurring wildfires. By burning dead or decaying matter, they can return otherwise trapped nutrients to the soil. They also act as a disinfectant, removing disease-ridden plants and harmful insects from an ecosystem. [14]

The clause “Although they can be dangerous to humans” positions wildfires predominantly in terms of human safety, portraying humans as the primary reference for potential harm. This linguistic selection indirectly relegates non-human life to a peripheral or subordinate status. The subsequent sentence outlines ecological advantages, like nutrient replenishment in soil and disease eradication in ecosystems; nevertheless, it fails to address biodiversity loss, animal fatalities, or habitat degradation, which are well documented repercussions of extensive wildfires.

This pattern illustrates the Othering Frame, wherein human experience is emphasized, while non-human suffering is marginalized or obliterated. Wildfires are shown as a hazard solely in relation to human safety, rather than as multifaceted occurrences that impact intricate ecosystems involving multiple species. This framing perpetuates anthropocentric discourse, wherein nature's value is assessed based on its influence on human existence, while non-human creatures are either excluded or objectified. This represents a discursive division that diminishes comprehensive ecological understanding and empathy for the interconnectedness of life.

4. Discussion

The analysis uncovers a notable pattern in the manner National Geographic formulates narratives around the LA wildfires. It is important to acknowledge that the

conclusions drawn from this study are based on a specific, focused dataset and, while providing in-depth insights into the framing of the LA wildfires, they may not be broadly generalizable to National Geographic's entire environmental reporting oeuvre across all topics or timeframes. Although the source presents itself as an advocate for environmental consciousness, the framing decisions in these pieces largely exhibit an anthropocentric perspective [20]. The predominant frames—Destruction, Sustainability, and Resilience—primarily emphasize human suffering, community recovery, and anthropogenic climatic factors, whereas non-human ecological effects are consistently underrepresented.

The Destruction Frame is employed to normalize wildfires as anticipated or cyclical events in the western United States [21,22,23]. Expressions like “natural feature” and “regularly experienced wildfires” convey a nuanced acceptance of calamity, which, while scientifically valid, may diminish the imperative for proactive ecological measures. This normalization might construct a narrative that portrays wildfires as unavoidable, so diminishing the significance of human activity and policy responsibility.

The Sustainability Frame, while existent, predominantly operates via indirect advocacy. The articles emphasize systemic failure and human error instead of prioritizing proactive environmental stewardship, indirectly advocating for improved management without offering specific ecological remedies [25]. This indirectness may diminish the urgency for transformative environmental change, confining the discourse to institutional critique rather than ecological advocacy.

The Resilience Frame is formed through tales of human and ecological recovery [25]. Resilience is frequently depicted as a reversion to the status quo instead of a chance for systemic transformation. The recurrent employment of vocabulary presuppositions (e.g., “rebuild,” “return,” “no longer”) indicates recovery as a cultural practice rather than a conscious transformation in ecological awareness. This may gently promote the notion that resilience is inherent, rather than an objective necessitating work and inclusive solutions.

The most significant findings arise from the Erasure and Othering Frames, which underscore a notable silence regarding non-human life [26]. Biodiversity, animal loss, and ecosystem degradation are nearly nonexistent, despite California's recognized ecological vulnerability. Plants are referenced solely for their function in fire propagation, rather than as essential components of a functioning ecosystem. These omissions exemplify what Stibbe [7] terms ecological erasure—a language phenomenon that marginalizes non-human entities in environmental discourses. Moreover, the Othering Frame solidifies this division by framing wildfire damage predominantly in human-centric terms, so strengthening the dichotomy between “us” and “nature.”

National Geographic employs a scientifically informed and emotionally impactful method for wildfire reporting;

however, its linguistic framing often perpetuates technocratic, anthropocentric, and resilience-focused ideologies, rather than fostering profound ecological contemplation or relational consciousness. These findings enhance the comprehension of how even altruistic environmental journalism may inadequately promote multi-species justice and ecocentric perspectives.

5. Conclusions

This research employed Stibbe's ecolinguistic paradigm to examine the framing of the 2024–2025 LA flames in National Geographic's Environment section. The research indicated that although the magazine highlights climate attribution, human casualties, and systemic failures, it often neglects ecological complexity, especially regarding the effects on non-human species. National Geographic weaves a narrative that integrates emotive storytelling with scientific credibility through the lenses of Destruction, Sustainability, and Resilience. The concurrent existence of Erasure and Othering frames suggests a persistent anthropocentric perspective that limits ecological consciousness.

Given the focused nature of this study's sample, further research is recommended to expand upon these initial findings. Future studies should investigate a larger corpus of National Geographic articles covering diverse environmental topics over an extended period to establish more generalized patterns of environmental reporting.

These findings underscore the necessity for a more inclusive environmental discourse that acknowledges the interdependence of all life forms and contests human exceptionalism in ecological narratives. Future studies should investigate how alternative media, indigenous knowledge systems, and grassroots environmental narratives may provide more ecocentric frameworks that foster biodiversity, justice, and environmental accountability.

Acknowledgements

The researchers would like to thank the Faculty of Cultural Sciences of Mulawarman University for its financial and administrative support.

REFERENCES

- [1] Calkin D., Short K., Traci M., "California wildfires," in *US Emergency Management in the 21st Century*, Routledge, 2019, pp. 155–182.
- [2] Keeley JE, Syphard AD. "Twenty-first century California, USA, wildfires: fuel-dominated vs. wind-dominated fires," *Fire Ecology*, vol 15, no 1, pp 1-15, 2019.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s42408-019-0041-0>

- [3] Pflaeging J. "Tracing the narrativity of National Geographic feature articles in the light of evolving media landscapes," *Discourse, Context & Media*, vol. 20, pp. 248–261, 2017.
- [4] Ahern L, Bortree DS, Smith AN. "Key trends in environmental advertising across 30 years in National Geographic magazine," *Public Understanding of Science*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 479–494, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662512444848>
- [5] Bortree D, Ahern L, Dou X, Smith AN. "Framing environmental advocacy: a study of 30 years of advertising in National Geographic Magazine," *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 77–91, 2012.
- [6] Todd A.M., "Anthropocentric distance in National Geographic's environmental aesthetic," *Environmental Communication*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 206–224, 2010.
- [7] Stibbe A. *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by*. Routledge; 2015 May 1.
- [8] Zhang B., Chandran Sandaran S., Feng J., "The ecological discourse analysis of news discourse based on deep learning from the perspective of ecological philosophy," *Plos One*, vol. 18, no. 1, e0280190, 2023.
- [9] Yuniawan T., Rokhman F., Rustono R., Mardikantoro H.B., "The study of critical eco-linguistic in green discourse: Prospective eco-linguistic analysis," *Humaniora*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 291, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.27441>
- [10] Gong H., Liu L., "Ecological discourse analysis of an UN environmental story in terms of transitivity process," *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 67–77, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aial.v.9n.3p.67>
- [11] Mansyur S.A., Lukmana I., Isnendes R., Gunawan W., "Eco-critical Discourse Analysis of the Indonesian President's Statement at the 21st Conference of the Parties in Paris," *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 105–114, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v3i2.6285>
- [12] Zhdanava A., Kaur S., Rajandran K., "Representing nonhuman animals as equals: An ecolinguistic analysis of vegan campaigns," *Journal of World Languages*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 26–57, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jwl-2021-0003>
- [13] Poole R., "A corpus-aided ecological discourse analysis of the Rosemont Copper Mine debate of Arizona, USA," *Discourse & Communication*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 576–595, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481316674775>
- [14] National Geographic. "How wildfires can grow deadly overnight." National Geographic. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/article/wildfires> (accessed Jan. 9, 2025).
- [15] National Geographic. "Here's what really caused L.A. fire hydrants to run out of water." National Geographic. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/article/los-angeles-wildfires-water-scarcity> (accessed Jan. 10, 2025).
- [16] National Geographic. "What the images of Los Angeles's fires don't show." National Geographic. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/article/LA-california-fire-lost-landmarks> (accessed Jan. 18, 2025).
- [17] National Geographic. "How did these 'miracle' homes survive L.A.'s wildfires?" National Geographic. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/article/wildfire-miracle-home-survival-design-neighborhood> (accessed Jan. 23, 2025).
- [18] National Geographic. "Climate change made the L.A. wildfires 35 percent more likely." National Geographic. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/science/article/climate-change-los-angeles-fire-wildfire> (accessed Jan. 29, 2025).
- [19] National Geographic. "Wildfires are making their way east—where they could be much deadlier." National Geographic. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/article/wildfires-east-cities-climate-change> (accessed Mar. 4, 2025).
- [20] Droz L., "Anthropocentrism as the scapegoat of the environmental crisis: A review," *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*, vol. 22, pp. 25–49, 2022.
- [21] Farkhondehmaal F., Ghaffarzagdegan N., "A cyclical wildfire pattern as the outcome of a coupled human natural system," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 12, no. 1, 5280, 2022.
- [22] Russo M., Fischer A.P., Huber-Stearns H.R., "Wildfire narratives: Identifying and characterizing multiple understandings of western wildfire challenges," *Environmental Science & Policy*, vol. 160, 103824, 2024.
- [23] Walker H.M., Reed M.G., Fletcher A.J., "Wildfire in the news media: An intersectional critical frame analysis," *Geoforum*, vol. 114, pp. 128–137, 2020.
- [24] Bennett N.J., Whitty T.S., Finkbeiner E., Pittman J., Bassett H., Gelcich S., Allison E.H., "Environmental stewardship: A conceptual review and analytical framework," *Environmental Management*, vol. 61, pp. 597–614, 2018.
- [25] Stokols D., Lejano R.P., Hipp J., "Enhancing the resilience of human–environment systems: A social ecological perspective," *Ecology and Society*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2013.
- [26] Barca S., "Telling the right story: Environmental violence and liberation narratives," *Environment and History*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 535–546, 2014.