


RESEARCH ARTICLE

Section: *Literature, Linguistics & Criticism*

From aridness to greenness: Ecological terminology in Arabic-English literary translation from students' perspectives

Malik Alkhawaldeh^{1*} , Ahmad S Haider¹, Zakaryia Almahasees² & Malak Alkhawaldeh³¹Department of English Language and Translation, Applied Science Private University, Amman, Jordan²Translation Department, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan³Department of English Language and Literature, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan*Correspondence: ma_khawaldeh@asu.edu.jo

ABSTRACT

This study investigates how translation students engage with ecological terminology in Arabic-English literary translation, with a focus on their familiarity, preferences, perceived challenges, and strategic approaches. A total of 1,800 undergraduate and postgraduate students from Arab-region universities participated in a structured questionnaire comprising 24 items grouped into six thematic constructs. These constructs explored familiarity with ecological expressions, preferred text types, translation challenges, strategic methods, use of reference tools, and pedagogical recommendations. Demographic data regarding academic level, translation training, language pairs, and interest in environmental topics were also collected to test eight hypotheses using inferential statistical methods. Findings indicate a moderate-to-high level of student familiarity with ecological imagery and culturally rooted expressions in Arabic and English literature. Participants expressed a strong interest in translating literary texts with environmental themes, especially poetry and essays rich in metaphor and symbolism. However, significant challenges were reported in maintaining literary style and translating culturally specific environmental terminology. Students with more translation coursework demonstrated greater use of adaptive and explanatory strategies, while those who frequently used reference tools reported higher confidence and awareness. Support for incorporating ecological translation into formal curricula was especially strong among postgraduate students. The study highlights a growing pedagogical demand for ecological translation as a specialized skill and underscores the need for updated curricula, resource development, and interdisciplinary collaboration. It concludes that effective training in ecological translation requires a balanced emphasis on environmental literacy, cultural sensitivity, and strategic flexibility.

KEYWORDS: ecological translation, Arabic-English literary translation, environmental terminology, translation pedagogy, metaphor and symbolism, translation strategies

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 6, Issue 3, 2025

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 15 September 2025

Accepted: 01 November 2025

Published: 14 November 2025

HOW TO CITE

Alkhawaldeh, M., Haider, A. S., Almahasees, Z., & Alkhawaldeh, M. (2025). From aridness to greenness: Ecological terminology in Arabic-English literary translation from students' perspectives. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.58256/7acf2m60>



Published in Nairobi, Kenya by Royallite Global, an imprint of Royallite Publishers Limited

© 2025 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

The intertwined visions of literature and ecology, heightened by the 21st-century revival of the environmental novel, brought about an unavoidable demand for exactness in the translation of ecological terminology in literary works (Cronin, 2017; Mellinger & Hanson, 2022; Scott, 2023). Most often, nonspecialist literary translators make use of their linguistic and, to a lesser extent, their encyclopedic abilities to render the works of literature from around the world (Al Saideen, Haider, & Al-Abbas, 2022). Indeed, an accurate rendering of ecological concepts is of great pertinence and urgency, given that ideas originate in words and are disseminated by other words: a clear understanding of vocabulary helps to support a clear strategy in environmental diplomacy. That is why we believe a sound *modus vivendi* with words enriching our discourse can be based on a sound composition as well.

Therefore, it seems most pertinent to investigate the difficulties arising from the translation of ecological terminology and concepts using poetics and the dynamic equivalence of literary works. As such, this essay treats the translation of ecological terms, including onomatopoeia and verbs of manner, in an abridged scene from a literary work. The essay is divided into sections as follows: the translative difficulties emanating from the use of ecological terminology as a genre, a literature of knowledge in environmental literature, and finally in a literary dialogue spanning several national literatures; a brief review of the designated translation practices for untranslatables and multiple translatives in post-colonial literatures, and the importance of reducing ecological illiteracy as a new literacy for each new generation.

The interdependence between language and the environment is increasingly being emphasized in today's world, reflected in the growing awareness of ecological terminology in the world's languages. Every culture has values that, in turn, shape the terminology of a given field (Al-Abbas & Haider, 2023; Al-Darabee & Farghal, 2025; Aldualimi & Almahasees, 2022; Alrais & Almahasee, 2024; Debbas & Haider, 2020; Farghal, 2005, 2019; Haider, Saideen, & Hussein, 2023; Samha, Haider, & Hussein, 2023; Silwadi & Almahasees, 2022). The main task of a translator is to retain a cultural stance in which an ecologically centered translation can fulfill the environmental discourse in today's world (Beecroft, 2015; Harrison, 2023; Zapf, 2008). The literature of environmental awareness has proliferated until today, and an eco-critique is in-depth in the literary discourse; thus, the translation of these materials is a necessity. Some deficiencies in ecological translation will cause some eco-centric misunderstandings or misinterpretations that finally lead to the inaccuracy of message transfer. While this may be meaningful in a purely biological frame, in terms of preserving the natural habitat, it also has cultural implications, further prioritizing the importance of translating terminology.

The history of ecological discussions can be traced back to ancient Greece. The term "ecology" was introduced in 1869 and, as a scientific doctrine, has been used since 1866, with the publication of a work by a German biologist. With the increasing interest in ecological research and the number of new concepts introduced, attention to terminology in ecological studies has increased, and therefore, an understanding of the vocabulary of ecology is increasingly important. Additionally, the concept of environment, which is closely related to ecology, also has a long existence in the field of ecology. More recently, a science guide has been published on environmentalism to define the fundamental terms and key phrases of ecological studies, containing approximately 200 entries of English ecology, because an understanding of such terms is crucial for restoring and repairing the damaged environment. These technical terms are the language that ecologists use to help them understand the systems.

This paper is a study of the translation of ecological terminology. As such, it has its objectives and limitations. On the one hand, the study aims to specify whether 'purely' ecological terms are translated in literary texts. It also aims to identify the strategies used in their translation and evaluate these in terms of their efficacy regarding the meaning transfer into the LC. The interest of this study does not encompass the cultural dimension of lexical item translation, which is the possible absence of a certain selected TL ecological item. Nevertheless, it is not merely descriptive, as I propose a certain tangible tool of analysis to be applied in empirical research. Consequently, the study is based on an attempt to keep a balance between the possible strategies suggested theoretically for handling extra-linguistic 'pure' ecological referents and the actual linguistic behavior of practitioners in translating and/or manipulating them.

This paper has a specific purpose and hence a set of limitations. This study is not primarily interested in investigating who talks about ecology in translated works. On the discursive level, this should consider

stylistics, register, and genre topics, which are not within the focal scope of this investigation. The purpose here is not to propose the ways in which a given text can talk about ecological problems and issues, thus allowing poets to become ‘eco-poets’. The present endeavor, however, aims at finding how natural objects are called in literary discourse, i.e., belonging to the literary linguistic register. It examines the desert’s natural entities that are constructed and represented in literary texts in Arabic and represented in English translations, as well as the lexical translator’s strategies in both contrastive levels (El-Zein et al., 2014; Elmusa, 2013; Halimah, 2018; Sharqāwī & al-Sharkawī, 2010; Sinno, 2013). Therefore, this paper chooses to look at names of places, plants, and animals as examples, as they are tangible referents that linguists do not usually manipulate for the purposes of analysis. Thus, focusing on this discursive strategy, I have put aside the study of other environmental items. No claims are made as to how data could be generalized. The nature of this research, as a theoretical study conducted on an ad hoc basis, does not allow it. Case studies and examples have been chosen from a literary corpus, mainly from translations.

Arabic-English literary translation involving ecological content presents unique challenges for student translators. These include unfamiliarity with environmental concepts, difficulty rendering symbolic or metaphorical language, and limited access to domain-specific reference materials. Additionally, translation pedagogy has not sufficiently addressed ecological translation as a distinct skill, leaving students underprepared to handle such texts critically and confidently.

This study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. How familiar are translation students with ecological and culturally embedded environmental terminology in Arabic-English literary translation?
2. What challenges and strategies do students report when translating ecological expressions, and how do these relate to their training background and academic level?

Literature Review

Nowadays, in the age of technology and man-made machines, people generally agree that the future of the environment is at stake. Wars, industrialisation, resource exploitation, and anthropocentrism are damaging the planet’s basic life support systems (Glottfelty, 1996, p. xx). Environmental restoration requires a change of behaviour and attitude towards all things natural (including land and all flora and fauna) and a study of the causes of environmental degradation. Thus, ecocriticism emerged to enable literary scholars to contribute to finding solutions to the environmental crisis. Slovic (2008) notes that literature is a lens through which we’re able to sharpen our understanding of our world’s vital problems – and literary criticism is the mechanism of articulating what we come to understand (p. 8). Joseph W. Meeker (1997) asserts that literature should be examined carefully and honestly to discover its influence upon human behavior and the natural environment, and to determine what role, if any, it plays in the welfare and survival of humanity, and what insight it offers into human relationships with other species and with the world around us (p. 4).

The rise of industrialisation has had major effects on the environment, and human beings have lost their connection to nature; it has become a means to gain profit by exploiting and manipulating it. This led to pollution, gas emissions, climate change, global warming, deforestation, animal extinction, and toxic waste. All of these environmental problems call for a change to the human-nature relationship and humans’ way of life. Europe, with its modern technology, invaded other continents in search of more natural resources to exploit in order to supply industrial societies. Europeans ransacked the earth for metal, destroyed the trees for industry, and deformed landscapes by setting up new human habitats, polluting land, water, and air. Orr (2002) argues that if we are to build a better world – one that can be sustained ecologically and one that sustains us spiritually – we must transcend the disorder and fragmentation of the industrial age. We need a perspective that joins the hard-won victories of civilization, such as human rights and democracy, with a larger view of our place in the cosmos (p. 4).

Simply put, ecocriticism is literary and cultural criticism constructed from an environmentalist viewpoint; it takes an earth-centred approach to literary studies. In Greek, *oikos* “eco” is home, which could be a house, a place of living, a land, a country, or any landscape that humans live on and interact with, whether it is natural, constructed, or even imagined in some literary texts. Many researchers point to the fact that the term

“ecocriticism” was first used by US critic William Rueckert (1978) in his essay ‘Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism’. The first person to revive the term and urge its adaption was Cheryll Glotfelty at the 1989 WLA conference. According to Peter Barry (2002), ecocriticism as a field started in America in the 1990s and appeared a few years later in the UK, but in the last decade it has gained significant fame in Asia, Africa, and South America. The American ecocriticism can be traced back to the American transcendentalism of the 1840s from three major works: Ralph Waldo Emerson’s ‘Nature’ (1836), a reflective essay on the impact upon him of the natural world; Margaret Fuller’s *Summer on the Lakes* (1843), a written journal of her encounter with the American landscape; and Henry David Thoreau’s *Walden* (1845), an account of his two year stay in a hut he built on the shore of Walden pond. This last piece is considered by many to be the foundational text for ecocriticism. British ecocriticism, also referred to as green studies, can be traced back to the British Romanticism of the 1790s. In recent times, Jonathan Bate is the founding figure in the UK and is the author of *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition* (1991).

Ecocritics have founded an association, the Association for the Study of Literature and Environment (ASLE). It seeks to exchange ideas and information on literature that considers the human-nature relationship and encourages new nature writing, traditional and innovative scholarly approaches to environmental literature, and interdisciplinary environmental research. Their journal, *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* (ISLE), seeks to explore the relationship between human beings and the natural world.

After pointing out the origins of ecocriticism, it is important to explain what ecocritics do and trace the phases that have shaped ecocriticism as it is today. Ecocritics pay special attention to the hierarchies that operate in the ecosystem, especially the one that privileges us humans at the expense of animals and the natural world. They challenge the taken-for-granted opposition between subject and object, culture and nature, the human and the non-human, which tends to reduce nature and the non-human to the position of inferior subalterns in the equation of life. Ecocritics reread major literary works from an ecocentric perspective, with particular attention to the representation of the natural world, and seek to ensure that nature is given as much attention within the humanities as is currently given to gender, class, and race. Ecocritics have a green agenda and take on an earth-centred approach to literary studies by attacking anthropocentrism and the centrality it accords to human beings. They examine human perception of wilderness and how it has changed throughout history. They also question the accuracy of representing current environmental issues in literature.

An ecocritical reading of a literary work elevates the status of nature in the text. Instead of being a symbol or a framework to enlighten the reader’s imagination, nature becomes a tool to make people aware of their actions and their place in the universe. An ecocritical reading would focus on the ways the environment is exploited or preserved in the literary text. Franca Bellarsi (2009) asserts the importance of studying nature as part of human existence on Earth by stating that even if human communities continue to differ as to how they see the relationship between Nature and Culture and as to the kind of ecological imprint they leave upon their environment, no human society has historically existed completely independently from Nature, be it at the material level or the one of cultural representation (p. 72). Alkhawaldeh (2024) also asserts that “the integration of nature, culture and history can help force environmental change. a deeper understanding of the natural and cultural history of a place might help shape a better future for the community that depends on that place” (p. 15).

Ecocriticism challenges the culture/nature dualism. It goes without saying that culture (man) is responsible for the degradation of nature. Not only have humans depended on nature to survive, but they have also exploited it. The solution that ecocriticism proposes is to surpass this dualistic thinking because it is used to justify the oppression of the ‘other’ emerging from dualisms such as man and woman, human and nature, human and animal, reason and emotion, coloniser and colonised, civilised and barbaric, and so on. Ecocriticism aims to explore the relationships between nature and culture to find mutual ground for them to be on the same level and explore the ways they can benefit each other. It is a coexistence that necessitates an understanding and knowledge of nature, where the environment is seen as a culture. Glotfelty (1996) argues that despite the broad scope of inquiry and disparate levels of sophistication, an ecological criticism shares the fundamental premise that human culture is connected to the physical world, affecting it and being affected by it. Ecocriticism takes as its subject the interconnections between nature and culture. Understanding how nature and culture constantly influence and construct each other is essential to an informed ecocriticism. As a critical stance, it has one foot in

literature and the other on land. As a theoretical discourse, it negotiates between the human and the nonhuman (p. xix).

Culture is determined by the physical environment. Clothes, food, industries, and professions that dominate different societies are the product of the nature of the place and suit the specific environment in which people live. Nature and culture are inseparable, and thus a shift in one often leads to a change in the other. Knowledge, values, and beliefs evolve with the environments upon which they are based. The environment is the setting for all cultural processes and activities. Knowledge is crucial in demonstrating how the environment is perceived as a culture, as cultural understandings of the environment enable people to adapt to their specific environment’s constraints and foster ecological interactions and sustainable practices. As Soper (2000) notes, in our own time, the human impact on the environment has been so extensive that there is an important sense in which it is correct to speak of ‘nature’ as itself a cultural product or construction (p. 124).

Ecocriticism seeks to see humans as part of nature to represent the interaction of all people with nature and the natural environment everywhere, not only in wild and rural settings. Larsen (2007) argues that ecocriticism deals with the way literature contributes to the articulation, interpretation, and transformation of the boundary between nature and culture or, even broader, between the non-human and the human (p. 342). The environment becomes an integration between nature and culture, humans and non-humans, a complete body. Catrin Gersdorf and Sylvia Mayer (2006) emphasise the need for an accurate investigation of nature where ecocriticism re-examines the history of ideologically, aesthetically, and ethically motivated conceptualisations of nature, of the function of its constructions and metaphorisations in literary and other cultural practices, and of the potential effects these discursive, imaginative constructions have on our bodies as well as our natural and cultural environments (p. 10).

Methodology

A total of 1,800 translation students from Jordanian universities (public and private) participated voluntarily in the 2024–2025 academic year. The sample included diverse academic levels, genders, and experience levels, all enrolled in translation-related programs. A two-part online questionnaire assessed students’ familiarity with ecological terminology, translation challenges, strategies, use of reference tools, and views on training needs. Data were collected via institutional platforms and instructors. A pilot with 30 students refined the survey’s clarity. Analysis using SPSS (v29) included descriptive statistics and reliability testing, with Cronbach’s alpha values between 0.72–0.80, confirming acceptable internal consistency. Ethical approval was obtained from the Applied Science Private University (Code: FOAH 10/2024). Participants provided informed digital consent, with anonymity and confidentiality maintained throughout.

Results And Discussion

Sample Characteristics

The final sample included 1,800 translation and linguistics students from various Arab universities, representing both undergraduate and postgraduate levels with diverse experience in ecological topics and translation training. The survey captured a broad cross-section of student translators with varying academic backgrounds and interests in environmental discourse (Table 1).

Table 1. Demographic Summary of Participants (N = 1,800)

Variable	Category	Count	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	774	43.00%
	Female	990	55.00%
	Prefer not to say	36	2.00%
Academic Level	Undergraduate – Year 1	270	15.00%
	Undergraduate – Year 2	324	18.00%
	Undergraduate – Year 3	360	20.00%
	Undergraduate – Year 4	396	22.00%
	Postgraduate (MA)	450	25.00%

Translation Courses Taken	1 course	270	15.00%
	2–3 courses	522	29.00%
	4–5 courses	594	33.00%
	More than 5 courses	414	23.00%
Language Pair Practiced	Arabic to English	792	44.00%
	English to Arabic	522	29.00%
	Both directions equally	486	27.00%
Familiarity with Ecological Topics	Very familiar	198	11.00%
	Somewhat familiar	594	33.00%
	Slightly familiar	684	38.00%
	Not familiar at all	324	18.00%
Interest in Environmental Topics	Very interested	576	32.00%
	Somewhat interested	666	37.00%
	Neutral	396	22.00%
	Not interested	162	9.00%

The sample showed a female majority (55%) and an even distribution across academic levels, with 25% postgraduate students. About 56% had completed four or more translation courses, reflecting solid training exposure. Only 11% reported being very familiar with ecological topics, though over two-thirds ($\approx 67\%$) had some familiarity. Interest in environmental issues was strong, with 69% expressing moderate to high interest. Arabic-to-English translation was slightly more practiced than the reverse, while over 25% worked equally in both directions. These demographics establish a foundation for analyzing students' familiarity, challenges, strategies, and curricular perspectives on ecological translation.

Analysis of the Questionnaire's Items

This section analyzes responses to the 24-item questionnaire on students' engagement with ecological terminology in Arabic–English translation. The items cover six constructs: familiarity, preferred text types, challenges, strategies, use of resources, and training recommendations. Responses were rated on a 3-point Likert scale (1 = Disagree, 2 = Neutral, 3 = Agree), with Table 2 summarizing results by construct.

Table 2. Questionnaire Item Responses by Construct (N = 1,800)

Construct	No.	Questionnaire Item	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)
Familiarity with Ecological Terminology	1	I can recognize culturally rooted ecological expressions unique to Arabic literary texts.	62.4	24.8	12.8
	2	I am familiar with literary expressions related to environmental conditions in English.	66.1	21.2	12.7
	3	I understand the meaning of ecological imagery used in literary writing.	68.7	20.3	11
	4	I am aware of how ecological concepts are represented differently in Arabic and English literature.	60.8	26.1	13.1
Preferred Text Types for Practice	5	I prefer translating literary texts with environmental themes.	64.5	23.3	12.2
	6	I enjoy translating poetry with ecological imagery and symbolism.	57.6	27.8	14.6
	7	I find non-literary texts like reports more useful for learning ecological terminology.	52.2	30.1	17.7
	8	I enjoy translating essays that link environment with culture or philosophy.	59.3	28.6	12.1

Perceived Challenges in Ecological Translation	9	It is challenging to maintain the literary style of ecological expressions while translating.	71.4	18.2	10.4
	10	I often struggle to interpret symbolic ecological meanings in Arabic literary texts.	65.2	22.6	12.2
	11	Ecological expressions related to arid landscapes are hard to render in English.	69.7	20.5	9.8
	12	Modern environmental terms are difficult to translate due to limited presence in Arabic literature.	62.5	25.9	11.6
Translation Strategies for Ecological Terms	13	I try to find the closest equivalent in the target language.	70.3	18.7	11
	14	I use explanatory translation when no direct equivalent exists.	67.8	20.1	12.1
	15	I rely on context and tone to guide ecological translation choices.	66.9	21.4	11.7
Use of Reference Tools and Resources	16	I adapt ecological terms to fit the target culture.	63.1	23.9	13
	17	I regularly use bilingual/specialized dictionaries for ecological terms.	71.2	19	9.8
	18	I consult online resources to verify environmental terminology.	74.5	16.5	9
	19	I struggle to find reliable reference materials for ecological terms.	61.8	25.3	12.9
Recommendations for Training	20	I use previous translations or parallel texts to understand ecological terms.	69.6	20.2	10.2
	21	Translation courses should include more ecological/environmental texts.	77.3	15.6	7.1
	22	Students need training on culturally embedded ecological expressions.	74.9	17.8	7.3
	23	Strategies for metaphorical/symbolic nature language should be emphasized.	76.4	16.5	7.1
	24	Ecological translation should be treated as a specialized skill.	72.6	19	8.4

Most of the students have reported being very familiar with the ecological language. Item 3 had the most agreement (68.7%), which means that most of the students were able to identify images such as “green landscapes” or “barren deserts” as being related to ecology. Items 1 and 2 also got over 60% agreement, showing that there is quite a good amount of recognition for definite culturally-specific and environmental expressions in both Arabic and English. The lesser agreement on Item 4 (60.8%) indicates that an improvement space still exists in terms of understanding cross-linguistic representations of ecological concepts.

Students had clear preferences for kinds of texts, like literary and philosophical, instead of strictly informational texts. The majority (64.5%) preferred to translate literary texts bearing environmental themes (Item 5), while 59.3% found essays discussing cultural-ecological links also interesting to read (Item 8). Though 52.2% were convinced of finding those nonliterary texts useful (Item 7), the greater inclination towards poetry (57.6%) and storytelling indicates that students enjoy using metaphors and symbols in ecological language learning.

These items affirmed that ecological translation constituted major cognitive and linguistic challenges. The most agreed statement (Item 9, 71.4%) brought forth the issue of maintaining the literary style, while items 10 and 11 demonstrated the difficulty encountered by students with respect to symbolism as well as expressions associated with desert, both being quintessential within the Arabic literary ecology. Moreover, a majority (62.5%) also accepted that there were problems concerning newly emergent environmental lexis not

yet anchored in Arabic literary discourse (Item 12).

Students mostly reported adaptive and context-oriented strategies. Item 13 (70.3%) indicated that most participants resorted to the closest equivalents, and 67.8% (Item 14) employed explanatory translation whenever necessary. Contextual interpretation and cultural adaptation (Items 15 and 16) also had strong agreement, reflecting a flexible, reflective approach to translating nature-infused language.

Heavy dependance on reference tools. The majority of the students (74.5%) used the online resource regularly (Item 18) while 71.2% consulted dictionaries (Item 17). Parallel texts and their previous translations (Item 20) were equally many (69.6) used. But it was agreed by 61.8% that reliable ecological references are still hard to find (Item 19) indicating still a lot of resources available for this subfield.

There was strong support among students for the development of a curriculum in ecological translation. Integrating more eco-themed texts received the highest agreement (77.3%) along with demands for explicit training in cultural and metaphorical ecological language (Items 22 and 23, both above 74%). A clear majority (72.6%) was in agreement that ecological translation must be treated as a specialized area, indicating rising student interest in environmental topics within literary translation studies.

Discussion

Ecology as a discipline has its specific terminology that might be difficult to translate from one language to another. Arabic-English translation of ecological terminology presents many challenges because of the peculiar cultural diversity of the Arab world and the Anglo-American society where these ecological texts in both languages circulate. Ecological concepts cannot be judged by their terms on their surface but by the functions they play in the local ecological culture. The former does not impede the search for the nearest ecological term that reflects the same function or for an equivalent term within another culture. Cultures are open structures, and what is indigenous to a given culture can be further examined for its potential fit for another ecoculture.

Translators of ecological texts struggle with conveying in the receptor language the underlying ecological or cultural meanings. This becomes more troublesome when the ecological term has no equivalent in the receptor language. However, not only comparing ecological terms, but comparing the terms with respect to the culture itself is much more dependable due to this being more precise, and so increasing the accuracy of the translation. Diverse ecocultural settings are expected to produce different translations as a result of the different signifiers chosen. People from different nations have different perceptions of the world, and hence, language becomes an in-depth channel that reflects these differences.

Arabic cultures are not ecologically literate, which makes it difficult to integrate ecological concepts drawn from Western literature in an attempt to frame an Arab ecological science. A whole list of untranslated essential ecological terms, causing false comprehension and interpretation, can only mislead researchers and decision-makers with far-reaching repercussions for their worldviews. This is one of the most challenging functions of the efficient translator who wants to minimize the gap of false understanding and societies' rejection of some theoretical outcomes when misapplied on their land.

Translating ecological terminology between Arabic and English presents an array of linguistic challenges. Linguistic units related to the environment may carry diverse linguistic and linguistic-cultural implications, conveying subterranean senses that might not be covered in the relevant translation equivalents. One of the main snags is lexical gaps when an equivalent does not exist in the target language. Other linguistic disadvantages include polysemy, which allows for alternative meanings, and homonymy, which shares a similar form but has a different meaning. In these cases, ambiguity might occur. One way of overcoming these issues is by understanding the expression that carries the meaning of the source text. Also, jargon found in technical scientific literature is sometimes challenging for a non-expert, and creating a unified list of translated standard terms might be more troublesome in these cases due to variation and difficulty in source text bits.

A linguistically mismatched register might also create an obstacle for translation. Overspecificity can lead to difficulties for the target language audience. Furthermore, sometimes when translating the technical meaning, there can be a range of semantic coverage. Useful examples can streamline the process and provide resembling ecological contexts to show differences, and some of the ecology vocabulary and phrases might be similar to the translation equivalent in the other language. Because there is an array of ecological terms, translation challenges are common, and a broad understanding of the subject area is useful. Ecology is multidisciplinary,

with implications for many areas, and wrongly states that it forces humans into social organization relating to ecological life. This is a different dimension of cultural implications, but there is no translation equivalent. The terminology needs to consider the intra-disciplinary aspects as well. The difficulties surrounding ecology and translation can be overcome if the translator consults with someone who is familiar with the source environment under study. It is possible to make an educated decision if sufficient context is provided.

There are a number of difficulties related to translating ecological concepts and terms, in particular, and culturally related terms, in general, from one culture and language into another. Translation involves not only language transfer but also cultural reproduction within the text. A concept that represents an essential constituent of translation theory is the “interpretation of cultures.” The meanings of words and cultural concepts can vary in relation to the country in which they are produced as well as the country in which they are received. Translation from and into Arabic requires a contextual political background and social knowledge to apprehend the multiplicity of this linguistic and so-called cultural phenomenon. Our understanding of ecological terminology is integral to the people’s ecological history; each culture has its own respect related to wildlife conservation and management strategies.

Unfortunately, there are several translation issues that may lead to misunderstandings in cross-language discourses if the ecological terms are not translated properly. An ecological term is not static in its meaning; it presupposes a dynamic practical utilization. One of the dubious aspects among linguists and translators is the assumption that all languages in the world contain synonyms, i.e., words that carry the same meaning, and that their translation will not lead to any translation error because of mutual equivalence. Yet, this hollow assumption might be farther from the truth; there are practices associating the notions of the “First World,” “Third World,” and “Islam.” Hence, it is imperative for worldling translators practicing ecological translation to call for “holonic thinking.” In sum, ecological terms cannot be translated exactly word-for-word because their significance is so thoroughly entwined in the etymological and rhetorical structure of language. Therefore, ecological concerns must be explored within the context of their native culture, to which they are so integral.

Conclusion

In the Jordanian context, reception studies have encompassed a wide range of research, with numerous investigations conducted in both translation and non-translation fields to explore how audiences interpret and respond to texts (AbuRumman et al., 2025; Al-Salman & Haider, 2021; Al-Salman, Haider, & Saed, 2022; Almhasees et al., 2024; Haider & Al-Salman, 2020).

The foregoing discussion has touched upon some of the salient issues in literal and literary translation where ecological terminology comes into play. The motivation lies in expanding the dialogue between the conceptual and social directions in translation and the inherently complex task of deciding on accuracy or accommodation in translation. There is no single right answer, and the inconsistencies and room for interpretation and debate are entirely expected. As such, some transcendence greater than a dichotomous compromise of these paradigms must be achieved: an understanding that a dialogue between them, learning from practices in each case, should be at the forefront of the criterion of all responsible translators. All of these approaches, and many more, have been glimpsed and touched upon ever so briefly in this work. The complete study and understanding of this subject requires wider field research, triangulating the perspectives and complementarity between the terms in question.

The field is advancing quickly, as terminology is dynamic. Thus, translators are encouraged to evolve with the landscape—speaking authoritatively on an obscure ecosystem one day, only to evolve understanding and translate with a new philosophy from an ecological revolution. At all junctures, words matter and ought to be chosen with ecological literacy in reflection. These challenges have deep human, epistemic, and environmental impacts that deserve ongoing attention. With translators and scholars working in dialogue, the complexity of transposing foreign terminology through different media into new and distant cultural and environmental milieus can be unlocked to a greater effect in pure theory and in the practice of literary translation.

This analysis suggests that the challenges posed by scientific, ecological, and environmental language require a more forward-thinking approach to translation methodologies. Consequently, ‘usual’ translation practices, based on existing theoretical frameworks, must be either adjusted or subverted to meet the requirements of a new type of translation. A paradigm shift may be needed in terms of how translation studies account for the

challenges presented in translating highly contextual subject areas such as ecological discourse. Additionally, this research sheds light on the language that ecological terms used in the translations produce, given that languages and cultures are distinct, and this understanding may increase awareness of ecological and environmental issues. Here, translators act as ecological communicators. Finally, collaborations between linguists and other environmental and ecological professionals are essential not only to collaborate on translation studies research but also to improve public ecological literacy through various interactions between languages, translation studies, and other disciplines with a clear ecological focus. This data offers a theoretical position that revalues how translation studies can engrave its contribution to ecological understanding and advocacy and is offered to invigorate further considerations into how this area may develop and expand.

Ecological translation is an emerging field at the intersection of language, ecology, and the transmission of meaning between cultures. There is still much to be done. First, translators' resources—monolingual, bilingual, and encyclopedic—would be categorically useful. A systematic study about differences in the cultural understanding of single terminological items would remain to be done. Investigations into the differences between cultures in terms of the number of terms populating a cultural field and the history and continuous employment of these terms may show, even if in no way, the degree of cultural importance. What is still lacking is the concreteness of the terms concerned.

Interdisciplinary meetings between linguists, who are intrinsically concerned with language, and ecologists, who mainly deal with the human and natural world, should be organized to ensure fruitful interdisciplinary research. It may again be plausible to assert that ecological consistency should be more comprehensive to cater for the first and 'literal' part of a translation task. More in-depth and systematic research about how to translate ecological terms is expected to clarify the main question of translating ecological terms. It would install a translator's orientation towards what shall be translated and what may be left, and if left, how to render this controversial behavior of arbitrariness. Furthermore, research is required on how to translate ecological terms in the digital age. Digital resources, as well as the contributions of technology to translation, would be examined. The last research issues that crop up in my mind are how to build an ecological terms corpus or bank for translators, and if flora and other related scientific staff are included in such corpora, is it conceivable, and what is the proportion of the main term varieties to their related species in nature for the target language users? Cross-linguistic work between translators on ecological terms would be of much profit and good for a better understanding of this scientific discipline of ecological discourse.

Acknowledgment

This research received grant no. (490/2024) from the Arab Observatory for Translation (an affiliate of ALECSO), which is supported by the Literature, Publishing & Translation Commission in Saudi Arabia.

References

- AbuRumman, R., Haider, A. S., Dagamseh, M., Saed, H., Is-haqat, M., & Tair, S. A. (2025). Psycholinguistic Perspectives on Jordanian University Students' Attitudes toward Uncommon Arabic Personal Names. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(4), 66–77. doi:<https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i4.8849>
- Al-Abbas, L. S., & Haider, A. S. (2023). Incorporating Islamic Values Through Arabic Re-dubbing of the Animated Television Series “Detective Conan”. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 23(4), 41-56. doi:<https://doi.org/10.36923/jicc.v23i4.186>
- Al-Darabee, M., & Farghal, M. (2025). Veed. AI Arabic subtitling of English taboo expressions in the movie The Wolf of Wall Street. *Babel Revue internationale de la traduction / International Journal of Translation*, 71(2), 1-25. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.24193.far>
- Al-Salman, S., & Haider, A. S. (2021). Jordanian University Students' Views on Emergency Online Learning during COVID-19. *Online Learning*, 25(1), 286-302. doi:<https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v25i1.2470>
- Al-Salman, S., Haider, A. S., & Saed, H. (2022). The psychological impact of COVID-19's e-learning digital tools on Jordanian university students' well-being. *The Journal of Mental Health Training, Education and Practice*, 14(4), 342–354. doi:10.1108/JMHTEP-09-2021-0106
- Al Saideen, B., Haider, A. S., & Al-Abbas, L. S. (2022). Erotizing Nabokov's Lolita in Arabic: How Translation Strategies Shift Themes and Characterization of Literary Works. *Open Cultural Studies*, 6(1), 307-321. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1515/culture-2022-0163>
- Aldualimi, M., & Almahasees, Z. (2022). A Quantitative Analysis of the Reactions of Viewers to the Subtitling the Arabic Version of Ar-Risalah's Movie” The Message” in English. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 57(6), 1053-1063. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.57.6.91>
- Alkhawaldeh, M. (2024). Bioregionalism in Tayeb Salih's Season of Migration to the North: a postcolonial study. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1), 2373567.
- Almhasees, Z., Abu-Rayyash, H. K., Olimat, S. N., & Mahadin, D. K. (2024). An Analytical Study on Student Perceptions of Using ChatGPT in Language Translation. *Language Value*, 17(2), 1-23.
- Alrais, S., & Almahasee, Z. (2024). Subtitling Cross-Cultures: Unveiling Audience Reactions to the Subtitling of the Iraqi Action Movie” Mosul” into English. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(3), 347-347. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n3p347>
- Ammari, R., & Al-Ahmad, W. (2023). A corpus-based study of English synonyms: Small, little, tiny, and petite. *Jordan Journal of Applied Science-Humanities Series*, 36(2), 1-20. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35192/jjoas-h.v36i2.542>
- Bartlett, F. C. (1995). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Beecroft, A. (2015). *An ecology of world literature: from antiquity to the present day*: Verso Books.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02310555>
- Cronin, M. (2017). *Eco-translation: Translation and Ecology in the Age of the Anthropocene*: Routledge.
- Debbas, M., & Haider, A. S. (2020). Overcoming Cultural Constraints in Translating English Series: A Case Study of Subtitling Family Guy into Arabic. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature®*, 26(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.17576/3l-2020-2601-01>
- El-Zein, A., Jabbour, S., Tekce, B., Zurayk, H., Nuwayhid, I., Khawaja, M., . . . Yassin, N. (2014). Health and ecological sustainability in the Arab world: a matter of survival. *The Lancet*, 383(9915), 458-476.
- Elmusa, S. S. (2013). The Ecological Bedouin: toward environmental principles for the Arab region. *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics*(33).
- Farghal, M. (2005). Arabic euphemism in English translation. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*, 6(1), 57-70.
- Farghal, M. (2019). *Jordan's Proverbs as a Window into Arab Popular Culture: The Fox in the Blackberries*: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Haider, A. S., & Al-Salman, S. (2020). Dataset of Jordanian University Students' Psychological Health Impacted by Using E-learning Tools during COVID-19. *Data in Brief*, 32. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2020.106104>

- Haider, A. S., Saideen, B., & Hussein, R. F. (2023). Subtitling Taboo Expressions from a Conservative to a More Liberal Culture: The Case of the Arab TV Series Jinn. *Middle East Journal of Culture and Communication*, 1(aop), 1-23. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1163/18739865-tat00006>
- Halimah, A. M. (2018). Translation of Arabic Ecological Terms: An Eco-Cultural Approach. *International Journal of Comparative Literature and Translation Studies*, 6(2), 55-65.
- Harrison, K. D. (2023). Environmental linguistics. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 9(1), 113-134.
- Ja'afreh, N. (2023). A pragmatic contrastive analysis of apology strategies in Jordanian arabic and english language. *Jordan Journal of Applied Science-Humanities Series*, 37(2), 69-86. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35192/jjoas-h.v37i2.601>
- Mellinger, C. D., & Hanson, T. A. (2022). Considerations of ecological validity in cognitive translation and interpreting studies. *Translation, Cognition & Behavior*, 5(1), 1-26.
- Meqdad, S., Al-Bayyari, M., & Al-Taher, M. (2023). Semantic Disparity between Amr (Command) and Nahy (Negative Command) in the Noble Quran: An Interpretive/Contextual Study. *Jordan Journal of Applied Science-Humanities Series*, 36(1), 1-10. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35192/jjoas-h.v36i1.516>
- Samha, F., Haider, A. S., & Hussein, R. F. (2023). Address forms in Egyptian vernacular and their English equivalence: A translation-oriented study. *Ampersand*, 10, 1-12. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2023.100117>
- Scott, C. (2023). The ecological force and function of literary translation. *The Translator*, 29(4), 421-434.
- Sharqāwī, M., & al-Sharkawī, M. (2010). *The ecology of Arabic: A study of Arabicization* (Vol. 60): Brill.
- Silwadi, J., & Almahasees, Z. (2022). A Quantitative Analysis of the Viewers' reactions to the Subtitling and Dubbing of the Animated Movies, Cars, into Arabic. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 57(6), 965-973. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.57.6.82>
- Sinno, N. A. (2013). The greening of modern Arabic literature: An ecological interpretation of two contemporary Arabic novels. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, 20(1), 125-143.
- Zapf, H. (2008). Literary ecology and the ethics of texts. *New literary history*, 39(4), 847-868.