



REVIEW ARTICLE

Section: *Literature, Linguistics & Criticism*

Green marketing and demarketing: Ecolinguistics, ecotranslation, and brand credibility in tourism and hospitality

Ahmed S. Ajina^{1*}, Hebatallah A. M. Ahmed², Bassam Samir Al-Romeedy³, Hany Hosny Sayed Abdelhamied⁴ & Abdelrahman A. A. Abdelghani²

¹Marketing Department, College of Business Administration, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

²Applied College, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

³Tourism Studies Department, Faculty of Tourism and Hotels, University of Sadat City, Egypt

⁴Hospitality management department, faculty of tourism, King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

*Correspondence: a.ajina@psau.edu.sa

ABSTRACT

Tourism businesses increasingly ask customers to reconcile enjoyment with environmental responsibility. Green marketing encourages the selection of environmentally preferable services, while green demarketing asks people to reduce particular forms of consumption. Both depend on language, yet their credibility becomes especially uncertain when environmental commitments move between languages. This conceptual article connects ecolinguistics, ecotranslation, and brand credibility to explain that uncertainty. A focused synthesis of verified scholarship provides the basis for examining how promotional discourse represents ecological relationships and how translation preserves, weakens, or enlarges environmental claims. The article proposes ecological claim continuity as an analytical construct: the preservation across languages of a claim's referent, scope, evidential status, attribution of responsibility, and requested action. Six propositions explain how continuity may influence perceived credibility through comprehension and judgements of accountability, subject to operational evidence, translation visibility, and the fairness of consumption restrictions. Constructed examples demonstrate how modest linguistic changes can convert a limited commitment into an unsupported promise or turn voluntary conservation into an obligation. A research agenda combines aligned multilingual texts, audience experiments, and independent operational evidence. The central argument is that credible environmental communication requires consistency between what a brand says, what different audiences understand, and what the organisation can substantiate. Translation therefore belongs within sustainability governance as well as promotional practice. The proposed agenda supports SDG 12 and 13 and Saudi Vision 2030 RDI priorities in sustainable tourism, green marketing, and responsible cross-linguistic environmental communication.

KEYWORDS: green marketing, green demarketing, ecolinguistics, ecotranslation, brand credibility, SDGs, tourism, hospitality

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 7, Issue 4, 2026

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 28 June 2026

Accepted: 23 August 2026

Published: 13 September 2026

HOW TO CITE

Ajina, A. S., Ahmed, H. A. M., Al-Romeedy, B. S., Abdelhamied, H. H. S., & Abdelghani, A. A. (2026). Green marketing and demarketing: Ecolinguistics, ecotranslation, and brand credibility in tourism and hospitality. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.58256/1d2sg018>



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

© 2026 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.

1 Introduction

A hotel can invite guests to enjoy an apparently abundant natural environment while asking them to consume less water. A restaurant can celebrate generous hospitality while encouraging smaller orders. Such messages bring commercial promises into contact with ecological limits. Their success depends partly on whether customers understand the requested action and accept the organisation's reasons for proposing it. The wording matters because it allocates responsibility, establishes expectations, and indicates what the business is prepared to explain. In multilingual tourism, these functions must survive translation.

Green marketing and green demarketing address this tension differently. Green marketing promotes products or services on the basis of environmental attributes. Demarketing seeks to discourage or redirect demand, and green demarketing applies that purpose to environmentally consequential consumption. A business might promote refill facilities while discouraging disposable bottles, or recommend a smaller portion while allowing additional orders. The distinction concerns the direction and object of demand. Neither label establishes whether the underlying activity produces a net ecological benefit (Armstrong Soule & Reich, 2015; Reich & Soule, 2016).

Tourism makes this qualification particularly consequential. Environmental burdens extend beyond the visible service encounter to transport, construction, energy provision, and supply chains. Lenzen et al. (2018) demonstrated the importance of considering the broader footprint of tourism consumption. Sun et al. (2024) subsequently examined the drivers of tourism emissions, showing why growth in demand must be considered alongside efficiency improvements. These studies do not establish the effects of particular promotional messages. They establish the material context in which claims about greener travel require careful boundaries.

The same boundaries can become unstable across languages. A qualified claim about reducing laundry water use may be translated as a general promise to protect the environment. A target for future action may acquire the grammar of an existing achievement. A request for voluntary participation may become an instruction with no apparent choice. Each shift changes what the audience is invited to believe. A fluent translation can consequently preserve the commercial attractiveness of a message while changing its environmental accountability. Ecolinguistics provides a way to examine the ecological assumptions embedded in such discourse. Ecotranslation extends the inquiry to the movement of environmental meanings between linguistic and cultural settings. Brand credibility supplies a reception concept through which the consequences of these choices can be investigated. The connection is substantive: the ecological content of a promise, its reformulation across languages, and its perceived believability become parts of the same explanatory problem.

Existing scholarship already connects demarketing with consumer evaluations. Azazz et al. (2024), for example, investigated green demarketing, brand credibility, authenticity, and perceived greenwashing among restaurant customers in Egypt. Shao et al. (2025) examined how individual characteristics affect evaluations of green marketing and demarketing messages. Their contributions prevent any defensible claim that the relationship between demarketing and credibility is wholly unexplored. The present article instead develops a linguistic and translational explanation of how the content of the environmental promise may change before credibility is assessed.

Three questions organise the argument. How do green marketing and demarketing messages distribute ecological responsibility through language? Which translation changes alter the substantive meaning of those messages? Under what conditions might continuity across languages support credible brand judgements? The article addresses these questions through conceptual synthesis and explicitly constructed examples. Its contribution is an account of ecological claim continuity, accompanied by propositions and an empirical design capable of distinguishing communicative effectiveness from environmental achievement.

2 Conceptual research design

The article adopts theory synthesis and model development. Jaakkola (2020) explains that conceptual research requires an explicit rationale for the theories selected and the roles they perform. Here, ecolinguistics identifies the ecological implications of discourse, ecotranslation explains the responsibilities and constraints involved in transferring meaning, and brand credibility specifies an audience judgement that may follow. These perspectives operate at different analytical levels. Their integration therefore requires an explanation of the connections between textual features, translation decisions, and reception.

The literature was located through focused searches for the principal concepts and relevant combinations, including green demarketing and brand credibility, sustainability communication in tourism, ecological discourse analysis, and translation of tourism texts. Publisher pages, journal records, and DOI registration metadata were used to check bibliographic identity. Foundational studies were retained alongside more recent tourism research when they supplied a distinct conceptual or empirical contribution. The selection is purposive and does not constitute a systematic review, an exhaustive bibliometric map, or a reproducible estimate of the entire field. The synthesis proceeded by distinguishing constructs, identifying points of contact, and testing the proposed connections against plausible counterexamples. The argument considers, for instance, an accurate translation of a misleading source claim and an awkward translation of a well-supported one. These cases prevent translation quality from being equated with ecological responsibility or perceived credibility. Evidence reported by previous studies remains separate from the relationships proposed here.

No original customer responses, organisational records, or naturally occurring multilingual corpus were collected for this article. The examples are analytical constructions intended to isolate specific semantic and pragmatic changes. They cannot establish how frequently those changes occur or how actual audiences respond. The propositions are accordingly stated as relationships requiring empirical examination. The research agenda specifies how textual observations, audience judgements, and environmental records could be combined without treating one as a substitute for another.

3 Theoretical foundations

3.1 Green marketing and the problem of consumption

Green marketing becomes conceptually weak when environmental vocabulary merely decorates an unchanged sales strategy. Peattie and Crane (2005) criticised practices that reduced its transformative promise to opportunistic promotion. Their argument remains useful because the environmental merit of a service cannot be established by the presence of words such as natural or responsible. Claims need identifiable objects and grounds. A hotel's refill system, energy supply, procurement arrangements, and visitor transport options involve different processes and require different evidence.

Green demarketing introduces a further question: what, precisely, is being reduced? Armstrong Soule and Reich (2015) examined the possibility of discouraging category consumption while maintaining a favourable position for the focal brand. Reich and Soule (2016) compared appeals encouraging greener purchasing with appeals encouraging less consumption. The distinction helps explain why demarketing need not amount to a business abandoning demand. Its ecological interpretation depends on whether the reduced activity is materially significant and whether other consumption replaces it.

A hotel may reduce routine linen changes while increasing occupancy. A restaurant may reduce plate waste while expanding the volume of meals served. Those developments are compatible with improvements in resource intensity and increases in total resource use. The present framework therefore distinguishes reduced consumption per service encounter from absolute reductions across operations. Peattie and Peattie's (2009) consideration of social marketing and consumption reduction supports treating the object of behavioural change as a substantive issue rather than an incidental advertising choice.

3.2 Ecolinguistics as ecological evaluation of discourse

Alexander and Stibbe (2014) distinguish the ecological analysis of discourse from simply analysing texts about environmental topics. The distinction means that tourism discourse requires examination even when it contains no explicit green vocabulary. An advertisement presenting unlimited consumption as the natural expression of a successful holiday can carry ecological implications through its assumptions about desire, entitlement, and abundance. Ecolinguistics asks how those assumptions position people in relation to other living beings and the physical environments on which they depend.

Stibbe (2021) supplies an analytical vocabulary that includes framing, metaphor, evaluation, identity, erasure, salience, and narrative. These categories direct attention to how discourse makes some relationships visible while marginalising others. Their use also requires an explicit evaluative position. For this article, ecological evaluation prioritises the maintenance of life-supporting systems, accountable resource use, and fair distributions of environmental responsibility. This stated orientation makes the normative basis of the analysis

open to criticism.

Applied to tourism, the approach prompts questions about the representation of destinations as inhabited environments. A coastline can appear as an empty setting for personal enjoyment or as a shared space involving residents, livelihoods, and vulnerable habitats. Neither interpretation follows mechanically from a single noun. The analyst must examine the surrounding discourse, including images, recurrent descriptions, and the actions offered to customers. A critical reading consequently needs textual evidence and contextual restraint; it cannot infer corporate intentions from an isolated adjective.

3.3 Ecotranslation and ecological responsibility

Cronin's (2017) account of eco-translation places translation within the environmental conditions and material interdependencies of the contemporary world. His earlier discussion of translation, ecology, and food further connects linguistic mediation with the cultural and ecological relations through which food circulates (Cronin, 2015). These contributions make ecotranslation relevant to hospitality without reducing it to terminology management. Translating a menu or a conservation message can affect which relationships between production, consumption, and place remain available to the reader.

Hu's (2020) eco-translatology develops a distinct approach organised around adaptation, selection, and the translator's relationship with the translational environment. Its ecological vocabulary should not be treated as interchangeable with an environmental critique of commercial discourse. Adaptation to communicative conditions can improve a translation's acceptability, but acceptability alone does not establish ecological merit. The present synthesis uses Hu to recognise institutional and cultural constraints on translators, while drawing on Cronin to retain a substantive concern with environmental responsibility.

Ecotranslation is used here to describe environmentally accountable mediation across languages. It involves preserving relevant ecological meaning, identifying consequential omissions, and questioning instructions that would enlarge unsupported claims. This does not authorise translators to insert their own environmental programme. It requires them to identify discrepancies and seek clarification through an accountable editorial process. A translation can be culturally appropriate and persuasive while still retaining the source claim's limits and evidential status.

3.4 Brand credibility and its limits

Erdem and Swait (2004) conceptualise brand credibility through trustworthiness and expertise, relating it to brand consideration and choice. For environmental communication, these dimensions concern whether audiences believe the organisation is willing and able to fulfil its stated commitments. They must remain distinct from liking a brand, finding its message attractive, or perceiving it as environmentally responsible. A pleasant advertisement can evoke positive feelings without providing a believable basis for a particular environmental promise.

Credibility is also a perception. Delmas and Burbano (2011) examine conditions that encourage discrepancies between environmental communication and performance. Chen and Chang (2013) connect greenwashing with green trust through consumer confusion and perceived risk. Together, these contributions support separating the audience's confidence from the quality of the evidence available. A successful persuasive message can increase confidence in an inadequately supported claim. The proposed framework therefore treats perceived brand credibility and the substantiation of environmental claims as related but independent objects of inquiry.

4 Ecolinguistic mechanisms in tourism communication

4.1 Agency and shared responsibility

Grammatical agency determines who appears responsible for action. Consider the difference between an appeal asking guests to save water and a statement describing how the hotel has changed its water systems before inviting guest participation. Both may encourage conservation, but they represent different distributions of obligation. The first leaves organisational action unspecified. The second makes a corporate commitment available for scrutiny. The analytical issue is whether responsibility is shared and supported by evidence, not whether one grammatical form is universally superior.

Pronouns require similar attention. An inclusive we may create cooperation, but its reference can remain uncertain. It might include management, employees, guests, or the wider destination community. A statement that we are reducing waste becomes more accountable when readers can determine who is acting and which practices are changing. Translation can alter that reference by omitting a subject, introducing an institutional voice, or making the customer the sole agent. Such changes connect sentence structure directly to the substance of the environmental appeal.

4.2 Scale and the boundaries of a claim

Environmental predicates need a scale. Reduced water use in laundry is a narrower claim than reduced water use across a resort; neither establishes the sustainability of the holiday as a whole. The framework therefore treats the referent and scope of a claim as essential analytical features. A brand may accurately report a local improvement while creating an expansive impression through an unqualified headline. The relation between headline, explanatory text, and supporting documentation must be examined together.

Metaphors of purity and untouched nature deserve particular attention when they detach an enjoyable experience from its infrastructural conditions. A destination's appeal can depend on water treatment, imported food, roads, and maintenance labour that remain outside the promotional scene. The proposed analysis asks whether these omissions are relevant to the environmental promise being made. No short advertisement can represent every supply chain. The critical threshold is reached when absent information materially changes the reasonable interpretation of the stated claim.

4.3 Evaluation and the moralisation of restraint

Demarketing often needs to make reduced consumption compatible with an enjoyable stay. Smaller portions can be associated with freshness, choice, or reduced leftovers. Reduced room servicing can be presented as an optional contribution to resource conservation. These evaluations may help customers understand a change, but they can also conceal a transfer of costs. If guests surrender a service while the organisation discloses neither its own contribution nor the distribution of savings, the appeal may be interpreted as a commercial convenience clothed in environmental language.

Goldstein et al. (2008) demonstrated that social norm messages could influence towel reuse in hotel settings. Their study establishes the importance of message design for a specific behaviour; it does not establish that every norm-based request is fair or environmentally comprehensive. In this article's proposed application, normative appeals require truthful reference groups and accessible choices. Describing responsible guests in a way that shames people with disability-related or practical needs would introduce an ethical problem even if the message increased aggregate participation.

4.4 Silence and uneven disclosure

Environmental communication can fail through omission as well as exaggeration. Font et al. (2017) investigate greenhushing, the deliberate undercommunication of sustainability practices by tourism businesses. Their work cautions against treating communication volume as a direct indicator of organisational performance. The multilingual extension proposed here is that disclosure may be uneven across audiences: one language version may contain explanations and limitations that another lacks. Such asymmetry could arise from cost, outdated content, or editorial priorities. Establishing deliberate concealment would require additional evidence about production decisions.

5 Ecotranslation and ecological claim continuity

5.1 Defining continuity across languages

Ecological claim continuity is proposed as the extent to which different language versions preserve the environmentally consequential commitments of a message. Five components define it: the activity or object described, the boundaries of the claim, its evidential and temporal status, the allocation of responsibility, and the action requested from the reader. Continuity does not require identical syntax or literal equivalence. It requires that audiences receive substantively comparable information about what is being claimed and what remains uncertain.

This construct differs from general translation quality. Pierini (2007) examines translation quality in tourism websites, while Durán Muñoz (2012) analyses recurrent problems in tourist text translation. Their studies establish the need for attention to communicative context and specialised discourse. The present proposal narrows that concern to changes affecting ecological commitments. A translation could score well for readability and terminology while deleting a qualification that determines whether an environmental claim is defensible. Conversely, stylistic awkwardness may coexist with accurate preservation of the claim.

5.2 Scope and evidential status

A claim about selected suppliers must not become a claim about every supplier. A reduction measured against a particular baseline must retain that comparison. Expressions such as aims to, has begun, and has achieved refer to different stages of action. Their deletion can transform an aspiration into a reported outcome. The analysis therefore requires attention to modality, tense, quantification, comparison, and the placement of limitations. These are consequential linguistic choices because they determine what evidence would be needed to support the translated statement.

An equally serious shift occurs when evidence becomes less accessible. A source message may link to a report explaining the measurement period and exclusions, while the translated page offers only the promotional sentence. The sentence can remain semantically accurate but become harder to evaluate in practice. Ecological claim continuity consequently includes the availability of essential explanatory context. A translated summary may be sufficient when it preserves the relevant limits and provides a usable route to the supporting material.

5.3 Cultural adaptation and responsible restraint

Hospitality norms can affect the acceptability of demarketing. In settings where abundant food communicates generosity, a direct instruction to eat less may suggest poor hospitality or judgement about personal conduct. A culturally responsive translation could instead explain ordering flexibility and the option to request additional portions. That adaptation changes the rhetorical approach while preserving the practical goal of avoiding unwanted food. It remains accountable if the restaurant actually provides the flexibility described.

English–Arabic communication offers a useful illustrative setting, although neither language corresponds to a homogeneous culture. Words associated with moderation, care, or waste may have ethical and religious associations for some audiences. Those associations cannot be presumed for every reader or used as a substitute for environmental evidence. Translators should avoid adding moral authority absent from the source merely because it might increase compliance. Cultural resonance needs audience testing and institutional justification, particularly when it changes the force of a request.

5.4 Translator agency and organisational constraints

Translators seldom control the entire environmental message. Marketing departments commission copy, sustainability staff hold technical information, local agencies adapt campaigns, and digital teams manage updates. A translator may be asked to improve a vague source without access to the evidence required to clarify it. Hu's (2020) attention to the translational environment helps locate such choices within a wider production system. Accountability should therefore examine the brief, available documentation, revision process, and decision authority rather than attributing every discrepancy to an individual translator.

The proposed response is a documented procedure for consequential queries. If a source claims that a service is carbon neutral without specifying its basis, the translator should flag the ambiguity and request approved clarification. Silent amplification would increase the claim; silent correction could misrepresent the organisation's authorised position. Recording the query and the agreed wording makes the decision inspectable. Shared terminology is useful, but preserving claim boundaries requires explanatory notes and access to subject specialists as well.

Some campaigns are written collaboratively in several languages, so a single authoritative source may never exist. In that situation, accountability should attach to a shared record of the environmental commitment rather than to the priority of one language. The record would identify the practice, approved evidence, qualifications, and available customer choices. Writers could then develop culturally appropriate versions against that common basis. This arrangement also avoids assuming that English is inherently more precise

or authoritative than another language. Disagreements between versions would be resolved by checking the commitment and its evidence, with the reasons for revisions recorded. The ecological question remains what each audience is being promised and whether the organisation can justify that promise in practice.

5.5 Meaning across platforms and images

Ecological commitments also depend on how text appears alongside images and interface choices. A short caption may describe a single conservation project while a surrounding montage suggests comprehensive environmental protection. Translating the caption accurately does not necessarily preserve the interpretation of the whole page. The proposed framework therefore requires attention to the communicative setting in which readers encounter the claim. Visual analysis should identify a demonstrable relation between image and wording rather than assume that any photograph of nature constitutes a misleading environmental promise.

Platform differences create another difficulty. A qualification visible on a desktop page may disappear within a shortened mobile message, while a booking button may separate the claim from its explanation. These changes can occur within one language as well as between languages. Researchers should distinguish translation effects from redesign effects and examine the version actually presented to the audience. Maintaining the same environmental commitment across formats may require rewriting, repositioning an explanation, or reducing the prominence of a headline that cannot be adequately qualified.

6 An integrated framework and research propositions

The framework begins with an environmental practice and the claim made about it. Ecolinguistic choices give that claim a particular account of consumption, agency, and ecological consequence. Translation then produces another version under linguistic, cultural, and organisational constraints. Audiences interpret the resulting message in relation to prior knowledge and experience. Perceived credibility emerges from that interpretation, while the factual adequacy of the claim remains open to independent assessment. These stages identify possible relationships rather than a sequence demonstrated by the present article.

Proposition 1 concerns interpretability. Where adequate supporting evidence exists, environmental claims that identify their object, scope, and responsible actor are expected to support more accurate comprehension than otherwise comparable vague claims. Better comprehension may support credibility when it allows audiences to recognise a defensible commitment. The qualification matters: making an inadequate claim more explicit can expose its weaknesses. Increased specificity is therefore expected to improve the calibration of credibility to evidence, rather than invariably increase favourable evaluations.

Proposition 2 concerns translation. Greater ecological claim continuity is expected to reduce differences between language groups in their comprehension of the same environmental commitment, provided that linguistic accessibility is comparable. This proposition links translation to understanding before making any claim about persuasion. A technically accurate rendering that readers cannot understand may perform poorly. Continuity and accessibility should therefore be measured separately, with neither treated as an automatic proxy for the other.

Proposition 3 concerns substantiation. The relationship between ecological claim continuity and appropriately favourable credibility judgements is expected to depend on the adequacy of the source claim. When the source is supported, continuity can preserve information that warrants confidence. When the source is misleading, accurate transfer can reproduce the same problem in another language. A faithful translation can consequently transmit greenwashing. This counterexample establishes why environmental review must address source content before judging the ecological responsibility of its translation.

Proposition 4 concerns visibility. Discrepancies across languages are expected to reduce perceived credibility more strongly when audiences encounter both versions or receive evidence of the discrepancy. Readers who see only one version cannot ordinarily identify a translation omission as such. They may nevertheless misunderstand the claim because of it. The proposition separates the effect of changed

content on comprehension from the effect of discovered inconsistency on trustworthiness, allowing the two mechanisms to be examined independently.

Proposition 5 concerns demarketing fairness. A consumption-reduction request is expected to receive more favourable credibility judgements when organisational commitments are visible, the requested burden is proportionate, and reasonable alternatives remain accessible. If the same request appears to transfer costs or deny an expected service, credibility may deteriorate. The relevance of audience differences is consistent with Shao et al. (2025), but the proposed fairness mechanism requires direct testing. It should not be inferred solely from age, income, or nationality.

Proposition 6 concerns organisational practice. Access to environmental documentation, an agreed procedure for consequential translation queries, and coordinated updating are expected to improve ecological claim continuity relative to workflows lacking those provisions. This proposition locates prevention within the production system. It can be assessed through revision records and aligned texts without presuming an immediate increase in brand credibility. A better documented process may initially remove attractive but unsupported statements, producing more restrained communication.

Taken together, the propositions specify a conditional account. Translation influences the information available to audiences; the evidential quality of that information and the fairness of the requested action influence whether confidence is warranted. The framework does not imply that communication controls consumption by itself. White et al. (2019) identify psychological and contextual considerations in sustainable behaviour change, including habits and the tangibility of consequences. Practical opportunities, service arrangements, and convenience can therefore interrupt any relationship between a credible message and actual participation.

7 Constructed illustrations of translation choices

The following examples were composed for this article. They are neither quotations from tourism businesses nor evidence of practices in a particular country. Romanised Arabic is accompanied by an English back-translation for readers who do not know Arabic. The purpose is to isolate the consequences of selected changes; the examples have not undergone audience testing. English is used as the source language for convenience, and the same analytical questions would apply when Arabic or another language supplies the source.

7.1 Turning an intention into an achievement

Source message: “We aim to reduce water use in our laundry.” A meaning-preserving Arabic rendering is “Nas’ā ilā taqlīl istikhdām al-miyāh fī maghsalatīnā,” meaning “We seek to reduce water use in our laundry.” Compare the altered version “Nuḥāfīz ‘alā al-bī’ah fī jamī’ khadamātīnā,” meaning “We protect the environment in all our services.” The latter expands the referent from laundry water to the environment generally, removes the status of intention, and extends the claim to all services.

The altered version may sound natural, yet it requires a different evidential basis. The source describes a goal in one operational area; the adaptation represents comprehensive environmental protection as an existing practice. The analytical finding is confined to this constructed pair: the versions make different commitments. Whether guests notice the difference or find the broader version more credible is an empirical question. Ecotranslation evaluation should record the shift even if an audience experiment later finds greater persuasion.

7.2 Preserving hospitality while discouraging waste

Source message: “Order a smaller portion first; you can request more.” A corresponding rendering is “Uṭlub ḥiṣṣatan aṣghar awwalan; yumkinuka ṭalab al-mazīd,” meaning “Order a smaller portion first; you can request more.” The second clause matters because it preserves choice and explains how restraint remains compatible with adequate food. Removing it changes the practical understanding of the request, even when the first clause is accurately translated.

An alternative adaptation might invite guests to begin with a portion suited to their appetite and explain that additional food is available. Such wording could preserve the purpose while changing the tone. Its suitability

depends on the actual service arrangement, including whether additional portions incur charges and whether those charges are disclosed. Translation cannot responsibly promise flexibility that the restaurant does not offer. Nor should reducing food waste be confused with making a judgement about a guest's nutritional needs or body size.

7.3 Replacing choice with obligation

Source message: "You may choose a refillable bottle." A corresponding Arabic version is "Yumkinuka ikhtiyār zujājah qābilah li-i'ādat al-ta'bi'ah," meaning "You can choose a refillable bottle." Compare "Yajibu 'alayka istikhdam zujājah qābilah li-i'ādat al-ta'bi'ah," meaning "You must use a refillable bottle." The lexical object is preserved, but the modal force changes from an available option to a requirement. That change affects the service promise as well as the environmental message.

Neither modality is inherently inappropriate. A venue may legitimately require reusable containers under its stated operating arrangements. The problem arises when one language represents the arrangement as optional and another represents it as compulsory. Customers then receive unequal information about their choices. The example demonstrates why ecological claim continuity includes requested action and obligation. It also shows why a terminology-only quality check would miss an important discrepancy: both versions use the same expression for the bottle.

8 An empirical research agenda

8.1 Building an aligned multilingual corpus

A future study could assemble paired language versions from hotel websites, restaurant menus, destination campaigns, booking interfaces, and conservation notices. The sampling frame should identify the geographical scope, sectors, languages, and collection period before retrieval begins. Sampling only organisations that prominently describe themselves as green would obscure businesses that communicate little and would limit conclusions to that selected group. Including different levels of environmental disclosure would permit a more informative comparison, while the sampling rationale should remain proportionate to the research questions. Each record should retain the original text, its apparent counterpart, collection date, page context, and relevant images or evidence links. Researchers should determine whether the texts are translations, independently written adaptations, or uncertain counterparts. Similar messages on two pages do not establish a source–target relationship. Where production history is unavailable, the analysis should describe cross-language correspondence rather than assert a translation direction. Version changes must also be considered before treating a discrepancy as a stable organisational practice.

The primary unit of analysis would be a claim in its immediate context. Coding should distinguish changes to referent, scope, temporal or evidential status, agency, and requested action. Additional codes could record whether explanatory material remains accessible and whether an omission affects interpretation. Independent bilingual coding, disagreement analysis, and transparent decision rules would help prevent impressionistic judgements. Frequency estimates should use clearly defined denominators, and uncertainty should be retained where the evidence does not support a confident classification.

The components of continuity should initially be treated as a structured profile rather than a validated psychological scale. Omitting an actor and changing an achieved reduction into a future target are different events, and there is no reason to assume they must correlate. Researchers should report the types and consequences of discrepancies before proposing a composite index. If weights are eventually introduced, their rationale should be transparent and tested against alternative specifications. A measure that rewards several minor similarities must not conceal one change that fundamentally alters the environmental commitment. Expert assessment and audience comprehension can inform severity judgements, but those sources of evidence should remain distinguishable.

8.2 Testing audience mechanisms

A preregistered experiment could vary claim continuity and evidential quality while holding the underlying service, visual presentation, and language difficulty as constant as possible. Separate conditions could present one language version or reveal both versions. This design would distinguish misunderstanding caused by

altered content from distrust caused by discovering inconsistency. Researchers should pretest the materials with speakers of the relevant languages and document whether manipulations inadvertently change politeness, length, or perceived service quality.

Primary outcomes should include claim comprehension and perceived brand credibility. Comprehension questions would ask what activity is covered, whether the statement describes a target or achievement, and what choice remains available. Credibility measurement should distinguish trustworthiness and expertise, drawing on Erdem and Swait (2004), while testing whether adapted items suit the tourism context. Perceived greenwashing, fairness, and behavioural intentions could be secondary outcomes. A favourable answer to a credibility item should never be coded as proof that the organisation's claim is true.

Cross-language comparison requires evidence that the measures operate comparably. Vandenberg and Lance (2000) explain the importance of measurement invariance for substantive group comparisons. Researchers should investigate translation equivalence and response processes before comparing scale means. Language proficiency, prior environmental knowledge, and previous experience with the brand are plausible covariates. They should be specified in advance rather than selected because they produce convenient results. Sample size should follow the planned contrasts and a justified smallest effect of interest, with allowance for exclusions and interaction tests.

8.3 Connecting perception with operational evidence

A further stage should examine the environmental practice supporting each claim. Depending on the activity, relevant records might concern laundry water use, food waste, procurement, or visitor transport. Measurements need explicit periods, denominators, and boundaries. A reduction per occupied room differs from a reduction in total consumption. Where evidence cannot be accessed, the correct classification is unverified within the study, not necessarily false. Researchers should distinguish insufficient disclosure from a demonstrated contradiction. Field research could then assess whether changes in communication influence observed choices or resource use. Random allocation at an appropriate organisational level would be preferable where feasible, with analysis accounting for clustering and concurrent service changes. The aim would be to determine whether improved understanding leads to useful participation under actual conditions. Researchers must retain the possibility that a clearer message improves comprehension without changing behaviour, or that a behavioural change produces little measurable environmental benefit.

9 Theoretical and practical implications

The first theoretical implication is that translation can be specified as a mechanism in sustainability communication rather than treated as a background service. Tölkes (2018) reviews sustainability communication in tourism, while Font and McCabe (2017) examine the contexts and contradictions of sustainability marketing in the sector. The present framework extends these concerns by identifying the environmental commitment that must remain interpretable across languages. It explains where communication can change and separates that change from subsequent audience evaluation.

The second implication concerns the relationship between marketing and ecological restraint. Fletcher et al. (2019) locate tourism within debates about degrowth and the consequences of continued expansion. A brand may acquire credibility for discouraging a visible form of waste while leaving larger growth commitments unexplained. An ecolinguistic approach can make that difference analytically explicit. The purpose is not to require every customer notice to become a comprehensive environmental report. It is to prevent a narrow achievement from being interpreted as a complete account of organisational sustainability.

For managers, the framework suggests that translation briefs should include the evidence behind claims, approved qualifications, the actual service arrangement, and a named route for resolving uncertainty. Environmental specialists should review the substantive commitment, while language specialists assess meaning and usability. Translated pages should be updated when the source changes, and customers should be able to reach relevant explanations in a language they understand. These provisions support traceability without requiring identical expression across markets.

For translators and educators, ecological claim continuity provides a focused basis for training. Students can compare fluent alternatives and explain which differences affect accountability. Assessment can then reward

accurate handling of scope, modality, and responsibility as well as idiomatic language. Such work is especially useful when tourism translation is taught as persuasive writing: the most attractive version may enlarge a claim beyond its evidence. Professional competence includes recognising that possibility and knowing how to raise it constructively.

Demarketing decisions also affect employees and destination residents. Reduced servicing can change work schedules, while restrictions on visitor activities can redistribute income and access. A message focused exclusively on the guest may leave these consequences unexamined. The framework therefore invites consultation with people who implement or bear the costs of the policy. Their accounts can identify practical conditions missing from promotional copy and prevent shared responsibility from becoming an empty phrase. Environmental communication should make room for such evidence even when it complicates an appealing brand narrative.

10 Limitations

The article offers a conceptual framework, not validated findings about tourism audiences or translation practices. Its purposive literature selection cannot establish the prevalence of a research gap across all languages or disciplines. Some foundational sources address general marketing or translation rather than tourism specifically, so their transfer to hospitality is argued here and remains open to empirical revision. The constructed examples isolate particular linguistic changes but lack the visual, institutional, and interpersonal complexity of actual encounters.

The proposed construct also requires refinement. Its five components may overlap, and their relative importance could differ by claim and audience. A missing qualification may be decisive in one context and recoverable from surrounding information in another. A single continuity score could conceal these differences; initial studies should therefore report component-level observations. Finally, the framework prioritises ecological accountability and fairness. Other legitimate perspectives may emphasise accessibility, cultural autonomy, or commercial viability differently. Making those evaluative commitments explicit enables debate without pretending that textual analysis alone resolves competing interests.

11 Conclusion

Green marketing and demarketing become more analytically precise when their environmental promises are examined as language that travels between audiences. Ecolinguistics reveals how that language represents consumption and assigns responsibility. Ecotranslation directs attention to the decisions through which those representations are preserved or altered. Brand credibility identifies an audience judgement whose relationship to evidence must remain visible throughout the analysis.

Ecological claim continuity connects these concerns by specifying what needs to survive translation: the object and boundaries of the claim, its evidential status, the responsible actors, and the action expected of the reader. The six propositions explain why continuity may improve understanding without automatically increasing trust or producing ecological benefits. Credibility is defensible when the audience's confidence corresponds to a commitment that the organisation can substantiate. For tourism and hospitality, the practical task is therefore to make environmental promises understandable, comparable across languages, and answerable to the conditions under which services are actually delivered. Also, the proposed agenda supports SDG 12 and 13 and Saudi Vision 2030 RDI priorities in sustainable tourism, green marketing, and responsible cross-linguistic environmental communication.

Funding: The authors extend their appreciation to Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University for funding this research work through the project number (Project number: PSAU/2026/02/46486).

References

- Alexander, R., & Stibbe, A. (2014). From the analysis of ecological discourse to the ecological analysis of discourse. *Language Sciences*, 41, 104–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2013.08.011>
- Armstrong Soule, C. A., & Reich, B. J. (2015). Less is more: Is a green demarketing strategy sustainable? *Journal of Marketing Management*, 31(13–14), 1403–1427. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2015.1059874>
- Azazz, A. M. S., Elshaer, I. A., Al Thani, A., Algezawy, M., Mahrous, A. A., Mansour, M. A., Abdel Moneim, A., & Fayyad, S. (2024). The influence of green demarketing on brand credibility, green authenticity, and greenwashing in the food industry. *Sustainability*, 16(21), Article 9215. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16219215>
- Chen, Y.-S., & Chang, C.-H. (2013). Greenwash and green trust: The mediation effects of green consumer confusion and green perceived risk. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114(3), 489–500. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1360-0>
- Cronin, M. (2015). The moveable feast: Translation, ecology and food. *The Translator*, 21(3), 244–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2015.1103094>
- Cronin, M. (2017). *Eco-translation: Translation and ecology in the age of the Anthropocene*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315689357>
- Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. *California Management Review*, 54(1), 64–87. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64>
- Durán Muñoz, I. (2012). Analysing common mistakes in translations of tourist texts (Spanish, English and German). *Onomázein*, (26), 335–349. <https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.26.12>
- Erdem, T., & Swait, J. (2004). Brand credibility, brand consideration, and choice. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(1), 191–198. <https://doi.org/10.1086/383434>
- Fletcher, R., Murray Mas, I., Blanco-Romero, A., & Blázquez-Salom, M. (2019). Tourism and degrowth: An emerging agenda for research and praxis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(12), 1745–1763. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1679822>
- Font, X., Elgammal, I., & Lamond, I. (2017). Greenhushing: The deliberate under communicating of sustainability practices by tourism businesses. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(7), 1007–1023. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1158829>
- Font, X., & McCabe, S. (2017). Sustainability and marketing in tourism: Its contexts, paradoxes, approaches, challenges and potential. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(7), 869–883. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1301721>
- Goldstein, N. J., Cialdini, R. B., & Griskevicius, V. (2008). A room with a viewpoint: Using social norms to motivate environmental conservation in hotels. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(3), 472–482. <https://doi.org/10.1086/586910>
- Hu, G. (2020). *Eco-translatology: Towards an eco-paradigm of translation studies*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-2260-4>
- Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: Four approaches. *AMS Review*, 10(1–2), 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0>
- Lenzen, M., Sun, Y.-Y., Faturay, F., Ting, Y.-P., Geschke, A., & Malik, A. (2018). The carbon footprint of global tourism. *Nature Climate Change*, 8(6), 522–528. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0141-x>
- Peattie, K., & Crane, A. (2005). Green marketing: Legend, myth, farce or prophesy? *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 8(4), 357–370. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13522750510619733>
- Peattie, K., & Peattie, S. (2009). Social marketing: A pathway to consumption reduction? *Journal of Business Research*, 62(2), 260–268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.033>
- Pierini, P. (2007). Quality in web translation: An investigation into UK and Italian tourism web sites. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, (8), 85–103. <https://doi.org/10.26034/cm.jostrans.2007.700>
- Reich, B. J., & Soule, C. A. A. (2016). Green demarketing in advertisements: Comparing “buy green” and “buy less” appeals in product and institutional advertising contexts. *Journal of Advertising*, 45(4), 441–458. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2016.1214649>

- Shao, X., Jeong, E., Zhang, X., & Jang, S. (2025). Green marketing versus demarketing: The impact of individual characteristics on consumers' evaluations of green messages. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 49(1), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10963480221147054>
- Stibbe, A. (2021). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367855512>
- Sun, Y.-Y., Faturay, F., Lenzen, M., Gössling, S., & Higham, J. (2024). Drivers of global tourism carbon emissions. *Nature Communications*, 15, Article 10384. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-54582-7>
- Tölkes, C. (2018). Sustainability communication in tourism – A literature review. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 27, 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2018.04.002>
- Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 3(1), 4–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810031002>
- White, K., Habib, R., & Hardisty, D. J. (2019). How to SHIFT consumer behaviors to be more sustainable: A literature review and guiding framework. *Journal of Marketing*, 83(3), 22–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242919825649>