

The Ecology of Evaluation Stories: Good and Bad Climate Stories in Weather Reporting

Muhammad Saleem

PhD Scholar, Air University, Islamabad

Naveed Ur Rehman Khattak

Associate Professor, Air University, Islamabad

Keywords

- Climate
- Evaluation
- Framing
- Reports
- Weather

Abstract

Language ecology views language as part of a dynamic system in which meanings emerge through interaction with social and environmental realities. This research aims to analyze how “good” and “bad” evaluative language in weather reports form opinions of people. The study used qualitative ecolinguistic examination based on Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005) within the Six Stories We Live By framework (Stibbe, 2015). The study carries out the thorough textual analysis of 300 weather reports of five news agencies i.e. Al-Jazeera, British Broadcasting Corporation, Cable News Network, Deutsche Welle, and G News Network. Close reading was used as the primary analytical method, with repeated readings to identify and refine evaluative patterns in weather reports using Appraisal Theory. Findings suggest that CNN and BBC depend on highly dramatic, fear-provoking assessments that uphold disastrous ecological stories. Contrariwise, DW and GNN implement an ambivalent evaluation pattern of emphasis, which transgresses economic effects or institutional awareness but does not involve underlying environmental structures. Al Jazeera has a relatively reflective tone, which at times attributes unusual weather to being rare and institutionally relevant, which is directed to a more positive story. The result shows that CNN and BBC predominantly construct bad evaluative climate narratives, DW and GNN rely mainly on neutral institutional and economic evaluations, while Al Jazeera more frequently employs good, ecocentric evaluations that acknowledge climatic irregularity and collective responsibility. The findings have implications for Sustainable Development Goal 13 (Climate Action) through media evaluations that influence public perceptions of climate-related events.

1. Introduction

From historical, cultural, and developmental perspectives, language emerges before science. Scientific knowledge itself is shaped through language, as scientists rely on linguistic systems to categorise, describe, and interpret phenomena that are assumed to exist independently of naming (Harris, 2005). Since language shapes how reality is perceived and organised, it also plays a central role in how knowledge systems develop. This understanding provides the foundation for language ecology, which may be defined as;

“Language ecology may be defined as the study of interactions between any given language and its environment. The true environment of a language is the society that uses it as one of its codes. Language exists only in the minds of its users, and it only functions in relating these users to one another and to nature, i.e. their social and natural environment. Part of its ecology is therefore psychological: its interaction with other languages in the minds of bi- and multilingual speakers. Another part of its ecology is sociological: its interaction with the society in which it functions as a medium of communication. The ecology of a language is determined primarily by the people who learn it, use it, and transmit it to others” (Haugen, 1972, p. 325).

Since Haeckel (1866) definition of ecology as the study of organism–environment relationships, ecology has developed into a core field of biology concerned with life at the supra-organismic level. It focuses on populations whose interactions form integrated systems with their environment. Although biolinguistics claims to deal with the biological foundations of human language (Bickerton, 2014).

As environmental crises intensify and climate anomalies become more frequent, the linguistic framing of environmental conditions has become a central factor in shaping ecological awareness. Environmental communication is not a neutral process; rather, it functions as a channel for the circulation of values, ideologies, and perceptual frameworks through which environmental realities are interpreted (Zhu, 2024). Daily weather reporting constitutes a significant yet often overlooked form of environmental communication. Such reports frequently employ evaluative language—terms such as *pleasant*, *severe*, and *life-threatening*—that extend beyond the mere description of atmospheric conditions. These lexical choices embed judgments and value positions. They influence how audiences perceive not only immediate weather events but also the broader environmental systems in which these phenomena are situated (Martin & White, 2005; Stibbe, 2021).

“The dissatisfaction with everyday weather might also encourage people to fly abroad on low-cost airlines to chase the Sun. Travel companies and newspapers are quick to take advantage of (and further entrench) the evaluation sunny weather is good in order to encourage them to do so.” (Stibbe, 2021, p. 93)

While extensive research has focused on the metaphorical and framing strategies in climate discourse, relatively little attention has been given to evaluation as a discursive mechanism in weather communication. Yet, evaluation—a key dimension in the appraisal framework (Martin & White, 2005)—plays a crucial role in constructing emotional responses and assigning value to both human and nonhuman elements of the environment. Stibbe (2021), in his ecolinguistic framework *The Stories We Live By*, identifies evaluation as one of nine central discursive strategies that underpin destructive, ambivalent, or beneficial ecological worldviews. The repetitive use of positive evaluative terms for ecologically problematic conditions (e.g., beautiful sunny days during droughts or fine weather amidst heatwaves) illustrates how language may normalize or even glorify climatic conditions that contribute to long-term environmental harm. “Evaluations are stories in people’s minds about whether an area of life is good or bad. Appraisal patterns are clusters of linguistic features which come together to represent an area of life as good or bad” (Stibbe, 2021, p. 79). Appraisal is concerned with evaluation – the kinds of attitudes that are negotiated in a text, the strength of the feelings involved and the ways in which values are sourced and readers aligned (Martin and Rose 2007, p. 63).

This article discusses a significant vacuum in the literature that describes ecolinguistic studies: the organizational examination of evaluative language in the casual exchange of comments about weather. Although metaphor and framing have been well-documented, the ideological work of the evaluation, the way in which it defines nature as being friendly or hostile, perfect or dangerous, have not yet been put under close examination within the framework of weather reports (Sullivan & Li, 2021). This paper, thus, reduces its scope of the analysis to evaluation as a discursive instrument, as it is used to build ecologies (or anti-ecologies) within the weather reports.

In this respect, evaluation is to be taken to mean the ascribing of value to environmental phenomena, either directly or indirectly. It takes the form of affective (emotional responses) dimensions and appreciation (attributions of value or importance) and tends to work behind the scenes of supposed objectively observed phenomena (Martin & White, 2005). As an example, the praising of sunny weather in British media is culturally normative, using such terms as stunning, lovely, or fine, even in the cases of climate pressure, such as heatwaves (Stibbe, 2021). These values laden terms are used to enforce human centric preferences and comfort largely to the costs of ecological sensitivity, resilience or consciousness. They are ideological clues which are discreet and potent in shaping the attitude of the people towards the environment.

The present paper draws on and develops the theories behind the debate of ecolinguistics through the analysis of the evaluative aspects of weather reporting and their correspondence with that of the greater narratives of ecology. More precisely, it would comprise such questions as whether language, through its use in weather reports, helps to advance anthropocentric worldviews, i.e. focus on human experience and economic comfort, or develop ecosophical sensibilities, i.e. care, justice, and interconnectedness with the environment (Naess, 1994; Stibbe, 2021). For the clarification of this question, the research will be seeking answers to the question of whether weather reporting restructure is a bet on maintaining an ecological form of ignorance or a site of ecological education in itself.

The available empirical studies have implied the possibility of local weather communication affecting climate knowledge. As in the case of Maibach et al. (2021), who discovered that weathercasters, who managed to incorporate the issue of climate change into the regular forecast, were more successful at building environmental awareness, even among climate skeptics. The observations support the pedagogical opportunities of weather talk, and consequently, of evaluative language as the means of creating an environment-related cognitive and emotional frame. Furthermore, as indicated by environmental psychology studies, public risk perception is largely determined by the presence of a theme in the media and of an evaluative tone (Chung, 2011; Wachinger et al., 2013). Introducing this understanding to weather reporting, it becomes clear that the recitative evaluative language may be used as the strategic tool of either supporting the denial or developing ecological concern. Likewise, Stibbe (2021) explains;

“When a company’s profits go up, this is almost universally reported positively by the media in line with the cultural evaluation profit is good, no matter how ecologically damaging or unnecessary the products produced by the company. When the luxury car manufacturer Jaguar made a record profit, the BBC news website reported this with positive appraising items such as ‘resurgence’, ‘increase’, ‘success’, ‘fantastic’, ‘highest’, ‘achieved’, ‘benefitting’ and ‘remarkable’”. (p. 86)

Within the philosophical velocity of ecosophy, of which a personal and communal dedication to the environmental rationale (Naess, 1990; Stibbe, 2021), the given investigation examines whether appreciation and evaluation patterns in weather reports contribute to the subordination or any disruption of toxic ideologies of consumerism, anthropocentrism and environmental apathy. Of central interest is whether it is possible to reframe the evaluative framing of weather discourse in the process of creating empathies around ecological and nonhuman inclusivity and interdependence.

1.1. Research Objective

- To examine how evaluative choices in weather reporting contribute to the construction of ecocentric and anthropocentric worldviews.

1.2. Research Question

- How do evaluative choices in weather reporting shape ecocentric and anthropocentric worldviews?

The paper analyzes 300 articles on weather reporting existing in five major media organizations in the world and regions i.e. CNN (USA), BBC (UK), DW (Germany), Al Jazeera (Qatar), and GNN (Pakistan) between June 1, 2024 and July 31, 2025. The study uses a qualitative analytical methodology based on the model of ecolinguistics Stibbe (2015, 2021). This classifies the evaluative language offered in terms of their compatibility with the destructive, ambivalent and beneficial ecological discourses. Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005) offers a systematic framework for analysing evaluative meaning in discourse. This states how language encodes attitudes, negotiates viewpoints, and amplifies or downplays significance. Through its three systems—Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation—it enables the identification of how weather reporting frames climatic events as good, bad, or neutral, and how such evaluations function as what Stibbe (2021) terms *evaluation stories*. As a result, this presents anthropocentric or ecocentric understandings of the natural world.

2. Literature Review

An interdisciplinary literature has increased in size arguing that there is no such thing as a neutral language used in environmental communication; language has been argued to be ideological in its purpose and can be applied in shaping environmental consciousness in relation to ethical orientations, perceptions of risk (Martin & White, 2005; Stibbe, 2021). In this linguistic ecology evaluation, in the sense of positive or negative evaluation, expression of feeling or of the appreciation of something, becomes a key resource of discursive criticality. It systematizes perception of the environmental phenomena and consequently the way in which the phenomena are reacted to. Evaluative language does not, therefore, simply work as a stylistic feature, but also acts as a means of creating environmental ideologies, especially when it tries to approach weather reports as a genre in which judgments may be slipped into the descriptions that supposedly have been objective.

Whereas metaphor and framing have been received a significant amount of scholarly attention in relation to climate discourse (Lakoff, 2010), evaluation has not been explored yet despite being a central concept when it comes to narrative construction. As an example, in the case of New Zealand and conflicting attitudes to rivers (Tadaki et al., 2024) discusses how two mutually exclusive frames of river (taonga or resource) produce strikingly different expectations and policy impacts. Such comparative judgments are not merely linguistic but cultural, which determine the management of the environmental quality as well as the moral agency of societies. By confirming the necessity to prioritize evaluation as a means to consolidate the language of the environment and the concept of environmental justice, their findings will be regarded as a valuable contribution.

Environmental news from Aljazeera, BBC, CNN, DW, and GNN has been analyzed from a corpus-assisted ecolinguistic perspective to explore how anthropocentric and ecocentric viewpoints are constructed through language. The study demonstrates that news discourse often privileges anthropocentric perspectives. It emphasizes human impacts and immediate concerns, while ecocentric perspectives appear less frequently. These framing shapes readers' understanding of environmental issues and influences the prominence given to sustainability and ecological awareness (Saleem & Rehman, 2025).

Likewise, Johnstone and Stickles (2024) critically review what they call climate doomism, that is, an excessive focus on apocalyptic judgment in green media. Although referring to irreversible collapse or climate apocalypse sounds good to create awareness, it also causes emotional exhaustion, fatalism, and shrinkage in society. Such assessments discourage long-term stewardship of the environment unless one has a counter-weight of hope or agency. Hauser and Fleming (2021) are also inclined towards discouraging the use of militarized metaphor (e.g., climate war, nature strikes back), stating that these rhetorical tactics do encourage early-stage panic but deter eco-long-term devotion. Collectively, these studies signal on the moral stature of assessive calibration toward constructive environmental attitudes.

The importance of positive ecological assessment also could be attested to in the context of the multimodal study of environmental campaigns by Hidalgo-Downing, and O'Dowd (2023). They found that although drama metaphors (e.g. invasion of the oceans) might be the way to attract attention, only when evaluation leads to the sense of shared responsibility and systemic possibility, does change in behavior and ecoliteracy actually occur. The insights presented here are particularly pertinent to the area of the weather talk, as most of the alarmist names such as freak storm, killer heatwave, or merciless drought are frequently used without ecological references or constructive orientation.

Passing through practical to theoretical levels, Augé (2023) suggests another approach, which is what she terms as evaluative aptness, the controlled use of language so that communication can match ecosophy ideas of collaboration, difference, and sustainability. She juxtaposes expressions that are emotionally dense and system-specific (e.g., the Earth is a common home, the atmosphere is a protective veil) and those that are technocratic and militaristic (e.g., the climate fight, defensive infrastructure) which effectively downgrade ecological systems to an object of operation by humans. The intervention by Aug and its application of weather discourse is especially helpful when one immediately thinks of comfort being promoted by humans at the cost of the complexity of the environment.

Indeed, comparative and corpus-based studies also indicate the role of evaluation in the determination of the ecological meaning across contexts and media genres. Döring (2018) demonstrates that evaluative decisions in reporting of disasters, such as when they are described as merciless floods or unprecedented droughts, contribute to spreading fear among the public and serve to conceal the structural reasons behind living in a vulnerable situation. Similarly, Jabeen

(2024) states that the adverse judgement in environmental media will be devoid of systemic ecological facets on which there will be distorted perceptions of the environmental crises. According to Poole (2024), evaluation should be a part of eco-pedagogy in that it would allow students to question emotional and ideological premises of environmental texts and, thereby, create ecoliteracy. Further study explores the types of talk within the British English context and demonstrates how environmental issues are ignored most of the time in the form of jokes and careless attitudes, and, therefore, even the reality built upon the casual assessment can diminish the eco-severity (Wijitsopon, 2025).

The discourse produced around the China–Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) was examined through a corpus-based ecosophical analysis. It reveals a strong emphasis on economic progress and national development while ecological balance and environmental sustainability remain largely backgrounded (Faraz et al., 2024). On the same note, Faraz and Saleem (2024) assess the ecolinguistic features of the CPEC-related discourse through the corpus-assisted study and discover that the economic assessment always dominates over the ecological and social assessment. Out of the 14 development frames that they find, economic frame is frequent, whereas environmental sustainability is highly underrepresented. The results of their research show an evaluative imbalance of the reflection of the trends in a fashion on the weather: the condition of the environment is sacrificed to convenience and humanity at the cost of lifelong evolution. Sometimes, western criteria of media evaluation are simply brought to Pakistani environments and fail to integrate with local ecologies or local knowledge which leads to yet another form of ideological alienation. This underlines what Stibbe (2021) describes as the disappearance of the local ecological politics within globalized discourse.

At the policy level, Yang and Sun (2025) offer a case study of the strategic use of evaluation in use of the microblog by the Chinese government. By systematically invoking the positively charged expressions positive ecological assessments, including harmonious development, co-fate and mutual prosperity, the slogan Life Community of Humans and Nature gets institutionalized into discourse. Their results highlight the possibility of evaluation developing and becoming an instrument of institutionalizing ecosophical values.

A combination of these studies validates the point that evaluative language not only captures but plays an active role in the setting of ideologies in the environment. According to Stibbe (2021), evaluation is a significant clue on whether discourse upholds negative, ambivalent or positive ecological tales. There are empirical grounds to scrutinise evaluation especially in routine genres like weather reporting since ideological assumptions have a way of being naturalised by exerting repetitive effects. It takes a constitutive form in normalizing some aspects of environmental experiences (e.g., warm weather as comfortable) and marginalizing others (e.g. the presence of drought as a systematic threat), thereby influencing how people think and how they may behave (i.e., politically).

In Pakistani context, the consequences of evaluative framing are even more dominant. Climate change in Pakistani media was examined through an ecolinguistic analysis of *Dawn* climate reports published between 2020 and 2025. The findings indicate that environmental issues are generally framed in scientific and impact-oriented terms, with limited emphasis on responsibility, systemic causes, and transformative ecological action (Saleem & Khan, 2025). Such words as deadly, crippling, catastrophic are all over the story, and it is mentioned that nature is an enemy or victim, but seldom as an interdependent system that needs care. In spite of the fact that their study focuses on semiotic approaches, it reveals the shortcomings of evaluative framing as a means to developing ecological consciousness.

Weather reports were examined from a linguistic-ecosophic perspective, showing that media discourse largely foregrounds immediate impacts and risks while marginalizing ecological interconnections, long-term responsibility, and sustainability-oriented meanings (Saleem & Rehman, 2025). In general, the analyzed literature strongly appeals to the requirement of the ecolinguistic research to focus on evaluation stories (Stibbe, 2021). The ideological work of evaluation in environmental discourse—especially in normalized genres such as weather reporting—demands critical attention. This study builds on that foundation to examine 300 weather reports from five influential news outlets: BBC, CNN, DW, Al Jazeera, and GNN. This study aims to analyze how “good” and “bad” evaluative language in weather reports contribute to the construction of ecocentric and anthropocentric worldviews. By focusing specifically on evaluation, this research seeks to expand the scope of ecolinguistic inquiry and contribute to a more ethically reflexive, ecologically grounded model of environmental communication.

3. Research Methodology

The present study follows a qualitative ecolinguistic approach that rests on the concept of Stories We Live By (Stibbe, 2015, 2021). Three hundred weather reports were manually selected as a purposive sample of five leading news outlets in the international and national news market, and those were: CNN (USA), BBC (UK), DW (Germany), Al Jazeera (Qatar), and GNN (Pakistan). These reports occurred during the period between June 1, 2024 and July 31, 2025 and they are regular everyday weather reports. The purpose of selection was to maximize the variety regarding the geopolitical, cultural, and linguistic settings and at the same time keeping the selection within the frame of regular weather reports. This study adopts a qualitative close-reading approach in which weather reports were analysed manually using Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005). Close reading was employed as the primary analytical procedure. Each weather report was read multiple times to ensure a systematic and theory-driven analysis. The first reading focused on understanding the overall meaning and narrative structure of the report. The second reading involved identifying evaluative language in line with Appraisal Theory i.e. resources of Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation. A third reading was conducted to confirm and refine the initial coding. This iterative reading process enabled a nuanced interpretation of evaluative patterns. These linguistic evaluations were then interpreted through Stibbe’s (2015, 2021) concept of evaluation stories to examine how climate and weather are framed as good or bad. In line with Stibbe’s ecolinguistic framework, evaluative expressions were analysed as evaluation stories that construct climate as ‘good’ or ‘bad’, enabling the identification of anthropocentric and ecocentric worldviews.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

Evaluation is one of the fundamental linguistic means existing to indicate approval, disapproval, urgency or significance. Stibbe (2021) claims that linguistically assessed events are part of the process shaping ecological relationships because some of them enhance and others deaden emotional involvement. Evaluation is another of the stories we live by in ecolinguistics because they reiterate the cultural standards imbedded in sentimental or critical language.

4.1. Evaluative Language in the Weather Reporting in CNN

CNN commonly uses evaluative terms of emotion whose bands are higher, i.e., disaster, devastated communities and shocking destruction which it uses to cover extreme weather reports. These expressions evoke an immediate emotional response and underscore the human cost of natural disasters, emphasizing suffering, loss, and unpredictability. Moreover, these evaluations tend to sever the link between natural events and anthropogenic causes. This contributes to a discourse of ecological disempowerment.

Table 1
Evaluation Stories in CNN Weather Reports

Report Excerpt	Evaluative Term(s)	Attitude	Engagement	Graduation	Ecological Implication
“Disaster struck the southern coast again...”	<i>Disaster</i>	Appreciation Reaction: <i>Impact</i>	Monoglossic (reporter’s authoritative voice; no alternative perspectives)	High force (catastrophic framing)	Constructs climate as sudden catastrophe; human-centred risk foregrounded, structural and ecological causes backgrounded (Anthropocentric)
“...devastating entire communities overnight.”	<i>Devastating</i>	Appreciation Reaction: <i>Impact</i>	Monoglossic	High force (totalising effect)	Focuses on human suffering; nature framed as destructive agent rather than part of socio-ecological systems (Anthropocentric)
“A violent storm lashes the Gulf region with deadly force.”	<i>Violent, deadly force</i>	Appreciation Reaction: <i>Quality</i>	Monoglossic	Intensified force through metaphor and personification	Anthropomorphises nature as hostile enemy; reinforces human–

“The weather turned brutal, as temperatures soared...”	<i>Brutal</i>	Appreciation Reaction: <i>Quality</i>	Monoglossic	High force (moralised intensity)	nature opposition (Anthropocentric) Attributes moral aggression to weather; evaluates climate through human pain and discomfort (Anthropocentric)
“An unexpected cold snap freezes livelihoods.”	<i>Unexpected, freezes</i>	Appreciation Reaction: <i>Impact</i>	Monoglossic	Moderate–high force (economic emphasis)	Highlights economic loss; omits climatic patterns and ecological processes (Anthropocentric)

Table 1 illustrates how evaluation stories in weather reporting are linguistically realized. Across all excerpts, evaluation is predominantly encoded through the Attitude system, specifically the subcategory of Appreciation, which is used to judge weather and climate phenomena as inherently bad through terms such as disaster, devastating, violent, brutal, and unexpected. These negative appreciations construct climate as a harmful and disruptive force, primarily in relation to its impact on human communities, livelihoods, and infrastructure. The Engagement system further reinforces this evaluative stance, as the reports are largely monoglossic, presenting these judgements as unchallenged and authoritative, with little inclusion of alternative scientific, ecological, or contextual voices that might reframe extreme weather within broader climate systems or human–environment interactions. Additionally, the Graduation system intensifies these evaluations through high-force lexical choices and metaphoric personification, amplifying emotional responses such as fear, urgency, and alarm. Together, these appraisal resources contribute to the construction of dominant evaluation stories in which climate is repeatedly framed as bad when it disrupts human life, thereby reproducing an anthropocentric worldview while marginalising ecocentric perspectives that would foreground ecosystem processes, long-term environmental balance, or shared human–nonhuman vulnerability.

4.2. Evaluative Language in DW Weather Reporting

In Stibbe’s (2021) terms, this mode of evaluation reflects ambivalent (neutral) stories: it acknowledges environmental degradation and disturbance, but only in so far as it affects human functioning. Ecological systems are not evaluated on their own terms (e.g., biodiversity loss, ecosystem damage), but in monetary or demographic terms—thus promoting a weak form of ecological awareness that may inform but rarely transform.

Table 2
Evaluative Language in DW Weather Reports

Report Excerpt	Evaluative Term(s)	Attitude	Engagement	Graduation	Ecological Implication
“The floods caused a huge economic hit to the agriculture sector.”	<i>Huge economic hit</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Impact	Monoglossic	High force (<i>huge</i>)	Frames nature primarily as an economic variable; ecological damage is subordinated to financial loss (Anthropocentric)
“Germany faced its most affected year due to extreme weather.”	<i>Most affected</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Impact	Monoglossic	Superlative intensification	Emphasises human severity through comparison; lacks ecological agency or systemic climate explanation (Anthropocentric)
“Damage was estimated in the billions.”	<i>Damage, billions</i>	Appreciation Valuation	Monoglossic	Quantitative intensification	Reduces climate impact to monetary metrics; ecological degradation rendered invisible (Anthropocentric)

“Insurance losses broke previous records.”	<i>Losses, records broken</i>	Appreciation Valuation	Monoglossic	Extreme force (record-breaking)	Constructs climate as a threat to economic systems; reinforces risk-based, market-centred worldview (Anthropocentric)
“At least 1.2 million residents displaced due to prolonged drought.”	<i>Displaced, 1.2 million</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Impact	Monoglossic	Numerical amplification	Human suffering foregrounded through statistics; ecological causes and non-human impacts omitted (Anthropocentric)

Table 2 demonstrates how economy-centred evaluation stories in weather reporting are realised through the combined operation of the Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation systems of Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005). Evaluative meanings are predominantly encoded through Attitude, specifically Appreciation, where climate and weather phenomena are repeatedly assessed as *bad* in terms of their economic and social impact, using expressions such as *huge economic hit*, *most affected*, and *damage estimated in the billions*. These valuations construct climate events primarily as financial and human crises rather than ecological processes. The Engagement system is largely monoglossic, presenting these evaluations as factual and uncontested, with no alternative ecological or scientific voices that might situate floods, droughts, or extreme weather within broader climate systems or long-term environmental change. At the same time, the Graduation system intensifies evaluation through superlatives, numerical quantification, and record-breaking comparisons, amplifying perceptions of severity while reinforcing a cost-based logic. Collectively, these appraisal patterns form dominant evaluation stories in which climate is understood as *bad* insofar as it disrupts economies, insurance systems, and human populations, thereby reproducing a strongly anthropocentric worldview that marginalizes ecocentric perspectives concerned with ecosystem health, biodiversity loss, and human–environment interdependence.

4.3. GNN Evaluative Language

The example of GNN (G News Network) a major Pakistani broadcaster shows the high level of ambivalence in term of evaluative style in the weather reports. This two-fold appeal to positive reassurance and institutional alerts is what generates a discursive tension; a form of mixed messaging that makes it difficult to understand the risk to the environment. This ambivalence corresponds with the category of stories formulated by Stibbe (2015, 2021), who refers to ambivalent discourses, the discourses which do not explicitly engage in the preservation of ecological understanding but also do not actively discredit it. In a different manner.

Table 3
Evaluative Language in GNN Weather Reports

Report Excerpt	Evaluative Term(s)	Attitude	Engagement	Graduation	Ecological Implication
“The weather remained dry and comfortable in most parts of the country today.”	<i>Dry, comfortable</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Quality	Monoglossic	Mild positive force	Frames weather as bodily comfort; normalises dryness and marginalises its ecological consequences (e.g., water stress) (Anthropocentric)
“Authorities have issued a rain alert for upper regions.”	<i>Rain alert</i>	Judgement (Institutional action) Appreciation	Heteroglossic (authority voice invoked)	Moderate force	Emphasises institutional control and preparedness; ecological causes such as deforestation or land-use change are backgrounded (Anthropocentric)
“Visibility improved following yesterday’s dusty conditions.”	<i>Improved visibility</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Impact	Monoglossic	Positive adjustment	Evaluates weather through human convenience and safety; ignores environmental sources such as pollution or land degradation (Anthropocentric)

“Temperatures will dip slightly over the weekend.”	<i>Dip slightly</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Quality	Monoglossic	Down- scaled force (<i>slightly</i>)	Downplays temperature variation; frames change as minor and normal, obscuring broader climate variability (Anthropocentric)
“No major changes expected in weather over the coming days.”	<i>No major changes</i>	Appreciation Valuation (Stability)	Monoglossic	Softened evaluation	Constructs stability and routine; obscures gradual climatic transformation and long-term ecological trends (Anthropocentric)

Table 3 highlights how good, bad, and neutral evaluation stories in weather reporting are linguistically apprehended. Evaluative meanings are primarily expressed through Appreciation, where weather conditions are assessed as *good* or *unproblematic* in terms of human comfort, safety, and routine, using expressions such as *comfortable*, *improved*, *dip slightly*, and *no major changes*. These evaluations construct climate as benign when it aligns with everyday human expectations. The Engagement system is largely monoglossic, with limited inclusion of ecological or scientific perspectives, except in cases where institutional voices are invoked, such as in the issuance of rain alerts. Even then, attention is directed toward administrative response rather than environmental causation. The Graduation system further contributes to this normalising effect by down-scaling change through mitigating expressions like *slightly* and *no major*, which soften the perception of variability and reinforce a sense of stability. Collectively, these appraisal patterns form evaluation stories in which climate is understood as *good* or *neutral* when it maintains human comfort and predictability, thereby reproducing an anthropocentric worldview that obscures ecological processes, long-term climatic shifts, and human–environment interdependence. GNN uses language that is evaluative and presents a lost opportunity that could have been used as environmental communicating. It is more of a perception management discourse, which serves to privatize attitudes toward climate change, rather than intent on building public knowledge or encouraging the mobilization of people to act on climate change.

4.4. Evaluative Languages used in BBC

Extreme weather in the BBC counters with highly intense evaluative language. The words like treacherous, life-threatening, relentless storms and brutal cold also feature in it. Though these adjectives fulfil the role of journalism in dramatizing the situations and making audiences alert. They also depict a hostile relation with nature as a threat, unpredictable, and ready to attack. This context is also linked to the concept of destructive stories (Stibbe, 2015, 2021) a threat, rather than a partner in the interdependence view of the natural world.

Table 4
Evaluative Language in BBC Weather Reports

Report Excerpt	Evaluative Term(s)	Attitude	Engagement	Graduation	Ecological Implication
“The region is bracing for treacherous ice and winds.”	<i>Treacherous</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Quality	Monoglossic	Intensified negative force	Personifies nature as deceptive and dangerous; foregrounds unpredictability while backgrounding ecological causes (Anthropocentric)
“This life-threatening cold snap could linger through the weekend.”	<i>Life-threatening</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Impact	Monoglossic	Extreme force (existential threat)	Constructs weather as lethal to humans; positions people as passive victims of an external natural threat (Anthropocentric)
“A relentless downpour continues to batter northern England.”	<i>Relentless, batter</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Quality	Monoglossic	High force through militarised metaphor	Frames nature as an aggressive enemy; obscures climate systems and human contributions (Anthropocentric)
“Rescue services respond to	<i>Brutal</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Quality	Monoglossic	High force, emotive framing	Emphasises emergency response and human suffering; erases ecological causality and

brutal weather overnight.”					long-term environmental context (Anthropocentric)
“Emergency declared as deadly storm moves in from the Atlantic.”	<i>Deadly, emergency</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Impact	Heteroglossic (institutional authority invoked)	Extreme intensification on	Supports crisis and authority narratives; systemic or ecological interpretations (Anthropocentric)

Table 4 demonstrates how fear-based evaluation stories in weather reporting are constructed through the interaction of the Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation. Evaluative meanings are primarily realised through Attitude, specifically negative Appreciation, where weather and climate phenomena are repeatedly characterised as *bad* through terms such as *treacherous, life-threatening, relentless, brutal, and deadly*. These evaluations attribute hostile and violent qualities to nature, often through militarised or personifying metaphors, which construct weather as an aggressive external force acting upon vulnerable human populations. The Engagement system is predominantly monoglossic, presenting these fear-laden judgements as self-evident and uncontested, although institutional voices are occasionally introduced to legitimise emergency responses and reinforce crisis framing. At the same time, the Graduation system intensifies evaluation through extreme force and emotive escalation, amplifying alarm, urgency, and panic. Together, these appraisal patterns generate dominant evaluation stories in which climate is understood as *bad* because it threatens human safety and control, thereby reinforcing a strongly anthropocentric worldview that marginalises ecological processes, systemic climate causality, and the interdependence of human and non-human life.

4.5. Evaluative Language in the Weather Reporting of Al Jazeera

The evaluative style that Al Jazeera employs is measured but still effective, with words like a rare, unusual, urge and prepare. These dialectical decisions are opposed to dramatized language that is observed in other media. They put the phenomena presented within the environment into the context of more general climate patterns, which enables them to evaluate them in reflective and ethically sound ways.

Terms such as rare direct the attention to the rare patterns in nature ones which imply that the local weather occurrences are related to the bigger pattern’s nature such as climate fluctuations or modifications by people. The seriousness exhibited by the institution in the use of urge portrays that it is not in a panic but rather in a position to create room where governance can be active and the citizens can hold its leaders accountable. These kinds of words are so insidious in their ability to amplify a sense of ecological consciousness in that they will cause audiences to realize that environmental distresses are manifestations of systemic ills but not random calamities.

Table 5
Evaluative Language in Al Jazeera Weather Reports

Report Excerpt	Evaluative Term(s)	Attitude	Engagement	Graduation	Ecological Implication
“Authorities urge caution as rare weather event hits Gulf region.”	<i>Rare weather event, urge</i>	Appreciation Valuation (Unusualness) Judgement (Institutional action)	Heteroglossic (authority voice invoked)	Moderate force	Acknowledges climatic irregularity and seriousness, but frames response through institutional control rather than ecological explanation Weakly ecocentric / predominantly anthropocentric
“Dust storm blankets the city, visibility reduced to near zero.”	<i>Blankets, near zero</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Impact	Monoglossic	High force (sensory extremity)	Emphasises immediate sensory disruption; omits environmental causality such as desertification or land mismanagement (Anthropocentric)
“Rainfall recorded in desert areas for the first time this year.”	<i>First time this year</i>	Appreciation Valuation (Novelty)	Monoglossic	Mild–moderate force	Frames ecologically significant rainfall as a statistical anomaly; lacks systemic climate interpretation (Anthropocentric with ecocentric potential)

“Unseasonal winds disrupt daily life across multiple provinces.”	<i>Unseasonal, disrupt</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Impact	Monoglossic	Moderate force	Centres human inconvenience; climatic irregularity is noted but not connected to ecological systems or climate change (Anthropocentric)
“Temperatures dropped unexpectedly, bringing some relief to coastal communities.”	<i>Unexpectedly, relief</i>	Appreciation Reaction: Quality	Monoglossic	Down-scaled positive force	Evaluates climate in terms of human comfort; abnormality is neutralised through relief framing (Anthropocentric)

Table 5 demonstrates how anomaly-based evaluation stories in weather reporting are constructed with evaluations distributed across bad, neutral, and good value positions. Through the Attitude system, weather events are predominantly evaluated as bad when they are framed as disruptive or risky to human life, as in expressions such as *rare weather event*, *unseasonal winds disrupt*, and *visibility reduced to near zero*, which foreground threat and inconvenience. Neutral evaluations emerge where climatic irregularity is acknowledged but treated as a statistical or temporal deviation, for example in *first time this year*, which marks anomaly without ecological interpretation. Occasional good evaluations appear in terms like *relief*, where unexpected temperature drops are positively appraised in relation to human comfort. The Engagement system alternates between monoglossic presentation and heteroglossic attribution to authorities, lending legitimacy to evaluations while steering interpretation toward institutional management rather than ecological explanation. Meanwhile, the Graduation system amplifies negative evaluations through sensory intensification or softens anomaly through down-scaling, thereby shaping whether climatic change is perceived as alarming, routine, or beneficial. Together, these appraisal patterns generate evaluation stories in which climate is predominantly understood as bad when it disrupts human routines, neutral when framed as an unexplained anomaly, and good when it restores comfort—resulting in an overall anthropocentric worldview with only limited scope for ecocentric meaning-making.

4.6. Discussion

The result indicates clear variation in evaluative patterns across news organisations. CNN and BBC frequently employ emotionally intensified negative evaluations, using expressions such as *devastated*, *life-threatening*, and *treacherous*, which construct the natural world as a hostile and threatening force. Through the Appraisal systems of Attitude and Graduation, these outlets repeatedly evaluate climate and weather as bad. It amplifies fear and urgency. In Stibbe’s (2021) terms, they reinforce anthropocentric ideologies in which nature is framed as an external aggressor and humans are positioned as passive victims rather than participants within interconnected ecological systems.

By contrast, DW and GNN display patterns of evaluative ambivalence. DW tends to rely on economically framed negative appreciation, such as *economic hit* and *loss to infrastructure*, which evaluate climate as bad primarily in financial terms. GNN, meanwhile, fluctuates between positive evaluations such as *cool and pleasant* and neutral or cautionary framings like *alert issued*. These mixed evaluative patterns align with what Stibbe (2021) describes as ambivalent stories, where environmental irregularities are acknowledged but not critically examined in relation to systemic ecological causes. Although these outlets recognise climatic disruption, their evaluations remain largely human-centred and institutionally focused. They prioritize comfort, economic stability, and administrative response over ecosystemic perspectives. As a result, environmental events are discursively constructed as isolated or episodic occurrences rather than as manifestations of deeper ecological imbalance.

Al Jazeera demonstrates comparatively more ecocentric evaluative tendencies than the other outlets examined. Expressions such as *rare cyclone* and institutional calls that *urge citizens* to prepare frame weather events as climatic irregularities requiring collective and ethical response, rather than merely as sources of human disruption. Through the Appraisal system of Attitude, these evaluations move beyond purely negative appreciation and introduce neutral-to-serious valuations that acknowledge abnormality without overt sensationalism. Although still embedded within journalistic urgency and authority-driven Engagement. Such evaluative choices align with what Stibbe (2021) characterizes as beneficial stories, as they have the potential to raise ecological awareness and encourage responsible action.

Across all outlets, however, the analysis reveals several recurring evaluative patterns that constrain ecocentric meaning-making. First, weather and climate are predominantly evaluated as bad through an emphasis on human suffering, displacement, and property loss, while ecological causes—such as deforestation, fossil fuel emissions, and biodiversity collapse—are largely backgrounded or omitted. Second, metaphorical and militarised intensifiers (e.g., *storm lashes*, *nature attacks*) operate through the Graduation system to amplify drama and fear, yet they contribute little to ecological understanding or contextual explanation. Collectively, these patterns show how appraisal resources across media outlets continue to privilege anthropocentric evaluation stories, with only limited and uneven movement toward ecocentric alternatives. These findings demonstrate how evaluative choices in weather reporting shape climate as predominantly ‘bad’ in relation to human disruption. While only selectively enabling ecocentric worldviews through neutral or ethically oriented evaluation stories.

5. Findings and Conclusion

The findings reveal significant variation in how evaluative language constructs environmental problems across different media and geopolitical contexts.

5.1. Prevalence of Bad Evaluation

BBC and CNN frequently employed negatively intensified evaluative expressions such as *devastated communities*, *life-threatening cold*, and *treacherous winds*. These bad evaluations dramatize weather events and frame nature as hostile, foregrounding human vulnerability while obscuring ecological causes such as climate change, deforestation, or infrastructural failure. Such patterns correspond to destructive stories that discourage systemic ecological understanding.

5.2. Neutral Evaluation

DW and GNN predominantly relied on institutional and economic assessments, using formulations such as *economic hit*, *alert issued*, and *most affected zones*. These largely neutral evaluations frame weather as a governance or economic issue rather than an ecological one. It reflects ambivalent stories that acknowledge climatic irregularity but externalize environmental responsibility and limit ecological depth.

5.3. Emergence of Good Evaluation

Al Jazeera demonstrated comparatively more ecocentric and context-aware evaluation. It employs expressions such as *rare event*, *unusual patterns*, and appeals that *urge citizens* toward preparedness and conservation. These good evaluations connect weather anomalies to broader climatic systems and collective responsibility. It aligns with beneficial stories that promote ecological awareness, civic engagement, and long-term thinking.

5.4. Conclusion

The findings demonstrate that weather reporting is not neutral; rather, it systematically assigns value to climate events and shaping public perceptions of nature and human–environment relations. Across the dataset, weather is predominantly evaluated as *bad*. CNN and BBC rely heavily on negatively charged evaluative terms such as *devastated*, *life-threatening*, *deadly*, and *treacherous*. These bad evaluations portray the natural world as hostile and threatening, reinforcing destructive stories in which nature is framed as an aggressor and humans as victims, with little reference to ecological causality or climate systems. In contrast, DW and GNN most frequently employ neutral or ambivalent evaluations. Weather events are described through institutional alerts, economic losses, or routine forecasting language (e.g., *economic hit*, *losses recorded*, *alert issued*, *no major change expected*). While such evaluations avoid overt dramatization, they neither frame climate as *good* nor critically address its ecological significance. As a result, weather is normalized as manageable disruption. It corresponds to ambivalent stories that acknowledge environmental problems without questioning underlying ecological imbalance. Positive (*good*) evaluations appear only selectively and most clearly in Al Jazeera’s reporting. Expressions such as *relief*, *rare weather event*, and calls urging preparedness evaluate weather not only in terms of human comfort but also as a meaningful climatic signal. These good or ethically oriented evaluations partially reframe weather events as opportunities for awareness, adaptation, and collective responsibility, aligning with beneficial stories that support more ecocentric worldviews.

Overall, the dominance of *bad* and *neutral* evaluations, alongside the relative absence of sustained *good* ecological evaluations, reveals a critical limitation in contemporary weather reporting. The lack of evaluative language that

frames climate within long-term ecological systems, interdependence, and moral responsibility encourages short-term, reactive interpretations and obscures the structural causes of climate instability. This study shows that current weather discourse largely perpetuates harmful evaluation stories by dramatizing risk (*bad*), normalizing disruption (*neutral*), and only rarely fostering ecological care (*good*). These findings suggest that everyday weather discourse plays a significant role in shaping climate awareness and therefore merits closer attention within climate communication aligned with Sustainable Development Goal 13 (Climate Action). This research highlights the ideological role of everyday weather reporting and calls for a shift toward ecologically constructive evaluations that align media communication with principles of ecosophy, ecological justice, and sustainability.

References

- Al Jazeera. (n.d.). *Weather* [Tag page]. Al Jazeera. Retrieved June 1, 2024–July 31, 2025, from <https://www.aljazeera.com/tag/weather/>
- Augé, A. (2023). *Metaphor and argumentation in climate crisis discourse* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003342908>
- Bickerton, D. (2014). Some problems for biolinguistics. *Biolinguistics*, 8, 73–96.
- British Broadcasting Corporation. (n.d.). *Weather science*. BBC. Retrieved June 1, 2024–July 31, 2025, from <https://www.bbc.com/future-planet/weather-science>
- Cable News Network. (n.d.). *Weather*. CNN. Retrieved June 1, 2024–July 31, 2025, from <https://edition.cnn.com/weather>
- Chung, I. J. (2011). Social amplification of risk in the internet environment. *Risk Analysis: An International Journal*, 31(12), 1883–1896. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2011.01623.x>
- Deutsche Welle. (n.d.). *Weather* [Topic page]. DW. Retrieved June 1, 2024–July 31, 2025, from <https://www.dw.com/en/weather/t-19410582>
- Döring, M. (2018). Media reports about natural disasters: An ecolinguistic perspective. In A. F. Fill & H. Penz (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of ecolinguistics* (pp. 293–308). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315687391-20>
- Faraz, H., Saleem, M., & Mehmood, T. (2024). A corpus-based ecosophical analysis of discourse produced around the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC). *Global Social Sciences Review*, 9(1), 445–460. [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2024\(IX-I\).08](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2024(IX-I).08)
- Faraz, H., & Saleem, M. (2024). Framing ‘development’ in economic discourse: An ecolinguistic perspective. *Journal of Higher Education and Development Studies*, 4(1), 220–234. <https://doi.org/10.59219/jheds.04.01.57>
- G News Network. (n.d.). *Weather* [Category page]. GNN. Retrieved June 1, 2024–July 31, 2025, from <https://gnnhd.tv/category/Weather>
- Haeckel, E. (1866). I-CLX. In *Generelle Morphologie der Organismen: Allgemeine Grundzüge der organischen Formen-Wissenschaft, mechanisch begründet durch die von Charles Darwin reformierte Descendenz-Theorie. Band 1: Allgemeine Anatomie. Band 2: Allgemeine Entwicklungsgeschichte* (pp. I-CLX). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110848281.2.fm>
- Harris, R. (2005). *The semantics of science*. Continuum International.
- Haugen, E. (1972). *The ecology of language*. Stanford University Press.
- Hauser, D. J., & Fleming, M. E. (2021). Mother nature’s fury: Antagonist metaphors for natural disasters increase forecasts of their severity and encourage evacuation. *Science Communication*, 43(5), 570–596. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10755470211031246>
- Hidalgo-Downing, L., & O’Dowd, N. A. (2023). Code red for humanity: Multimodal metaphor and metonymy in noncommercial advertisements on environmental awareness and activism. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 38(3), 231–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2022.2153336>
- Jabeen, I. (2024). The portrayal of environmental concerns: An ecolinguistic analysis of media discourse. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(5), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n5p13>
- Johnstone, C., & Stickles, E. (2024). Navigating the climate change minefield: The influence of metaphor on climate doomism. *Frontiers in Communication*, 9, 1380092. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1380092>
- Lakoff, G. (2010). Why it matters how we frame the environment. *Environmental Communication*, 4(1), 70–81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524030903529749>
- Maibach, E. (2021). Supporting communities of practice as a strategy to accelerate uptake of environmental science for climate action: TV weathercasters as a case study. *Environmental Research Letters*, 16(2), 025004. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abdc44>
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury.

- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230511910>
- Naess, A. (1994). The shallow and the deep, long-range ecological movement. *Inquiry*, 16, 130–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00201747408601682>
- Naess, A. (1990). *Ecology, community and lifestyle: Outline of an ecosophy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Poole, R. (2024). A corpus-assisted ecolinguistic analysis of hurricanes and wildfires and the potential for corpus-assisted eco-pedagogy in ELT classrooms. In M. Bortoluzzi & E. Zurru (Eds.), *Ecological communication and ecoliteracy: Discourses of awareness and action for the lifescape* (pp. 44–64). Bloomsbury Academic. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350335851.0011>
- Saleem, M., & Rehman, N. (2025). A Linguistic-ecosophic perspective on weather reports. *The Discourse*, 11(1), 58–69.
- Saleem, M., & Khan, J. (2025). Climate change in Pakistani media: An Ecolinguistic analysis of Dawn climate reports (2020–2025). *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 5(3), 119–131. <https://doi.org/10.62843/jssr.v5i3.573>
- Stibbe, A. (2015). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by*. Routledge.
- Stibbe, A. (2021). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Sullivan, W. C., & Li, D. (2021). Nature and attention. In E. K. Nisbet, J. M. Zelenski, & S. Capaldi (Eds.), *Nature and psychology: Biological, cognitive, developmental, and social pathways to well-being* (pp. 7–30). Springer.
- Tadaki, M. (2024). Limits to measurement: Rethinking the role of monitoring in environmental governance. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 7(4), 1647–1671. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848624124801>
- Wachinger, G., Renn, O., Begg, C., & Kuhlicke, C. (2013). The risk perception paradox—Implications for governance and communication of natural hazards. *Risk Analysis*, 33(6), 1049–1065. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2012.01942.x>
- Wijitsopon, R. (2025). Exploring the semantic domain of environmental issues in British English conversation: A corpus-assisted ecolinguistic perspective. *rEFLections*, 32(1), 76–103. <https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v32i1.278833>
- Yang, K., & Sun, Y. (2025). To change or not to change: Transformations of ecological metaphors in Chinese government microblogs. *Discourse & Society*, 36(2), 310–328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265241265512>
- Zhu, R. (2024). Grammatical mechanism in environmental discourse: An ecolinguistics study of voice, nominalization and metaphor. *Journal of Linguistics and Communication Studies*, 3(3), 53–58.

Citation of this paper

Saleem, S., Khattak, N., (2025). The Ecology of Evaluation Stories: Good and Bad Climate Stories in Weather Reporting. *Erevna: Journal of Linguistics and Literature*