This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:

Media rhetoric plays the market : the logic and power of metaphors behind the financial crisis since 2006

Reference:

De Landtsheer Christ'l.- Media rhetoric plays the market : the logic and power of metaphors behind the financial crisis since 2006

Metaphor and the social world - ISSN 2210-4097 - 5:2(2015), p. 204-221

Metaphor and the Social World

VOLUME 5 NUMBER 2 2015

Editors

Alice Deignan
University of Leeds

Graham Low
University of York

Review Editor

Susan Nacey
Hedmark University College

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam/Philadelphia

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Metaphor and the Social World

Editorial Board

John A. Barnden
University of Birmingham, UK
Tony Berber Sardinha
Pontifical University of São Paulo
Rosario Caballero
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha
Lynne Cameron
The Open University
Jonathan Charteris-Black
University of the West of England
Alan Cienki
VU University Amsterdam &
Moscow State Linguistic University
Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr.
University of California, Santa Cruz
Michael Kimmel
University of Vienna

Veronika Koller
Lancaster University
Jeannette Littlemore
University of Birmingham
Fiona MacArthur
Universidad de Extremadura
Cornelia Müller
European University Viadrina, Frankfurt/Oder
Andreas Musolff
University of East Anglia
L. David Ritchie
Portland State University
Elena Semino
Lancaster University
Gerard J. Steen
University Amsterdam

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

SPECIAL ISSUE

The political impact of metaphors

Edited by Julien Perrez and Min Reuchamps

Université de Liège / Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Table of contents

Introduction

- Special issue on the political impact of metaphors 165
Julien Perrez and Min Reuchamps

Articles

- Framing, metaphor and dialogue: A multimodal approach to party conference speeches 177
Camille Debras and Emilie L'Hôte
- Media rhetoric plays the market: The logic and power of metaphors behind the financial crises since 2006 204
Christ'l De Landtsheer
- The "Belgian Tetris": Assessing the political impact of metaphors on citizens' representations of Belgian federalism 222
Julien Perrez and Min Reuchamps
- How viruses and beasts affect our opinions (or not): The role of extendedness in metaphorical framing 244
W. Gudrun Reijnierse, Christian Burgers, Tina Krennmayr and Gerard J. Steen
- The allegorical character of political metaphors in discourse 263
Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr.

Book reviews

- Tay, D. (2013). *Metaphor in Psychotherapy. A Descriptive and Prescriptive Analysis*. Reviewed by Julia T. Williams Camus 282
- Nacey, S. (2013). *Metaphors in Learner English*. Reviewed by June Eyckmans 289

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

INTRODUCTION

Special issue on the political impact of metaphors

Julien Perrez and Min Reuchamps

Université de Liège / Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium

In the wake of Lakoff and Johnson's seminal work (1980), much attention has been devoted to the study of metaphors not as rhetorical figures, but as conceptual tools to express a complex reality in more familiar terms. While conceptual metaphors occur in every area of life, the political domain remains a particularly rich source of metaphors. As Semino puts it: "It is often claimed that the use of metaphor is particularly necessary in politics, since politics is an abstract and complex domain of experience, and metaphors can provide ways of simplifying complexities and making abstractions accessible" (2008, p.90). Moreover, "if metaphor is at the heart of cognitive framing then it should be crucial to political study" (De Landtsheer, 2009, p.60).

Accordingly, scholars in linguistics and political researchers have moved towards investigating the use and especially the identification of metaphors in various political domains (for an overview, see Bougher, 2012). For instance, Lakoff (1996, 2004, 2008) has offered various accounts of American politics in terms of conceptual metaphors; Musolf (2004) and his colleagues (Musolf, Schaeffner, & Townson, 1996) have explored how we conceive and thus speak not just about Europe, but also about the Holocaust (2010); in metaphorical terms, Beer and De Landtsheer (2004) have looked at metaphors in international relations; Charteris-Black (2004, 2011) and L'Hôte (2010, 2012) have analysed speeches by major British and American politicians and their persuasive power; Perrez and Reuchamps (2012) have captured metaphors of federalism and how citizens use them in daily language, while Goatly (2007) has demonstrated how metaphors can construct myths and shape ideologies. As suggested by this brief overview, many different topics and discourse types have been uncovered by scholars interested in political metaphors.

Nonetheless, Carver and Pikalo contend that metaphor research should move one step further (2008a, p.3): "the analysis of political metaphors should not be

just about the interpretation of political metaphors but also and above all else about the creative-productive function that they have in politics and in political science itself". In fact, although a large body of research has been devoted to the study of (conceptual) metaphors in the political domain, it is striking that the question of the political impact of metaphors has only recently started to be addressed. While metaphors are described as devices structuring our perception of political realities and representations, and as devices frequently used by political elites to frame particular debates, their actual political impact, for example their ability to frame the citizens' understanding of given issues, has mostly been taken for granted. To illustrate this claim, consider the following passage taken from Stenvoll's (2008, p. 29) account of the 'slippery slope' metaphor in political discourse:

The slippery slope image works metaphorically in at least two ways. First, it sets up the physical world of solid objects as an analogy to political matters, implying that politics is like the physical world: if you 'move' something in the world of politics, like making or changing a particular law or policy, other things will inevitably follow — just as if you put a physical object on a sliding plate. This naturalising image of politics simplifies the complexity of cause and effect in the social world, compared to the natural world and its more mechanic [sic], more predictable patterns of causality.

Second, the slippery slope does [sic] in itself entail a particular image of movement: from a good or relatively good place to a relatively worse or bad place and from a political world of voluntarism and human action to a natural world of determinism and laws of physics. It imposes a kind of unidirectional, unstoppable movement which, when used metaphorically about politics, binds phenomena together in a specific way.

The author concludes that "the slippery slope metaphor is an expression of several conceptual metaphors that structure the way people understand, experience and practise politics" (Stenvoll, 2008, p. 35). While this account of the slippery slope metaphor offers an intuitive and interesting analysis of the metaphor's conceptual implications — by pointing among other things to the notion of irreversible movement, and thereby highlighting the political advantages of using such a metaphor in a debate about a controversial political issue — claiming that people actually understand this metaphor that way (e.g., draw similar conclusions as the ones intended by the speaker), needs further empirical investigation. On the basis of such reasoning, the focus switches from the reasons why some political actors *use* a particular metaphor — that is, the production side — to its alleged *impact on the public* — that is, the reception side. While the former has received a lot of attention in metaphor research, the latter is still largely underexplored.

Nonetheless, from the production-side perspective, there are good reasons to assume an impact might result. One reason to assume metaphors have an impact is that it has been shown that metaphor is a central component of human cognition; it is “a central cognitive process for abstract conceptualization and reasoning” (Johnson, 2010, p. 412); metaphors are thus able to be highly persuasive precisely because they can activate “both conscious and unconscious resources to influence our rational, moral and emotional response, both directly — through describing and analysing political issues — and indirectly by influencing how we feel about things” (Charteris-Black, 2011, pp. 50–51). Bowdle and Gentner have demonstrated in several instances that individuals can process metaphors as quickly as they can process literal meanings (Bowdle & Gentner, 2005; Gentner & Bowdle, 2001), yet they add that individuals need more time to comprehend novel metaphors than conventional metaphors. This suggests that the nature of the impact might be different for novel metaphors than for conventional ones. This is a point to bear in mind when turning to the analysis of metaphors in political discourse.

So far, we have been talking about the political impact of metaphors as if it was one single process. However, there are different ways in which metaphors can have a political impact. Firstly, metaphors have the ability to frame the debate. Studies in psycholinguistics have demonstrated the metaphor framing effect on individuals in their everyday life (Bosman, 1987; Read, Cesa, Jones, & Collins, 1990; Robins & Mayer, 2000). In particular, political and social scientists posit that metaphors have the potential to frame political debates (Carver & Pikalo, 2008b). One single political issue can be framed in entirely different ways depending on the metaphors at work. For instance, Walter & Helmig (2008, p. 126) suggested that the use of different metaphors about the Eastern enlargement of the EU affected the discourse orientations about this political issue at the macro level.

Using a particular metaphor can also reveal an underlying conception of a political reality. This has been shown by the proponents of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, following Lakoff and Johnson’s work (1980). Such varying conceptions may indeed lead to specific policy choices. Metaphors may thus not only frame the debate, but also orient it towards particular political decisions. Looking at the history of Europe from the latter part of the seventeenth century onwards, Ringmar (2008, p. 64) explains that “the regimes where the [machine-]metaphor was most popular — Prussia and Austria in particular — were also the states where people first were granted rights.”

Therefore, another political impact of metaphors is to achieve certain political goals such as (re-)producing legitimacy not just in the short term, but also in the longer run (Yanow, 2008). In this line of reasoning, Schneider (2008) argues that the frequency of certain metaphorical mappings in political discourse will eventually lead to constructing legitimacy, as this frequency influences how an

issue is collectively conceived of, how it should be addressed, and what solutions are brought forward. The analysis of metaphors and their political impact relates thus to the larger question of how language might structure politics, “by promoting certain ways and downplaying other possible ways of understanding phenomena, and of acting upon these understandings” (Stenvoll, 2008, p. 39). This is why Charteris-Black (2004) proposes a critical metaphor analysis that “aims to identify *which* metaphors are chosen in persuasive genres such as political speeches, political party manifestos or press reports, and attempts to explain *why* these metaphors are chosen, with reference to the interaction between an orator’s purposes and a specific set of speech circumstances” (Charteris-Black, 2013, pp. 174, author’s emphasis).

The next step in the study of political metaphors is therefore to explore, from an interdisciplinary perspective, their political impact, not only in terms of their presence in political discourse (the production side) but also in terms of their reception by the discourse recipients. This special issue accordingly entails a twofold question about the nature of political metaphors, or to put it differently, about the nature of metaphors in political discourse, on the one hand, and the nature of their reception, on the other hand.

Are political metaphors different from any other metaphors? Are the metaphors found in political discourse typical of this type of discourse? These questions tap into the production side of metaphors. In this regard, recent research has also called into question the all-encompassing nature of conceptual metaphors and it has emphasized the need to test theoretical views against empirical data (Cameron, 2003; Steen & Wolters, 2012), and to develop reliable methods for metaphor identification (Pragglejazz Group, 2007). The question of the nature of metaphors in political discourse is also related to their deliberate nature, in the sense of Steen (2008, 2011b), who proposes a three-dimensional model of metaphor analysis, distinguishing between the linguistic, conceptual and communicative levels, in which metaphors are considered as being deliberate at the communicative level when they are “expressly meant to change the addressee’s perspective on the referent or topic that is the target of the metaphor, by making the addressee look at it from a different conceptual domain or space, which functions as a conceptual source” (Steen, 2008, p. 222). According to Steen, these deliberate metaphors tend to be processed differently than non-deliberate ones, the former being processed by cross-domain mapping, the latter being processed by categorization as conventional metaphorical extensions of a single lexical category. This view has been challenged in the literature, among others by Gibbs (2011b, p. 41) who rejects the view that conventional metaphors are not processed by cross-domain mappings but also questions the very notion of what deliberateness means by reminding us that “people have limited awareness of their habitual

behaviours”, but also by highlighting the methodological endeavour of identifying metaphors that are produced deliberately in spontaneous discourse. However, when analyzing metaphors in political discourse, it might be important to be able to make a distinction between metaphors that appear to be conventional instances of language use and metaphors which seem to be explicitly used to present one’s conceptualization of a given issue (see for instance Goatly, 2007; Charteris-Black & Musolff, 2003). In this regard Perrez and Reuchamps (2014) have also shown that making the distinction between deliberate metaphor and nondeliberate ones when analyzing citizen data can lead to meaningful political insights in reflecting the citizens’ political opinions.

In addition to the nature of political metaphors, there is the question of the nature of the discourses that convey them. As argued by Steen (2011a), scholars of discourse analysis should pay more attention to genre as a key driving force behind language use, cognition, and communication. Such an endeavour will shed light on the very nature of political discourses and their different subcategories and how they are realized in language, distinguishing between code (language, register, style, rhetoric), text (content, type, form, structure) and context (participants, settings, medium).

The questions about the nature of political metaphors and about political discourse are topics that are intrinsically interrelated and this is why the first part of this special issue tackles them. Some questions that might arise are, for instance, to what extent metaphors can be regarded as a defining feature of political discourse from the perspective of genre analysis. Or to put it another way, can the frequent use of metaphors in this kind of discourse be explained by the common expectations of the participants engaged in such an interaction/discourse? What is the nature of the metaphors identified in such political discourse? Are these realizations of conceptual metaphors that are deeply rooted in our conceptual system, or more context-specific metaphors that are used for specific communicative goals? And finally does the context of their production — be it political, social or economic — matter to understand their potential impact?

The first article directly tackles the question of the genre of political discourse and specifically addresses the nature of metaphors and their multimodality in party conference speeches. In this first contribution, linguists Emilie L’Hôte and Camille Debras argue that party conference speeches are a specific subgenre of political discourse that should be examined through a multimodal approach. Their hypothesis is that conference speeches are clearly distinguished from other types of political speech by an overuse and a greater variety of conceptual metaphors, the most important of which are made salient by a prominent multimodal frame (involving, e.g., gesture, facial expression, posture, and prosody). To this end, the authors offer a study based on a comparison between party conference speeches

and other political speeches from both the UK Labour and Conservative parties. They perform a qualitative-yet-systematic analysis of conceptual metaphors connected with the political issues raised in the speeches, looking at both the textual and multimodal levels. Their contention is that the most prominent and the most productive metaphors at the textual level are also clearly marked at a multimodal level, which is likely to yield a greater political impact.

In order to explore the impact of metaphors, the second article by communication scientist Christ'l De Landtsheer takes a very different approach. Following the tradition in political science and communication that seeks to establish a method for quantitatively evaluating the rhetorical power of metaphors, the author uses the Metaphor Power Index (MPI), a method that aims at deriving the potential rhetorical power of metaphors in a given discourse environment, to investigate the nature and the role of metaphors in the recent financial crisis. Her article more specifically examines the logic behind financial crisis metaphors in concert with the economic and political climate, in order to determine to what extent the economic and political context had an impact on the use of specific metaphors over the course of the crisis. To achieve this, the article relies on an extensive content analysis of several newspapers in The Netherlands and Flanders between 2006 and 2013.

While the first two articles tackle the production side, the second part of the special issue deals with the reception side; that is, the question of their political impact on the metaphor's recipient (in terms of representations, attitudes and behaviour). As suggested by Bougher (2012, p.217), metaphorical reasoning "offers a cognitive mechanism that explains how citizens make sense of the political world by drawing from their nonpolitical knowledge and experiences". Metaphors therefore not only reflect perceived reality, but they also function as cues by which citizens come to understand political positions, and through which they can shape their political behaviours. Recent studies have started to empirically explore such dynamics and show contrasting results. A case in point is Thibodeau and Boroditsky's studies (2011, 2013), in which different metaphors about crime were found to lead to different policy proposals by the citizens. When crime was described as a "contagious virus", measures were proposed to foster social integration; when crime was described as "ravaging beast", repression is favoured. This was explained as different images of crime resulting from the two different metaphorical frames.

Yet, a recent extended replication by Steen et al. (2014) did not come to the same conclusions. The authors show that the impact might be due to simple exposure to textual information, rather than metaphors *per se*. Simply reading about crime would increase people's overall preference for enforcement, regardless of the presence or absence of a specific metaphorical frame. Metaphors therefore do not

automatically lead to straightforward political behaviour, and above all they might have differential effects on reasoning. Between the reception and production sides of the metaphor chain, much is still to be understood about the process itself, or perhaps processes. Concerning the individual level, Gibbs and Colston (2012, p. 130) point out that “psychologists disagree [...] about the cognitive mechanisms responsible for emergent meanings during metaphor understanding.” Following this line of reasoning, it might well be the case that the context matters considerably, both in trying to understand why a given metaphorical frame is used instead of another plausible frame in a particular context and what impact this choice yields on the recipient’s representations. Moreover, the choice of a specific metaphorical frame, might have more than one single impact; there might well be multiple impacts and their temporal nature might also vary a lot between the short term, mid term and long term.

While political scientists have hitherto often neglected political metaphors (Bougher, 2012), they have long made useful distinctions for studying the impact of political decisions. First of all, they distinguish between the micro level (typically the level of individuals), the meso level (the level of organizations), and the macro level (the level of systems). In this regard, the framework of analysis of the political impact of metaphors could even be more refined. Metaphors could have an impact on *politics*, but also on *policies* and on the *polity* itself. Politics is “the activity by which decisions are arrived at and implemented in and for a community” (Blondel, 1991, p. 482), while policies consist of the output of politics, or more broadly defined, “the linkage between intentions, actions and results” (Heywood, 2007, p. 427) of government bodies. Finally, polity refers to the place is where politics occurs, i.e. “a society organized through the exercise of political authority” (Heywood, 2007, p. 5). This distinction between various levels illustrates that the potential impact of metaphors could be manifold. It would therefore be useful to determine what kind(s) of impact(s) a metaphor could lead to and under which conditions.

One could also think of a differentiated impact between stand-alone metaphors and metaphors that are part of a larger network of metaphors, which may express allegories (Gibbs, 2011a; see also Crisp 2008 on the distinction between extended metaphors and allegories), within a single discourse or across several discourses. In some cases, extended metaphors could help structure the textual information and lead to the construction of a more coherent textbase, which would eventually result in a better integration of the textual information, at least in the short-term. This in turn would suggest that the use of a metaphor might lead readers/listeners to mobilize the necessary cognitive means to make sense of a given topic at a particular point in time. Accordingly, one may pick a particular metaphor in one specific context to frame a particular issue, but pick another in a

different context to frame the same issue. This would suggest that our representations of political issues should not be regarded as static representations, but rather as being built on the fly in a given context to make sense of a political issue.

The temporal nature of the impact of metaphors has already been mentioned. It makes even more sense to take this into account in the study of political impact, since political scientists have demonstrated that political opinions should be distinguished from political attitudes and political representations. Whereas political opinions may be short-lived and change quickly, political attitudes are more entrenched in individual and group behaviours (as they are “mental predisposition[s] that need not ever be translated into observable acts or specifically formulated thoughts or beliefs” (Laponce, 1991, p.437)) and political representations are made of political opinions, political attitudes and imagination (Moscovici, [1961] 1976). Opinions, attitudes and representations all influence political behaviours, but they do it in different ways. This is why a close study of the political impact of metaphors is necessary. Hence, the second part of this special issue is devoted to examining the nature of the political impact of metaphors on the recipient side.

Taking an interdisciplinary perspective, linguist Julien Perrez and political scientist Min Reuchamps developed an experimental procedure based round an article published in the Belgian newspaper “Le Soir” (13–14 July 2013), in which Belgian federalism is compared to a Tetris game. The procedure involved a picture and a text and four conditions: full, text, image and control. Comparing the various experimental conditions allows the authors to measure the impact of the Tetris metaphor on the citizens’ representations of Belgian federalism, to assess to what extent the different metaphorical media contribute to this impact and to measure the long-term impact of this metaphor on the citizens’ political representations. By examining these topics, the study seeks to contribute to a better understanding of the role and functions metaphors play in political discourse, and more globally in our everyday political interactions.

The impact of metaphors could also be explained by the role played by frame extendedness. In their article, linguists W. Gudrun Reijnierse, Tina Krennmayr, Gerard J. Steen and communication scientist Christian Burgers explore “How viruses and beasts affect our opinions (or not): The role of extendedness in metaphorical framing”. Following on the on-going debate between Thibodeau and Boroditsky’s studies (2011, 2013) and their own work (Steen et al., 2014) and the existence of contrasting findings, they investigate whether extending the metaphorical frame of the ‘Crime is a virus’ metaphor, on the one hand, and of the ‘Crime is a beast’ on the other, leads to a differentiated impact on the perceived effectiveness of policy measures related to crime solving. More specifically, they analysed to what extent these respective extended metaphorical frames led the subjects to choose either reform-oriented policies (hypothesised as being in line with

the former) or enforcement-oriented ones (hypothesised as being in line with the latter). Their two experiments show mixed results: the experiment testing the extension of the metaphor ‘Crime is a beast’ showed frame-consistent measures, but this was not the case with the experiment based on the ‘Crime is a virus’ metaphor. Metaphorical framing effects thus appear to be more subtle than often assumed.

Extended metaphors are also discussed in the final paper of the series. In his contribution, psycholinguist Ray Gibbs contends that many conceptual metaphors should be understood as allegories, i.e., extended metaphors in which an entire narrative introduces and elaborates upon a metaphorical source domain to present a rich symbolic understanding of people and events. Such an approach could refine our understanding of the political impact of metaphors. Indeed some studies show that people can readily interpret many of these allegories via ‘embodied simulations’, by which they imagine themselves participating in the very actions referred to in the language. These embodied simulations are automatic and sometimes tap into enduring allegorical themes that have symbolic value. The author presents both linguistic and psycholinguistic research supporting the idea that embodied simulations are critical to creating and interpreting metaphors in political discourse, and demonstrates how these extended metaphors foster allegorical inferences which enable speakers and listeners to bond over mutually-held narrative symbols.

The questions raised in this special issue concern both the production side and the reception side of the metaphor chain, as well as the intermediary processes themselves, both at the individual and collective levels. All of these questions address the methodological challenges of measuring the political impact of metaphors. Only an interdisciplinary group of scholars is likely to be able to provide viable answers to these questions. This is the endeavour of this special issue. It brings together metaphor specialists from various disciplines — cognitive linguistics, communication, political science and psychology — to explain if and how discourse, through metaphors, actively shape the political reality.

Acknowledgments

The articles published in this special issue were initially presented at an international workshop held at the Université de Liège, Belgium, on 15–16 May 2014. We would like to thank all the participants and discussants for their insightful comments that have allowed the authors to refine their papers. The transformation of this collection of papers into a coherent special issue owes much to the Editors, Alice Deignan and Graham Low, and the Editorial Board of “Metaphor and the Social World”, as well as to the two anonymous reviewers who diligently reviewed each article. Finally, we are grateful to the authors whose works contribute to a better understanding of the political impact of metaphors. Needless to say that much still needs to be written on this key issue for the social world.

References

- Beer, F. A., & De Landtsheer, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Metaphorical world politics. Rhetorics of democracy, war and globalization*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Blondel, J. (1991). Politics. In V. Bogdanor (Ed.), *The Blackwell encyclopaedia of political science* (pp. 482–484). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bosman, J. (1987). Persuasive effects of political metaphors. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 2(2), 97–113. DOI: 10.1207/s15327868ms0202_2
- Bougher, L. D. (2012). The case for metaphor in political reasoning and cognition. *Political Psychology*, 33(1), 145–163. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2011.00865.x
- Bowdle, B. F., & Gentner, D. (2005). The career of metaphor. *Psychological Review*, 112(1), 193–216. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.112.1.193
- Cameron, L. (2003). *Metaphor in educational discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Carver, T., & Pikalo, J. (2008a). Editors' introduction. In T. Carver & J. Pikalo (Eds.), *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world* (pp. 1–11). London: Routledge.
- Carver, T., & Pikalo, J. (Eds.). (2008b). *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world*. London: Routledge.
- Charteris-Black, J., & Musolff, A. (2003). "Battered hero" or "innocent victim"? A comparative study of metaphors for euro trading in British and German financial reporting. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22(2), 153–176. DOI: 10.1016/S0889-4906(02)00012-1
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230000612
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor* (2nd ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230319899
- Charteris-Black, J. (2013). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Crisp, P. (2008). Between extended metaphor and allegory: Is blending enough? *Language and Literature*, 17(4), 291–308. DOI: 10.1177/0963947008095960
- De Landtsheer, C. (2009). Collecting political meaning from the count of metaphor. In A. Musolff & J. Zinken (Eds.), *Metaphor and discourse* (pp. 59–78). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Easton, D. (1965). *A systems analysis of political life*. New York: John Wiley.
- Gentner, D., & Bowdle, B. F. (2001). Convention, form, and figurative language Processing. *Metaphor & Symbol*, 16(3/4), 223–247. DOI: 10.1080/10926488.2001.9678896
- Gibbs, R. W. (1999). *Intentions in the experience of meaning*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W. (2011a). The allegorical impulse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 26(2), 121–130. DOI: 10.1080/10508406.2011.556498
- Gibbs, R. W. (2011b). Are 'deliberate' metaphors really deliberate? A question of human consciousness and action. *Metaphor and the Social World*, 1(1), 26–52. DOI: 10.1075/msw.1.1.03gib
- Gibbs, R. W., & Colston, H. L. (2012). *Interpreting figurative meaning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139168779
- Goatly, A. (2007). *Washing the brain — Metaphor and hidden ideology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/dapsac.23
- Heywood, A. (2007). *Politics* (3rd ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Johnson, M. (2010). Metaphor and cognition. In D. Schmicking & S. Gallagher (Eds.), *Handbook of phenomenology and cognitive science* (pp. 401–414). London: Springer.
DOI: 10.1007/978-90-481-2646-0_22
- L'Hôte, E. (2010). New Labour and globalization: Globalist discourse with a twist? *Discourse & Society*, 21(4), 355–376. DOI: 10.1177/0957926510366212
- L'Hôte, E. (2012). « Breaking up Britain » ? Métaphores et discours sur la dévolution au Royaume-Uni. In J. Perrez & M. Reuchamps (Eds.), *Les relations communautaires en Belgique : Approches politiques et linguistiques* (pp. 161–189). Louvain-la-Neuve: Academia-L'harmattan.
- Lakoff, G. (1996). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant: Know your values and frame the debate*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing Company.
- Lakoff, G. (2008). *The political mind: Why you can't understand 21st-Century American politics with an 18th-Century brain*. New York: Viking.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Laponce, J. A. (1991). Political attitudes. In V. Bogdanor (Ed.), *The Blackwell encyclopaedia of political science* (pp. 437–438). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Moscovici, S. ([1961] 1976). *La psychanalyse, son image, son public* (2nd ed.). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Musolff, A. (2004). *Metaphor and political discourse. Analogical reasoning in debates about Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230504516
- Musolff, A. (2010). *Metaphor, nation and the holocaust: The concept of the body politic*. London: Routledge.
- Musolff, A., Schaeffner, C., & Townson, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Conceiving of Europe: Diversity in unity*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Perrez, J., & Reuchamps, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Les relations communautaires en Belgique : Approches politiques et linguistiques*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Academia-L'harmattan.
- Perrez, J., & Reuchamps, M. (2014). Deliberate metaphors in political discourse: The case of citizen discourse. *Metaphorik.de*, 25, 7–41.
- Pragglejazz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22(1), 1–39. DOI: 10.1080/10926480709336752
- Read, S. J., Cesa, I. L., Jones, D. K., & Collins, N. L. (1990). When is the federal budget like a baby? Metaphor in political rhetoric. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 5(3), 125–149.
DOI: 10.1207/s15327868ms0503_1
- Ringmar, E. (2008). Metaphors of social order. In T. Carver & J. Pikalo (Eds.), *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world* (pp. 57–68). London: Routledge.
- Robins, S., & Mayer, R. E. (2000). The metaphor framing effect: Metaphorical reasoning about text-based dilemmas. *Discourse Processes*, 30(1), 57–86. DOI: 10.1207/S15326950dp3001_03
- Schneider, S. G. (2008). Exploring the metaphorical (de-)construction of legitimacy: A comparison of legitimization discourses in American and British newspapers. In T. Carver & J. Pikalo (Eds.), *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world* (pp. 83–102). London: Routledge.
- Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Steen, G. J. (2008). The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23(4), 213–241. DOI: 10.1080/10926480802426753

- Steen, G. J. (2011a). Genre between the humanities and the sciences. In M. Callies, W. R. Keller, & A. Lohöfer (Eds.), *Bi-directionality in the cognitive sciences: Avenues, challenges, and limitations* (pp. 21–42). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/hcp.30.03ste
- Steen, G. J. (2011b). What does ‘really deliberate’ really mean? More thoughts on metaphor and consciousness. *Metaphor and the Social World*, 1(1), 53–56. DOI: 10.1075/msw.1.1.04ste
- Steen, G. J., Reijnierse, W. G., & Burgers, C. (2014). When do natural language metaphors influence reasoning? A follow-up study to Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2013). *PLoS ONE*, 9(12), e113536. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0113536
- Steen, G. J., & Wolters, R. (2012). Is Bush a strict father and Obama a nurturing parent? Paper presented at the 9th Conference “Researching and Applying Metaphor,” 4–7 July, University of Lancaster.
- Stenvoll, D. (2008). Slippery slopes in political discourse. In T. Carver & J. Pikalo (Eds.), *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world* (pp. 28–40). London: Routledge.
- Thibodeau, P. H., & Boroditsky, L. (2011). Metaphors we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 6(2), e16782. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0016782
- Thibodeau, P. H., & Boroditsky, L. (2013). Natural language metaphors covertly influence reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 8(1), e52961. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0052961
- Walter, J., & Helmig, J. (2008). Discursive metaphor analysis: (De)construction(s) of Europe. In T. Carver & J. Pikalo (Eds.), *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world* (pp. 119–131). London: Routledge.
- Yanow, D. (2008). Cognition meets action: Metaphors as models *of* and models *for*. In T. Carver & J. Pikalo (Eds.), *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world* (pp. 225–238). London: Routledge.

Framing, metaphor and dialogue

A multimodal approach to party conference speeches

Camille Debras and Emilie L'Hôte

Université Paris Ouest, Nanterre — La Défense / Université Paris Diderot,
Sorbonne Paris Cité

This paper considers the Party Conference Speech as a paradigmatic example of effective political discourse, so as to identify and analyse the elements that make for the successful reception of a speech, and determine the ways in which the leader brings about consensus and generates applause. Methodologically speaking, our framework for analysis combines (i) quantitative and qualitative methods, as well as (ii) textual and multimodal analyses of the performed text. We start with a quantitative overview of party conference speeches analysed as written corpora, before zooming in on Tony Blair's 2006 party conference speech, in which we identify what non-verbal strategies come into play in the discursive construction of the leader's individual and the party's collective identities.

Keywords: Party conference speeches, discourse analysis, corpus-based methods, gesture studies, conceptual metaphor theory, framing, reception theory

1. Introduction

In the United Kingdom, political party conferences regularly receive substantial media and press attention, in accordance with their marked significance with respect to the parties' cohesion and evolution over the years (Faucher-King, 2005, p. 1). They can even be described as an institutional ritual (Mariot, 2006, 2009), insofar as they have an important unifying function across the three components of the party: public office, grassroots and central office (Mair, 1994).¹ Within this

1. Yet they remain under-investigated in the area of political discourse analysis (Finlayson & Martin, 2008, p. 455). Studies like Faucher-King (2005) or Heritage & Greatbatch (1986) have focused on their significance from the standpoints of anthropology and political sociology, or of conversation analysis. See also Minkin (1978), and more recently Pettitt (2012) and Bull (2012).

specific political setting, the leader's speech at the Conference functions as "the rallying finale of [the] conference" (Faucher-King, 2005, pp. 80–82). As such, it is more often than not termed the 'most important speech' of a politician's career. In Labour's history, these speeches have set the scene for crucial moments in the life of the party, such as Kinnock's 1985 attack on Militant, or Blair's launch of the new Clause IV. Still formally referred to as "the Parliamentary Report" in the conference programme, it originally consisted of a written document destined to be critically examined by delegates, which led to much debate (Minkin, 1978, p. 214). Things changed after the Second World War: Attlee decided to use the report to address the conference directly, and this practice was resumed by Wilson in the 1960s. The shift gradually affected the very nature of the speech, which stopped being the subject of critical discussion, and was rather "made under circumstances which guarantee its uncritical reception" (Minkin, 1978, p. 216). Debate was replaced by "prolonged applause", as the speech became the "symbol of leadership pre-eminence" (1978, p. 216), thereby bringing it closer to its Conservative counterpart. On both sides of the political spectrum, the leader's speech at the party conference now takes the form of a political ritual where consensus prevails: the leader bonds with the members of the party as the speech reasserts the party's collective identity, and the party leader is preaching to the choir.

This is why in this paper, we propose to consider the Party Conference Speech as a paradigmatic example of effective political speech, so as to identify and analyse the elements that make for the successful reception of a political speech, and determine the ways in which the leader brings about consensus and generates applause (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986). We aim to account for the successful impact of a political speech on its audience. We argue that multiple points of entry are needed to get a full picture of such a complex research object. Therefore our framework for analysis combines quantitative and qualitative methods at the textual level, with a multimodal analysis integrating speech, prosody and gesture. We start with a quantitative overview of party conference speeches analysed as written corpora, before zooming in on Tony Blair's 2006 speech, so as to identify what non-verbal strategies come into play in the discursive construction of the leader's individual, and the party's collective, identities.

2. Corpus and methods

2.1 Corpus description

A corpus of political speeches was compiled to bring out the specific features of the leader's speeches at the party conference. It comprises 4 sub-corpora, which are

described in this section. The first sub-corpus is a compilation of the Labour leader's speeches at party conferences (henceforth LPCS, for 'Labour Party Conference Speeches') from 1994 to 2013. LPCS contains 119,805 words, and includes 20 speeches. The second Labour sub-corpus is a compilation of non-party conference speeches delivered by the leader of the party for the same time period (henceforth LnPCS, for 'Labour non-Party Conference Speeches'). LnPCS contains 144,786 words and includes 46 speeches. A parallel set of sub-corpora was compiled for the Conservative Party. The sub-corpus consisting of the Conservative leader's speeches at party conferences (henceforth TPCS, for 'Tory Party Conference Speeches') contains 107,245 words, and includes 20 speeches. Similarly, the second Conservative sub-corpus is a compilation of non-party conference speeches delivered by the leader of the party for the same time period (henceforth TnPCS, for 'Tory non-Party Conference Speeches'). TnPCS comprises 85,791 words and 28 speeches.

This paper aims at drawing comparisons that go beyond traditional divisions on the British political spectrum, and look at the leader's party conference speech as a prototypical example of effective political discourse, regardless of political allegiance. For this purpose, all party conference speeches were compiled into the corpus section called PCS, containing 227,052 words and including all 40 speeches mentioned above. Its non-party conference counterpart (henceforth nPCS) contains 230,581 words and includes 74 speeches. Comparisons between PCS and nPCS² will not obscure differences between parties, and do not presume that Labour and Conservative discourse are one and the same object of study; instead they focus on party conference speeches as prototypes of political discourse in the first instance, which means that party-specific distinctions are identified as relevant, but come second in our analyses.

The overall size of this preliminary collection of texts is 457,633 words; the overall corpus is composed of 114 speeches. This allows us to obtain valid statistical results and identify statistically significant discourse patterns, which we focus on in the qualitative part of our analysis.

Party conference speeches are not just textual transcripts that can be analysed for verbal content. They are also spoken performances, delivered in front of an audience of party members, which are accessible through video recordings. Thus our analyses focus on both text and non-verbal elements like prosody, gesture, posture and facial expression. Such speeches also have a fundamentally dialogical dimension. The speaker addresses an audience that reacts during the course of the speech, albeit with the limited repertoire of laughter and applause. Some

2. Acronyms like PCS are used in the paper to refer to both the relevant (sub-)corpus, and to individual examples of items in the corpus.

of the multimodal resources mobilized in the spoken performance are devoted to anticipate, trigger (see Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986) or respond to the audience's reactions in this asymmetrical dialogue. In the qualitative section of the paper, we analyse the text and video recording of Blair's 2006 party conference speech, as one representative example of effective political discourse. It is 56 minutes and 23 seconds long, and contains 5227 words.³ Before focusing on one of Blair's PCS in the qualitative multimodal part of our study, we deal more specifically with elements that are characteristic of new⁴ Labour discourse.

2.2 Theoretical background

Frame semantics (Fillmore, 1982; Lakoff, 2002, 2006) and Conceptual Metaphor Theory are at the basis of the work carried in our analysis of political discourse. As established by Lakoff (1993, p. 194), the primary purpose of conceptual metaphor is to create understanding. Metaphor also *determines* understanding because it only allows for partial profiling of concepts (Kövecses, 2002, p. 81). This element of human cognition is particularly relevant to political discourse. Politicians use conventional aspects of conceptual metaphors to frame or reframe parts of their agendas, and knowing what elements are profiled in a particular metaphor also raises awareness of the elements that are hidden (Semino, 2008). What is not profiled in political discourse is often as important as what is brought to the foreground, and the discourse of the two main British political parties is no exception to this rule. Previous studies of metaphor in political discourse have focused on specific target domains to see how selected issues are framed in discourse (e.g., globalization in L'Hôte (2010, 2014)) and on how specific source domains participate in political discourse strategies (e.g., religion in Charteris-Black (2004)). These studies rely on Fillmore's initial (1982) definition of 'semantic frames', as words and constructions that invoke a known scenario for a situation or an event, and on what Lakoff (2006) has termed 'surface frames', i.e. mental structures associated with specific lexical elements.

In this paper however, our main goal is to propose a study of party conference speeches as a paradigm of effectiveness in political discourse, by highlighting their main characteristics. We argue that such speeches in the UK aim at touching the audience's emotions and values, at generating consensus and at celebrating the party as a united entity. Therefore, this study focuses more on the 'deep frames' at stake in discourse and gesture, i.e. basic frames that constitute people's

3. See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1PCYPPKp7ts> for the video version of Blair's 2006 PCS (accessed 07/07/14).

4. The adjective *new* in the name of the party was never officially capitalized (L'Hôte, 2014).

worldviews, define what is understood as common sense, and are connected to values and principles (Lakoff, 2006). In particular, it relies on Lakoff's conceptual models of politics of the Strict Father and the Nurturant Parent (2002). These models are built on a series of conceptual metaphors bringing together nation and family (Lakoff, 2002, p. 153), namely *THE NATION IS A FAMILY*, *THE GOVERNMENT IS A PARENT* and *THE CITIZENS ARE THE CHILDREN*. The Strict Father model is defined by a dominant father figure whose priorities include moral strength and obedience to authority figures (Lakoff, 2002, p. 35). While Lakoff's analysis contains a lengthy list of metaphors included in the Strict-Father model, Cienki (2005a, p. 281) highlights *MORALITY IS STRENGTH*, *BEING GOOD IS BEING UPRIGHT* and *MORALITY IS PURITY* as having the highest priority. At the other end of the spectrum, the Nurturant-Parent model is defined by a more horizontal and non-gendered parental structure, whose main values include caring, empathy and nurturance (Lakoff, 2002, p. 35). Cienki (2005a, p. 281) highlights the following moral metaphors as central to the model: *MORALITY IS EMPATHY*, *MORAL ACTION IS NURTURANCE* and *MORAL GROWTH IS PHYSICAL GROWTH*. Deep frames such as these models, along with large schemas such as those L'Hôte (2014) has identified as new Labour's narrative of change and progress, contribute to the selection of many surface frames — metaphorical or not — in discourse and gesture, but they may not always be identified by a precise series of source-to-target mappings expressed in the text. Cienki's (2005a) empirical testing of Lakoff's theoretical models suggests that reasoning in terms of conceptual models may occur more "through non-metaphorical language than through verbal metaphoric expressions" (Cienki, 2005a, p. 304). His analyses also lend support to the definition of a conceptual model as "something which a cultural group ('supra-individual') has a mastery of, rather than any one individual speaker. Only some of the metaphors which cohere as part of a cognitive/cultural model may belong to an individual's repertoire" (p. 305).

Cienki's empirical study highlights the relevance of our reliance on gesture analysis. He remarks that some of the metaphors identified by Lakoff in connection with the Strict-Father and the Nurturant-Parent models may be expressed more frequently in the gestures of speakers than in their discourse. We elaborate on this idea in Section 4.

2.3 A corpus-based multimodal analysis of political discourse

In this study, we present a corpus-based multimodal analysis of political discourse. Our approach is a variation on the "methodological synergy" advocated by Baker et al. (2008, p. 274) in their analysis of the discourse of refugees and asylum seekers in the British press. It is based on the assumption that "qualitative findings can

be quantified, and that 'quantitative' findings need to be interpreted in the light of existing theories, and lead to their adaptation, or the formulation of new ones" (p. 296). Our approach differs from Baker et al.'s in the detail of the methodological steps proposed (p. 295), as it incorporates cognitive linguistics and multimodality. The analysis proceeds along six steps, which are detailed below.

- i. The analysis starts with the formulation of research hypotheses informed by a context-based analysis of our main topic — the specificities of the leader's party conference speeches as a model of effective political discourse.
- ii. The full lists of significant keywords and key concepts for each of our corpus comparisons are the starting point of our analyses. Significant differences between the corpora are studied in detail so as to determine larger patterns.
- iii. Significant keywords and key concepts are manually selected from the list for each of the larger issues at stake in the study.
- iv. Concordance analyses for given elements in the lists yield necessary contextual information on the words/concepts under scrutiny. Collocation analyses are also taken into account, especially in the case of high-frequency words.
- v. Our initial research questions and hypotheses are then detailed further.
- vi. Based on these refined hypotheses, we proceed to the second part of the process, which is a qualitative focus on a sample speech from our corpus data. The detailed study of the full text and the video version of Blair's 2006 party conference speech allows us to analyse these claims further: we focus on elements that, while more difficult to quantify, are essential to our study, namely metaphor⁵ and deep frames, as well as gesture and other multimodal factors at play.

5. We relied on the method developed by the Pragglejaz Group (2007) for the identification of lexical units used metaphorically in the text of the speech. A contemporary audience was assumed for the analysis. Phrasal verbs were treated as one single lexical unit. WMatrix's multi-word units were not retained as a measure of lexical units for the analysis, in accordance with the Pragglejaz group's original decision regarding frequent collocations (Pragglejaz Group, 2007). Word-class boundaries were not crossed (Steen et al., 2010). The "New Oxford American Dictionary" was used as a reference. C. Debras and E. L'Hôte were the two analysts in charge of coding of the data. Discussion between coders took place after each finished their first 'pass'. When a mention of the target domain for the metaphor was available in the immediate co-text — in the same sentence, or in the sentence immediately preceding or following the analysed word, the conceptual metaphor was identified based on this textual occurrence. When the target domain was not explicitly mentioned, identification of the conceptual metaphor was determined after a discussion between the two analysts. Statistical analysis on inter-analyst agreement is planned in the next steps of the project. Non-metaphorical entailments of Lakoff's metaphorical models of politics could not, however, be identified with the same procedure.

The rest of this section details some of the key elements to our approach, namely our reliance on WMatrix for the quantitative part of our study and the grid designed for gesture analysis of Blair's speech.

2.3.1 *WMatrix and statistics*

WMatrix is an online tool for corpus analysis and corpus comparison that produces concordance tables, frequency lists, collocation tables and keyness analyses (see definition below) (Rayson, 2003, 2009).⁶ The dataset is tagged for parts of speech (PoS) using CLAWS⁷ (Rayson, 2003, p. 64).⁸ Semantic annotation for semantic concepts is performed using USAS.⁹

WMatrix's keyness analysis is a comparison between two frequency lists using log likelihood ratio as a statistical test (Meyer, 2002, p. 126). One of WMatrix's strong points is that keyword analysis is then extended to analyses of key PoS and key semantic concepts. Each word/semantic tag/PoS tag in the primary corpus is compared with its equivalent in a secondary corpus; the software then evaluates whether the difference between the frequencies in the two corpora is statistically significant or not¹⁰ and finally reorders the word/tag list according to the statistical score obtained. WMatrix identifies both positive keywords — words that are over-represented in the primary corpus, and negative keywords — words that are under-represented in the primary corpus. '+' signs are displayed next to positive keywords in the table, and '-' signs indicate negative keywords.

2.3.2 *Multimodal analysis*

The video was annotated in ELAN¹¹ for the multiple non-verbal dimensions of the speaker's performance, including the forms and functions of hand gestures, head

6. For detailed descriptions and a discussions of concordance tables, concordance analysis and collocations, see Sinclair (1991), Baker (2006, pp. 92–93), and Archer (2009). For a detailed discussion of frequency lists, see Rayson (2008).

7. Constituent Likelihood Automatic Word-tagging System.

8. See Rayson (2003, p. 66) for a detailed description of the entire tagset.

9. UCREL Semantic Analysis System.

10. It is hard to find any kind of popular consensus about cut-off points in the literature (Baker, 2004, p. 351). Because of the generally skewed nature of corpus data (Oakes, 1998, p. 4) and the fact that multiple comparisons are often carried out on the same data set, we have chosen to move from a standard cut-off point at $p=0.01$ to results yielding a p -value inferior to 0.0001, which means an LL score equal to or greater than 15.13.

11. ELAN is a free video annotation software available from: <http://www.lat-mpi.eu/tools/elan/download>

movements and facial variations like raised eyebrows. As the literature on gesture has shown, there is no absolute categorization for gesture functions, and several gesture typologies have been established, including those by McNeill (2005, pp. 38–41), Müller (1998) and Kendon (2004, pp. 158–159). We have therefore created a specific template for the annotation of a speech performed in the presence of an audience, composed of the following tiers:¹²

- i. Head movements: single nod, head nod, head shake, head tilt (to the side), other;
- ii. Facial expressions: raised eyebrows, tense mouth, other;
- iii. Hand gesture forms: precision grip, index pointing up, both palms straight facing each other, open palm(s) lateral, other;
- iv. Hand gesture functions: referential, abstract referential (metaphoric), deictic, pragmatic, prosodic beat;

So as to characterize the speech's impact on the audience, another tier (v) was added to annotate the audience's reaction to the speech: laughter, applause, other.

Using online material for multimodal analysis has advantages and drawbacks. When the video is available online, it can easily be downloaded right away in a convenient format. Yet a major issue arises with most political speeches that are already edited for media broadcasting. Most of the time, the camera zooms in to get a medium close-up of the politician, leaving out a large part of the speaker's gesture space. The multiple cameras used to record the speech also regularly focus on the audience members' reactions, especially on people mentioned in the speech who are part of the audience, or on general audience reactions such as applause or laughter. Such angles can be included in the final editing of the video recording, at times when the political leader may be speaking and gesturing. As a consequence, prosody remains accessible continuously but gestures are not always fully visible, because the camera's focus is either too close or away from the speaker. And yet, the video's editing usually does not hinder gesture analysis: facial expressions and head movements are accessible when the camera is on the speaker, while most of his hand gestures are ample and salient enough to be seen by the whole audience, thus remaining within the camera's angle.

12. In ELAN, a template is a structure of annotation lines called 'tiers'. The annotator can freely adapt the annotation scheme to his or her research project; for instance, annotation tiers can be independent or organised in a hierarchy.

3. Quantitative analysis: Connecting with the audience

In the quantitative part of our study, we identified three key dimensions of PCS through which the speaker builds a strong and direct connexion with his various audiences (at the conference, on TV, online). To win them over, the speaker emphasizes the interpersonal dimension of his address by framing it as an intimate relation even with a distant, indirect audience (TV, Internet). He favours affect and values over political reasoning, by presenting political stakes in a non-technical way. He brings consensual elements to the fore to seal the party's collective identity.

3.1 Intimacy at a distance

Based on our keyness analyses, we identified various ways in which PCS stage the words of the leader in connection with the symbolic function of institutional events. (i) PCS call attention to their circumstances of production; (ii) PCS present the leader as addressing his people; (iii) PCS are delivered more like an informal exchange with the audience than a highly formal speech.

First of all, (i), the leader's Party Conference Speeches call attention to their circumstances of production, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Staging the speech: keyword list 1

Word	PCS (n)	PCS (%)	nPCS (n)	nPCS (%)	+/-	LL PCS-nPCS
debate	33	0.01	121	0.05	-	52.11
problems	62	0.03	137	0.06	-	27.83
Mr._President	26	0.01	0	0	+	36.45
conference	84	0.04	36	0.02	+	20.5
week	90	0.04	41	0.02	+	19.55
next_year	47	0.02	16	0.01	+	16.42
bill	6	0	32	0.01	-	19.13
parliamentary	4	0	26	0.01	-	17.69
constitutional	11	0	38	0.02	-	15.33

The noun *conference* itself is significantly more frequent in PCS than in nPCS (LL = 20.5, $p < 0.0001$). Additionally, party conferences on both sides of the aisle last for a *week* (LL = 19.55, $p < 0.0001$), they look forward to the year ahead (*next_year*¹³: LL = 16.42, $p < 0.0001$), and involve frequent mentions of the *President* (LL = 36.45, $p < 0.0001$). Party conferences can be understood as a specific kind of political ritual, which aims at creating unity between the different branches of the

13. In WMatrix, some phrases are identified as 'multi-word-expressions', or single semantic units, and thus automatically joined by underscore characters e.g., *red_tape*, or *tuition_fees*.

party — especially in the case of the Labour Party, as detailed in the introduction. The fact that words like *bill*, *parliamentary* and *constitutional* are in significant underuse in PCS compared with nPCS calls attention to these specific circumstances. The nouns *debate* and *problems* occur significantly less in PCS than in nPCS, thereby confirming the role of the leader's speech as seeking consensus. Additionally, *report* is not identified as a keyword in any of our corpus comparisons, which confirms Pettitt's claim (2012) that the reference to the leader's speech as "the Parliamentary Report" in the Conference programme is no more than lip service.

The leader's speeches to the party conference also emphasize the privileged connection between the speaker and his supporters (ii). As shown in Table 2, references to *I* and *you* and their related determiners and pronouns are significantly more frequent in PCS than in nPCS.

Table 2. Staging the speech: keyword list 2

Word	PCS (n)	PCS (%)	nPCS (n)	nPCS (%)	+/-	LL PCS-nPCS
i	2850	1.26	1611	0.7	+	368.06
you	1671	0.74	824	0.36	+	306.54
my	464	0.2	270	0.12	+	54.93
people	1700	0.75	1382	0.6	+	37.96
your	364	0.16	237	0.1	+	29.03
mine	24	0.01	4	0	+	16.16

In example (1) below, the connection between the speaker and the audience is made very clear through the repetition of the phrase *I want you*, as well as the reliance on the lexicon of inclusion, with words like *together* or *head and heart*.

- (1) The people of this country are not looking to *us* for a revolution. They want *us* to make a start. *I want you* with me in that task. *I want you* with me. *Head and heart*. Because this can only be done *together*. Leaders lead, but in the end the people govern (LPCS).¹⁴

There is a distinction between *the people of this country* and *you*, which points to the audience. So the two mentions of *us* in the example can refer to the leaders — and thereby metonymically to the party as an entity, as well as to the combination of leader and supporters that is established semantically and syntactically in the speech. Based on this evidence, we suggest — unlike Pettitt (2012) — that self-reference in party conference speeches is a means of establishing a clear connexion with the audience (see also Benveniste (1966)), and of focusing on interpersonal relations in the speech, so as to create a valuable impression of 'intimacy at a

14. In this example as in all the following ones, the italics are ours. They highlight key elements in each of the quotes.

distance' (Horton & Wohl, 1956). As Horton & Wohl remark, one striking feature of mass media communication is for the speaker to adopt a conversational style usually reserved to face-to-face conversation when addressing an audience that is in fact not present, but at the other end of the TV, or behind their computer watching the speech on YouTube. In the specific case of PCS, the addressed audience is a hybrid of present and absent public: an audience is present where and when the speech is delivered, but the speech is also designed and filmed to be broadcast on TV and on the Internet. In that respect, strategies meant to create intimacy at a distance also serve to win over the immediate audience of the conference.

In the same vein, Table 3 points to an increased presence of discourse verbs in the leader's party conference speech.

Table 3. Staging the speech: keyword list 3

Word	PCS (n)	PCS (%)	nPCS (n)	nPCS (%)	+/-	LL PCS-nPCS
tell	234	0.1	71	0.03	+	94.35
know	495	0.22	247	0.11	+	88.38
yes	191	0.08	60	0.03	+	73.91
you_know	66	0.03	9	0	+	49.82
said	292	0.13	162	0.07	+	39.78
told	109	0.05	37	0.02	+	38.23
no	515	0.23	351	0.15	+	33.83
say	412	0.18	274	0.12	+	30.12
think	266	0.12	166	0.07	+	24.93
i_believe	99	0.04	44	0.02	+	22.57
look	47	0.02	13	0.01	+	20.99
argued	2	0	23	0.01	-	20.4
claim	9	0	36	0.02	-	16.93
hear	54	0.02	20	0.01	+	16.75
i_say	71	0.03	31	0.01	+	16.74

These verbs are connected to rhetorical strategies that allow the speaker to present himself as having a conversation with the audience (iii), and with the people of Britain at large as in example (2), or to summon the presence of interlocutors voicing dissent, in order to pre-empt criticism and generate agreement around him, as in examples (3) and (4).

- (2) I spoke to *a woman* the other day, a part-time worker, complaining about the amount of her tax credit. *I said*: hold on a minute: before 1997, there were no tax credits not for working families not for any families; [...] And no minimum wage, no full time rights for part time workers, in fact nothing. So what?, *she said* that's why we elected you. *Now go and sort out my tax credit*. And, of course, she's right (LPCS).

- (3) Now, *I hear people, some of them* in our own party, falling for the Tory attack that we have no policies. *What nonsense* (LPCS).
- (4) Did you *hear what Ed Miliband said* last week about taxes? He described a tax cut as the government writing people a cheque. *Ed... Let me explain to you how it works.* When people earn money, it's their money (TPCS).

In example (2), the anecdote stages a conversation between a woman and Tony Blair, which allows him to present his argument about new Labour's social achievements in a more concrete light. The conclusion of the story (*Now go and sort out my tax credit*) gives a humorous tone to an otherwise dry economic account, and allows the speaker to praise his own achievement while still presenting the people in the audience as wiser than himself. In example (3), the indefiniteness of the speaker's interlocutor serves less as the staging of a humorous cautionary tale than as a way to dismiss all attempts at dissent — within and outside the party — as irrelevant. As criticism is voiced by the speaker only, it is necessarily him who has the last word (*What nonsense*). In example (4), a similar technique is at work, but the interlocutor is clearly identified as Ed Miliband. The passage starts with an actual quote by the Labour leader, and continues with a fictional conversation in which the speaker — David Cameron — gives him a lesson in finance (*Let me explain to you how it works*). In both cases, dissenting opinions are staged, but immediately rejected in favour of consensus over the leader's words. This is confirmed by the significant underuse of the only two discourse verbs with more negative prosody (see Sinclair, 1991) than the others listed in Table 3, namely *argued* and *claim*. The aim of the speaker is to stage dialogue, not debate.

Finally, Table 4 signals that marks of orality are significantly more frequent in PCS than in nPCS.

Table 4. Staging the speech: keyword list 4

Word	PCS (n)	PCS (%)	nPCS (n)	nPCS (%)	+/-	LL PCS-nPCS
n't	1213	0.53	533	0.23	+	282.56
's	1951	0.86	1074	0.47	+	271.65
've	436	0.19	120	0.05	+	195.69
're	436	0.19	160	0.07	+	137.12
'll	143	0.06	26	0.01	+	90.99
'm	157	0.07	45	0.02	+	67.49
'd	109	0.05	23	0.01	+	62.21
thing	172	0.08	98	0.04	+	21.7
well	139	0.06	78	0.03	+	18.33
for_example	1	0	73	0.03	-	90.89
indeed	9	0	82	0.04	-	66.31

While the presence of these marks may be a question of transcription conventions, they either point to a conscious emphasis on the spoken nature of the speech, or to its reception as a performance with a heightened spoken character compared with other, more formal speeches. Additionally, the high frequency of the noun *thing* or the adverb *well* confirm the spoken character of the speech, as in examples (5) and (6).

(5) [W]e are doing *the right thing*, and we are on the right track for Britain (LPCS).

(6) Our task is to promote *the real things*, and expose the counterfeit (TPCS).

The noun *thing* is used very frequently both in written and spoken English, and occurs in a variety of colloquial set phrases such as *the only thing*, *the one thing*, *the real thing* or *the thing is* (Barlow, 2000). On the other hand, words that signal reasoning based on more complex logical relations (*indeed*, *for example*) are identified as being in significant underuse in PCS compared to nPCS. This is confirmed by the semantic concept A2.2 (Cause & Effect / Connection), which is also identified as a negative key concept in a PCS-nPCS comparison (LL = 23.91, $p < 1e-4$).

All in all, a first striking feature of party conference speeches is a meta-discursive representation of the speech itself as a dialogical event. The speaker insists on the here-and-now of the speech, highlighting his relation with the discourse's immediate addressees: the audience attending the conference. The speech relies on various strategies to tighten the bond between the leader and the party. It is a bond that is interpersonal in nature, based on an explicit relationship between 'I' and 'you'. Marks of orality bring the speech closer to an informal exchange, creating closeness with the audience. The dialogical aspect is also highlighted by discourse verbs: the speaker stages the speech by emphasizing its discursive nature and resorting to stories and anecdotes. Finally, debate and dissent are rejected: the speaker must be agreed with, regardless of potential objections.

3.2 Affect over policy

The second pattern identified by our quantitative analyses is that Party Conference Speeches, as most political speeches, talk about politics — but they do so by giving prominence to affect over argument and policies. These findings are consistent with Lakoff's claim that people vote for their values more than they vote for policies and arguments (Lakoff, 2002), as shown in Table 5.

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Table 5. Talking politics: keyword list 1

Word	PCS (n)	PCS (%)	nPCS (n)	nPCS (%)	+/-	LL PCS-nPCS
NHS	259	0.11	86	0.04	+	93.5
taxes	136	0.06	37	0.02	+	61.78
EU	21	0.01	101	0.04	-	55.84
universities	23	0.01	91	0.04	-	42.35
european_union	18	0.01	76	0.03	-	37.61
social_security	5	0	46	0.02	-	37.35
economic	128	0.06	246	0.11	-	36.08
cuts	58	0.03	11	0	+	35.84
cancer	40	0.02	4	0	+	34.75
pensioners	61	0.03	13	0.01	+	34.54
WMD	2	0	31	0.01	-	30.21
job	165	0.07	95	0.04	+	20.18

Overall, in PCS, policies that are perceived as too far removed from the voters, too complex or too controversial are mentioned significantly less than in nPCS. This is notably the case for *universities*, the *EU*, or *WMD*. Policies that are mentioned significantly more frequently in PCS are first of all the ones that can touch voters to their core, as illustrated by the words *cancer* and *job* for instance. Some results in Table 5 may appear paradoxical at first glance: *economic* is in significant underuse in PCS, while *taxes* and *cuts* are positive keywords. Similarly, while *social_security* occurs significantly less often in PCS than in nPCS, we get opposite results for *NHS*. These apparent contradictions actually confirm earlier claims: they suggest that PCS tends to favour frames that are symbolically charged with the public, as opposed to nPCS that rely more frequently on more technical, specific terms to talk about similar policies. The goal of the speaker is to appeal to emotion rather than reason and to rely on the audience's attachment to political symbols, rather than proceed with a complex political argument based on facts. Such focus on affect highlights the role of PCS as institutional rituals (Mariot, 2009), whose first and foremost function is to unite the party around its leader in a moment of shared emotion (Mariot, 2006, p. 98).

3.3 Generating consensus

Finally, Party Conference Speeches re-emphasize the party's collective identity. The speeches focus on elements of the party's identity about which everyone agrees or on which the speaker wants everyone to agree, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. The party's collective identity: keyword list 1

Word	PCS (n)	PCS (%)	nPCS (n)	nPCS (%)	+/-	LL PCS-nPCS
generation	150	0.07	61	0.03	+	40.13
tough	140	0.06	56	0.02	+	38.5
family	206	0.09	109	0.05	+	31.88
love	64	0.03	16	0.01	+	31.58
common_sense	65	0.03	18	0.01	+	28.99
choice	174	0.08	91	0.04	+	27.73
journey	36	0.02	7	0	+	21.85
wrong	156	0.07	94	0.04	+	16.51

The keywords listed in the latter point to key elements in each of the parties' identities,¹⁵ which are in significant overuse in PCS compared to nPCS. Some words are specific to a given speech in the data, and thus represent a specific moment in the lives of the parties. For instance, the multi-word expression *common_sense* is not evenly distributed in our data. It appears mainly in David Cameron's 2010 PCS, in which he defines the Conservatives' Common Sense Revolution, as illustrated in example (7):

- (7) Only by trusting the instincts and *the individuals* and the institutions and the independence of *the people of this country* can we hope to seize the opportunity that this Government is so tragically squandering. That's why we're going to lead a *Common Sense Revolution*. That's why we're going to govern for the hard-working, hard pressed, decent law abiding *people of this country* and bring an end to the rule of the *small out-of-touch new Labour clique* that thinks it is so much better than *the rest of us* (TPCS).

Inclusive phrases such as *the people of this country*, or *the rest of us* are repeated in connection with Cameron's motto. It is meant to present the Conservatives as closer to the population and oppose them to a *new Labour clique* supposedly disconnected from the needs of the people. This is part of a general strategy to create a more compassionate branding for the party (Bale, 2010), which requires the speaker to frame the Labour party as a group of heartless bureaucrats. The recurrent reference to common sense in Cameron's speeches may actually kill two birds with one stone and speak to the more traditional branch of his supporters: it can be taken as a reference to Margaret Thatcher's Speech at the 1980 party conference, in which she hopes for "a winter of common sense" — the Conservative alternative to the 1978–9 "winter of discontent" which Labour Prime Minister Callaghan had to face right before losing the 1979 General Election. A similar argument can be

15. For a detailed analysis of party identity in the Blair era, see among others L'Hôte (2010, 2014) and L'Hôte & Lemmens (2009).

made for the noun *generation*, which points to Ed Miliband's new rallying call of Labour's "new generation" in his 2010 and 2011 PCS.

Other words in Table 6 are more evenly distributed in the data, reflecting more stable elements in the framing of the parties' identities. The prominence of the noun *choice* is far from surprising: the prototypical concept of choice plays an essential role in Conservative philosophy, and has been taken over and transformed into what L'Hôte (2010) has termed "no-alternative choice" in new Labour discourse. As for the noun *journey*, it is mostly used metaphorically in new Labour discourse. It is part of the party's narrative of change and modernisation, which played a major role in the discourse of the party from Blair's start as leader in 1994 to the 2010 elections (see L'Hôte (2014) and L'Hôte & Lemmens (2009) for more detail on the issue). Words like *tough*, *love*, *family* and *wrong* point to a radical change in the framing of Labour's identity during the Blair era, i.e. the partial adoption of the deep frames associated with a Strict-Father model of politics (Lakoff, 2002). As discussed in L'Hôte (2014), this complex deep frame was first used in connection to the issues of crime and defence before pervading the entire discourse of the party, in order to defuse Labour's soft stereotype in the minds of the public.

Quantitative analyses have allowed us to identify three relevant patterns in our corpus data. Party conference speeches stage the words of the speaker in a manner that calls attention to the ritualistic conditions of their production, while emphasizing the importance of a strong interpersonal connexion between the leader and the audience, and the leader and the country. When dissent is given a voice through the words of the leader, it is immediately contradicted and rejected as invalid, thereby forcing consensus under the appearance of true dialogue. Party conference speeches also use specific frames to talk about politics: far from being a detailed policy exposé, the speech aims at touching the audience's emotions and values. In contemporary Britain, the role of party conference speeches is to generate consensus and to celebrate the party as a united entity. Based on these first findings, we hypothesize that key metaphors and frames also consistently organize the verbal and non-verbal dimensions of the PCS when it is envisaged as a spoken performance, for optimum effectiveness of discourse. In order to elaborate on this new hypothesis, we provide a multimodal analysis of Tony Blair's 2006 party conference speech in the following section.

4. A multimodal analysis of Blair's 2006 PCS

In 2006, Blair gave his last conference speech as leader, as he resigned from his position as Labour leader and as Prime Minister one year later, leaving Gordon

Brown in charge. Blair explicitly presents this Conference Speech as his last one. This speech performance is no exception to the phenomena observed in the previous section of this paper: it emphasizes the interpersonal relation between the speaker and his audience and asserts the party's defining values so as to foster consensus around its collective identity. The most salient features of Blair's 2006 PCS correspond to three deep frames that are specific to contemporary Labour discourse. First, Blair's 'tough' rhetoric is typical of Labour's shift towards the Strict Father model (Lakoff, 2002) under his leadership. Second, the idea of forward movement and its connected metaphors are anchored in Labour's consensual narrative of progress and change. Third, the assertion of the party's collective identity as the people's party is highlighted by a multimodal discourse of inclusion. In this section, we analyse deep frames from a multimodal perspective, showing how they are instantiated not only in speech, but also in the gestures used by the speaker. Gestures can serve multiple functions with respect to the verbal discourse (Kendon, 2004), for instance by representing, structuring, or even countering it. This means that the fundamental deep frames and schemas at play in the speech can be expressed in the verbal content and the gestures simultaneously, or in only one of these two modalities at a given time. For instance, even when Blair's words do not refer to the Strict Father model, this deep frame can still be expressed in the speaker's gestures, thereby strengthening the consistency of the discourse. The simultaneous and sequential combination of verbal content and gesture contributes to a successful reception on the part of the various audiences addressed by Blair.

4.1 Tough rhetoric

As shown in Table 6 above, the word *tough* is significantly more frequent in PCS, which points to a recent shift in new Labour discourse. Being "tough" was first applied to the issue of crime, before gradually pervading all topics of political and social life in Labour discourse, in connection with a partial adoption of the Strict-Father model of politics on the part of the Labour leader. As stated by Cienki (2005a) in his analysis of Lakoff's models of the Strict Father and the Nurturant Parent in US Presidential Debates, these models point to deep frames that structure political discourse and our understanding of politics, but they occur rather rarely as textual realisations of the metaphors. Our multimodal analysis of Blair's 2006 PCS expands on these findings. We identify textual entailments of the models, as in (8):

- (8) I always said the Home Office was *the toughest job* in government. It hasn't got easier. We should get a few facts *straight*. Crime has fallen not risen. We are the only government since the war to do it (Blair, 2006).

The image of 'toughness' is applied both to the politics of crime and to the policies implemented to fight it. The occurrence of *straight* in the second part of the quote is coherent with the Strict Father frame, as it points to one of its constitutive metaphors as identified by Lakoff (2002) and confirmed by Cienki (2005a): BEING MORAL IS BEING UPRIGHT.

Blair's and Labour's 'tough' rhetoric is also constructed through a consistent use of multimodal resources, sometimes independently from the text of the speech. We argue that Blair's positioning (Harré & Langenhove, 1999) as a strict father is visually enhanced by the recurrent use of the index finger pointed upwards. Throughout the speech, this gesture is performed in various forms, as illustrated in Figure 1: with the left hand or right hand and with one hand or two for extra emphasis (Müller, 2004).

Figure 1. Blair's tough gestures

This gesture form is combined with a large variety of verbal content, and is always synchronized with prosodic stress, as in examples (9) to (13).

- (9) We have (...) not enough women MPs, but **twice** what there were (Blair 2006).¹⁶
- (10) Manchester (...), a city that shows what a confident, open, and proud people **with** a great Labour council can do (Blair 2006).
- (11) Last year China and India produced more graduates... **graduates** than all of Europe put together (Blair 2006).
- (12) David Cameron's Tories? **My advice**: get after them (Blair 2006).

16. In this section's examples, boldface type is used to highlight prosodic stresses.

- (13) And I say to business: you have a responsibility to train your workforce (Blair 2006).

As a gesture form, the basic motivation of the upward-pointing index is deictic.¹⁷ And yet, in none of the aforementioned examples does Blair point at any object (concrete or abstract)¹⁸ or space located above himself, as evidenced by the type of verbal content this gesture combines with (*twice, with, graduates, my advice, I say*). Instead, this upward-pointing gesture is used as part of multimodal prosody (Bolinger, 1983; Ferré, 2012): the speaker synchronizes beat movements of the hand (McNeill, 2005) with vocal prosodic stresses to highlight — without actually pointing at — the importance of a specific element in the discourse and to bring it to the audience's attention. Thus in examples (9) to (13), as in the rest of the speech, the upward-pointing index takes on a pragmatic function (Streeck, 1994; 2009) rather than a referential one. The upward direction of the gesture does not take on its basic, spatial meaning but an abstract one (Cienki & Müller, 2008). It can therefore be interpreted as the source domain for a metaphor, which can be formalized as *X IS BEING PHYSICALLY UPRIGHT*. Because gestures are schematic and underdetermined by nature (Cienki, 2005b; Lapaire, 2011), and because the meaning of a pragmatic gesture cannot be derived from the accompanying verbal content, the target domain of this metaphor cannot be identified with absolute certainty. Nonetheless, the potential target domains of this visual metaphor (including *EMPHASIS, CORRECTNESS, DOMINANCE, or MORALITY*) have a common denominator: they present the speaker as a figure of authority. This meaning is reminiscent of the culturally conventionalized use of this gesture as an emblem (Ekman & Friesen, 1969) to scold or threaten children. The upward-pointing index creates an asymmetrical relation between speaker and audience, positioning the former as a source of power and normativity: the metaphor expressed in this case is likely to be *BEING MORAL IS BEING UPRIGHT*. According to this analysis, the upward-pointing index functions a visual entailment of the Strict Father model (Cienki, 2005a), and Blair's recurrent use of this gesture contributes to positioning him as the authoritative source of the party's values. This casts a new light on examples (12) and (13), in which Blair gives marching orders, either to his supporters (*get after them*) or to a potentially dissenting entity (*train your workforce*).

17. See Kita (2008) for a detailed discussion of the rich variety of meanings of pointing gestures.

18. For a discussion of abstract deixis, see McNeill et al. (1993).

4.2 Talking progress

Referential gestures (28 occurrences) are rarely used in Blair's speech, compared with pragmatic ones (296 occurrences). When Blair uses gestures affiliated with the propositional content of the speech (Butterworth, 1975), their function is usually an abstract referential (or metaphoric) one, relying on a basic orientational metaphor, which we connect with the party's established narrative of change and progress. For example, at 12'48, Blair recalls major steps in the history of the Labour party, and more specifically the divided reception of Harold Wilson's audacious proposals in the 1960s. He explains:

- (14) Everyone was telling Harold **Wilson** not to **push** it. They said it was divisive, unnecessary (Blair 2006).

In (14), the three words *Wilson*, *push* and *divisive* receive extra prosodic salience, with vocal stresses synchronized with three gestural beats. The shape of the hand indicates a link with the metaphor *push it*, which is also at the centre of the prosodic salience. Both palms are flat, facing Blair's body and form an imaginary vertical plane (see Figure 2). On each prosodic beat, the hands move forward and down, as though marking steps in a progression.

Figure 2. Both palms with extended fingers facing the torso move forward and down on “push it”

Even though people were discouraging Wilson from “pushing” things in a certain direction, the spatial meaning of the lexeme *push* implies a movement forward that is reflected in the gesture. Blair suggests that innovation was in fact the right choice, and this idea is immediately stated in his next utterance:

- (15) In the end he gave up, but so did the public on Labour (Blair, 2006).

In (15), Blair does not gesture at all and uses the lower pitch of his voice: his grave and distanced attitude reinforces his criticism of Wilson's choices.

Gesture space and orientation are organized in a highly consistent way in this speech, since another version of this gesture, performed only with one hand this time, occurs a minute before (at 11'41), as illustrated in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Extended fingers facing the torso move forward and down on “on the way up”

The orientational metaphor in this gesture (forward movement) is closely synchronized with another orientational metaphor in the text (GOOD IS UP), as the three strokes of this gesture highlight the word stresses in *up*, *ambitious* and *themselves* in (16):

- (16) We reach out not just to those in poverty or need but those who are doing well but want to do better; those on the way **up**, ambitious for themselves and their families (Blair, 2006).

Throughout the speech, Labour’s narrative of progress and change is asserted and emphasized by speech-gesture combinations of forward and upward movements. More specifically, in this last example, Blair skilfully blends two deep frames typical of new Labour discourse. Progress is associated with defending the British population as a whole: not just the underprivileged (*those in poverty or need*) but the well-off as well (*ambitious for themselves and their families*). New Labour’s narrative of progress is thus conflated with Labour’s shift from *the party of the people*, (i.e. representing the working class) to being *the people’s party* (i.e. representing everyone).

4.3 The people’s party

One last recurrent pragmatic gesture in Blair’s speech is an extended arm with an open, slightly curved palm with extended fingers, but this time open to the side. This gesture can be performed with one hand only or with both hands. By its form, direction and function (Blair often uses it to introduce a new idea in speech) this pragmatic gesture is clearly an interactive one (Bavelas et al., 1995). In ordinary conversations, interactive gestures presenting a new idea in the speech are usually performed with a horizontal open palm facing upwards. So by opening his arm to the side with the result of an oblique or vertical palm facing the audience, Blair is

at the same time presenting new ideas and including his audience in his speech. In variations of the gesture performed with one arm, Blair appears to simply reinforce the interpersonal dimension of his speech when highlighting a new idea. In other more emphatic versions of the gesture, particularly those performed with both arms, the effect is much more theatrical: Blair visually includes his audience, by embracing his party members with his whole body, as shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4. Extended arms with open palms facing away: Blair's gesture of inclusion

In picture 4b, the gesture is performed on the phrase *for us as a party*: Blair is simultaneously voicing and physically enacting the party's unity. Interestingly, the professionals who edited the video of the speech also noticed this multimodal strategy and chose to enhance it, by zooming out in an extreme long shot, dramatizing Blair's performance of this ample gesture. Part of Blair's illocutionary point is to take the audience under his wing: this dramatic gesture reinforces the bond between the leader and his party. It serves as a visual contribution to the discourse of inclusion that equates new Labour with 'the people's party', as in (17) and its associated gesture in Figure 6:

- (17) Thank you to you, our party, our members, our supporters, the people who week in, week out do the work, **take the flak** but don't often **get the credit** (Blair 2006).

Figure 5. Vertical left palm facing the audience on "take the flak"

Here, the apparent paradox of relying on a “nurturant” gesture (Lakoff, 2002) while using a war-like metaphor in speech (*take the flak*) is quickly resolved, as the goal of the speaker is to perform an act of fairness and care towards members of the party who usually go unrecognised for their efforts. This recurrent gesture positions Blair as a protective leader, who guarantees the party’s unity. It fleshes out the recurring themes of embrace, reconciliation, unity and inclusion that are typical of new Labour’s self-defining discourse.

In order to reinforce new Labour’s image as the unifying, consensual people’s party, Blair makes repeated use of antanaclasis — the association of multiple meanings of the same word (or idea), some literal, some metaphorical. This strategy allows him to create smooth transitions from concrete achievements to issues concerning the Labour party’s collective identity, as in (18), in which Blair proposes to define the aimed electorate of the Labour party:

- (18) The **core** vote of **this** party today is not the **heartlands**, the **inner** city, not any sectional interest or **lobby**. **Our core vote** is (.)¹⁹ the **country** (Blair 2006).

This short passage illustrates what we analyse as an antanaclasis network in Blair’s speech. The noun *core* is identified as a realisation of the basic metaphor CENTRAL IS IMPORTANT. It activates the basic meaning of the noun *heart* in the compound *heartland*: its basic sense is connected to the metaphorical sense of *core*, and its metaphorical meaning points to the subsequent reference to the *inner city*. The terms echo each other, as metaphorical meanings alternate with non-metaphorical meanings. They build a consistent image that is also a known metaphor of the country and the nation, namely THE NATION IS A PERSON. In (18), Blair marks every prosodic stress with a beat of the hand during the first part: “the **core** vote ... or **lobby**”, before densifying beats and vocal stresses on the final utterance “**our core vote** is (.) the **country**”. The continuity in the network of images is marked visually by continuity in gesture, since Blair relies on the same gesture form throughout the passage: a movement downward of the right hand with curled fingers apart from the index and middle finger that are extended, as illustrated in Figure 6.

The increased frequency of prosodic stresses towards the end adds to the dramatic intensity of the passage. The head nod immediately following “our core vote is the country” visually echoes this final assertion, giving it extra assertiveness and marking the conclusion of a vocal paragraph. The audience immediately acknowledges this multimodal dramatization by enthusiastically responding with a 14-second round of applause. Once again, Blair’s speech is met with success as he connects the people’s collective identity (*this party*) and concrete experience (*the heartlands*, *the inner city*) with their emotions and values (*core vote*).

19. The sign (.) indicates a short pause in the speech.

Figure 6. Marking prosodic stresses visually on “our core vote is the country”

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have accounted for some of the major features that make political discourse effective, based on the example of political party conference speeches in contemporary Britain. We have taken up the “methodological synergy” propounded by Baker et al. (2008, p.274), by associating quantitative and qualitative analyses to propose a multimodal corpus-based analysis of political discourse. Our quantitative analyses have shown how the leader stages the speech as an informal exchange with his audience, and creates consensus over the party’s values to ensure a privileged relationship with his supporters. The speech’s politics are not about factual achievements, but rather about ‘you’ and ‘I/me’ standing for the same values. PCS stand out as a concentrate of the party’s identity and values.

Zooming in on Blair’s last party conference speech as party leader in 2006 has allowed us to see how the micro-level reflects the macro-level of discourse. Blair’s positioning as a Strict-Yet-Inclusive Father plays out in the recurrent use of hand gestures that are compatible entailments of this diffuse, complex deep frame. New Labour’s defining features are also expressed visually: the POLITICS IS A JOURNEY metaphor is reflected through orientational metaphors in both text and gesture. Finally, gestures highlight stylistic strategies like antanacsis, by visually indicating continuity in a network of images, relying on emotion to secure the speaker’s bond with his audience.

Our corpus-based multimodal analysis of political discourse has allowed us to identify consistent patterns characteristic of party conference speeches in terms of framing and metaphors, at several levels of analysis. In the next steps of this project, we hope to apply this method to account for the specific features of other political discourse corpora.

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Min Reuchamps and Julien Perrez for including us in this special issue, and for regularly bringing together researchers from various countries and disciplines to work together on political discourse, its creation and its reception. We would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers, as well as Graham Low, for their very valuable comments and corrections on previous versions of this paper. All remaining inaccuracies are our own responsibility. Our use of Youtube screen shots from Tony Blair's 2006 party conference speech in Figures 1–6 follows accepted conventions of fair use.

References

- Archer, D. (2009). Does frequency really matter? In D. Archer (Ed.), *What's in a word-list? Investigating word frequency and keyword extraction* (pp. 1–16). Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., Khosravini, M., Krzyżanowski, M., McEnery, T., & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK Press. *Discourse & Society*, 19(3), 273–306. DOI: 10.1177/0957926508088962
- Bale, T. (2010). *The conservative party: From Thatcher to Cameron*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Barlow, M. (2000). Usage, blends and grammar. In M. Barlow & S. Kemmer (Eds.), *Usage-based models of language* (pp. 315–345). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Bavelas, J., Chovil, N., Coates, L., & Roe, L. (1995). Gestures specialized for dialogue. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(4), 394–405. DOI: 10.1177/0146167295214010
- Benveniste, E. (1966). *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Bibliothèque Des Sciences Humaines. Paris: Gallimard.
- Bolinger, D. (1983). Intonation and gesture. *American Speech*, 58(2), 156–174. DOI: 10.2307/455326
- Bull, P. (2012). The microanalysis of political discourse. *Philologia Hispalensis*, 26, 79–93.
- Butterworth, B. (1975). Hesitation and semantic planning in speech. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 4(1), 75–87. DOI: 10.1007/BF01066991
- Cienki, A. (2005a). Metaphor in the 'strict father' and 'nurturant parent' cognitive models: Theoretical issues raised in an empirical study. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 16(2), 279–312. DOI: 10.1515/cogl.2005.16.2.279
- Cienki, A. (2005b). Image schemas and gesture. In B. Hampe (Ed.), *From perception to meaning: Image schemas in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 421–442). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110197532.5.421
- Cienki, A., & Müller, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Metaphor and gesture*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/gs.3
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230000612
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. (1969). The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: Categories, origins, usage, and coding. *Semiotica*, 1(1), 49–98. DOI: 10.1515/semi.1969.1.1.49

- Faucher-King, F. (2005). *Changing parties : An anthropology of British political party conferences*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ferré, G. (2012). Functions of three open-palm hand gestures. *Multimodal Communication*, 1(1), 5–20.
- Fillmore, C. (1982). Frame semantics. In The Linguistic Society of Korea (Ed.), *Linguistics in the morning calm: Selected papers from SICOL-1981* (pp. 111–137). Seoul, Korea: Hanshin Pub. Co.
- Finlayson, A., & Martin, J. (2008). 'It ain't what you say...': British political studies and the analysis of speech and rhetoric. *British Politics*, 3(4), 445–464. DOI: 10.1057/bp.2008.21
- Harré, R., & Langenhove, L. (1999). *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Heritage, J., & Greatbatch, D. (1986). Generating applause: A study of rhetoric and response at party political conferences. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(1), 110–157. DOI: 10.1086/228465
- Horton, D., & Wohl, R. (1956). Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observations on intimacy at a distance. *Psychiatry*, 19, 215–229.
- Kendon, A. (2004). *Gesture: Visible action as utterance*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511807572
- Kita, S. (2008). *Pointing: Where language, culture and cognition meet*. Mahwah & London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- L'Hôte, E. (2014). *Identity, narrative and metaphor: A corpus-based cognitive analysis of new labour discourse (1994–2007)*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- L'Hôte, E. (2010). New Labour and globalization: Globalist discourse with a twist? *Discourse & Society*, 21(4), 355–376. DOI: 10.1177/0957926510366212
- L'Hôte, E., & Lemmens, M. (2009). Reframing treason: Metaphors of change and progress in new Labour discourse. *CogniTextes*, 3, <http://cognitextes.revues.org/248>.
- Lakoff, G. (2006). *Thinking points: Communicating our american values and vision*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Lakoff, G. (2002). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. DOI: 10.7208/chicago/9780226471006.001.0001
- Lapaire, J.-R. (2011). Grammar, gesture and cognition: Insights from multimodal utterances and applications for gesture analysis. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філологічна*, 52, 87–107.
- Mair, P. (1994). Party organizations: From civil society to the state. In R. S. Katz & P. Mair (Eds.), *How parties organize: Change and adaptation in party organizations in Western democracies* (pp. 113–35). London, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Mariot, N. (2006). Le frisson fait-il la manifestation? *Pouvoirs*, 1, 97–109. DOI: 10.3917/pouv.116.0097
- Mariot, N. (2009). Le paradoxe acclamatif, ou pourquoi les institutions n'ont pas de première fois. In F. Buton & N. Mariot (Eds.), *Pratiques et méthodes de la socio-histoire* (pp. 169–90). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- McNeill, D. (2005). *Gesture and thought*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. DOI: 10.7208/chicago/9780226514642.001.0001
- McNeill, D., Cassell, J., & Levy, E. T. (1993). Abstract deixis. *Semiotica*, 95(1/2), 5–19. DOI: 10.1515/semi.1993.95.1–2.5
- Meyer, C. F. (2002). *English corpus linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511606311

- Minkin, L. (1978). *The Labour Party conference: A study in the politics of intra-party democracy*. London: Allen Lane.
- Müller, C. (1998). *Redebegleitende Gesten: Kulturgeschichte, Theorie, Sprachvergleich*. Berlin: Spitz.
- Müller, C. (2004). Forms and uses of the palm up open hand: A case of a gesture family? In C. Müller & R. Posner (Eds.), *The semantics and pragmatics of everyday gestures, Proceedings of the Berlin conference, April 1998* (pp. 233–256). Berlin: Weidler Buchverlag.
- Pettitt, R. T. (2012). Me, myself and I: 'Self-referencing' in Labour Party conference leaders' speeches. *British Politics*, 7(2), 111–34. DOI: 10.1057/bp.2012.2
- Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22(1), 1–39. DOI: 10.1080/10926480709336752
- Rayson, P. (2003). Matrix: A statistical method and software tool for linguistic analysis through corpus comparison. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Lancaster University, Lancaster.
- Rayson, P. (2008). From key words to key semantic domains. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 13(4), 519–549. DOI: 10.1075/ijcl.13.4.06ray
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Describing English Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steen, G., Dorst, A., Herrmann, B., & Kaal, A. (2010). *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/celcr.14
- Streeck, J. (2009). *Gesturecraft: The manu-facture of meaning*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/gs.2
- Streeck, J. (1994). 'Speech-handling': *The metaphorical representation of speech in gestures. A cross-cultural study*. Austin (Texas): Unpublished manuscript.

Authors' addresses

Dr Camille Debras (Corresponding Author)
UFR Langues et Cultures Étrangères
Bâtiment V, Casier 28
200 avenue de la République
92001 Nanterre Cedex, France
cdebras@u-paris10.fr

Dr Emilie L'Hôte
Université Paris 7 Denis Diderot, UFR
d'Études Anglophones
Bâtiment Olympe de Gouges, Case 7046
5 rue Thomas Mann
75205 Paris Cedex 13, France
emilie.lhote@univ-paris-diderot.fr

Biographical note

Camille Debras is a Lecturer (Maître de Conférences) in English Linguistics at the Université Paris Ouest, Nanterre, La Défense (France). Her research on the multimodality of spoken communication explores how speakers integrate speech, prosody and gesture to take stances and construct meaning intersubjectively.

Emilie L'Hôte is a Lecturer (Maître de Conférences) in English Linguistics at the Université Paris Diderot, Sorbonne Paris Cité (France). Her research interests include discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics and corpus linguistics; her main current project focuses on the analysis of new Labour discourse.

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Media rhetoric plays the market

The logic and power of metaphors behind the financial crises since 2006

Christ'l De Landtsheer
University of Antwerp

This article examines the logic and power of financial news metaphors in the current economic climate. The sequence of global financial crises starting in late 2007 led to a particular discursive phenomenon in financial news. Newspapers constructed, with vivid imagery (e.g., *toxic loans*, *nervous markets to be calmed down*), a globalized register for talking and writing about the crises. The empirical study of 3,730 Dutch and Flemish-Belgian financial news articles (2,042,596 words) investigates how during 2006–2013 metaphor power (Author) interacts with financial-economic indicators. It is suggested, on the basis of the case study, that financial news articles generally may be more metaphorical during crises; metaphor power significantly correlates with Eurostat financial-economic indicators in either a positive direction (unemployment rates, public debt) or a negative one (gross national product, consumer confidence).

Keywords: metaphor, financial crisis, financial news, metaphor power index, correlations, financial indicators.

1. Preamble

This article examines the logic of metaphor in financial news and its potential impact on the financial crises for the Netherlands and Flemish-Belgium between 2006 and 2013. The study builds on previous long-term research (De Landtsheer, 1991) that saw political metaphor moving in concert with 20th century unemployment rates. The introduction (Section 2) discusses metaphor and its possible functions in financial crises as well as relevant research, after which a methodology part (Section 3) explains the Metaphor Power Index (MPI) method (De Landtsheer, 2009) that is used in this article. The empirical part (Section 4) presents a Dutch-Flemish comparative study on the interaction between financial-economic

Metaphor and the Social World 5:2 (2015), 204–221. DOI 10.1075/msw.5.2.02del
ISSN 2210-4070 / E-ISSN 2210-4097 © John Benjamins Publishing Company

indicators and financial media metaphors, followed by a discussion of the results (Section 5).

2. Introduction

Until the 1970s, most scholars saw metaphors as ornamental style elements with no other functions than embellishment. In the rhetorical tradition, metaphors were thus mainly considered as a decoration of the language. With their 1980 study of the function and the importance of metaphors in everyday language, entitled “Metaphors we live by”, Lakoff & Johnson provided an important, ‘cognitive’ turning point in studies on metaphors (Steen, 2008). Their conceptual metaphor theory represented a new, cognitive-linguistic, paradigm arguing that metaphor is an essential part of our thinking. Complementary ideas to this ‘language in thought’ approach to metaphor were around the same time initiated by Ortony (1979/1993) in his psycholinguistic version of ‘metaphor in language’ (Steen, 2008, p. 7). Metaphor is seen as an instrument of cross-domain mapping, whether in thought or in language, or simply put, of the understanding and experiencing of something based on something else (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Steen (2008) advanced contemporary metaphor theory by adding the concept of ‘metaphor in communication’; he thereby connected to the older rhetorical tradition, while acknowledging the above mentioned contemporary concepts. Most importantly, he delivered with his ‘metaphor in communication’ and ‘deliberative metaphor’ concepts a useful theoretical frame for operationalizing metaphor analysis within the social sciences. Users, especially in politics and journalism, may deliberately exploit the cross-domain mapping qualities of metaphor for communicative purposes such as changing their reader’s view on a subject (Steen, 2008, p. 21). There has been some disagreement about what exactly constitutes deliberateness (see issue 1(1), 2011 of “Metaphor and the Social World”), but according to Steen (2008, p. 11) “deliberate metaphors are those cross-domain mappings that involve the express use, in production and/or reception, of another domain as a source domain for re-viewing the target domain”. Because of the contemporary scholarly work on metaphor from linguistics, scholars in politics, international relations, and communication became aware of the value of metaphor as a research instrument for politics and they paid more attention to metaphor’s persuasive and propaganda qualities (Gregg, 2004, p. 60). Charteris-Black and Musolff, (2003) distinguish between the semantically motivated use of metaphor — for enriching language — versus pragmatically motivated metaphor use for rhetorical purposes. Metaphors affect our vision of how the world looks and how we observe certain things (Deetz & Mumby, 1985). For example, with the *incestuous relationships between*

the government and the banks metaphor offers the ideological insight that governments should not be mixed up in the financial world, or become stakeholders in banks. Metaphors appeal to the emotions of the audience and therefore have persuasive effects (Gibbs, Leggitt, & Turner, 2002; Kövecses, 2000; Sopory & Dillard, 2002). Thibodeau & Boroditsky (2011, 2013) found that in discussing political and social issues, we often fall back on metaphors, because these could contribute to clarifying abstract situations and to formulating new insights on old problems. In business and financial news, journalists often deliberately offer their information, decisions, and standpoints in simple, straightforward and colorful terms, in order to connect with their (potential) consumers, voters and audiences. They use, to take an example, the *bubbles in the housing markets* metaphor to make the housing crisis better understood by the audience (e.g., Charteris-Black & Musolff, 2003; White, 2004). Metaphor is among the rhetorical figures that positively affect the cohesion and comprehensiveness of discourse. Metaphor by its emotive connotations gives the audience the (often false) impression that they understand complex subjects. Metaphors might be seen as complex tropes, because it may cost cognitive energy to decipher their underlying message. Thus the *toxic loans* metaphor gives the immediate association that the loans are bad news, and those who want to make some cognitive effort may see them as poison. In the longer term, metaphor may generate more profound persuasive effects, compared with simple tropes like hyperbole (or rhetorical exaggeration) which is more straightforward (Toncar & Munch, 2003). In relation to crisis situations, metaphors might reassure the audience by their capacity to simplify and to reduce psychological stress (Holsti, 1969).

Given the enormous political effects of the housing, Euro, and banking crises since 2006/7 there is a clear need for extensive reporting on them. But the increase in financial information in the media, and the consensus about its financial and social impact, has not really led to more research into the interaction between media coverage, or media metaphors, and the economic environment. We can conclude from the scarce research that, generally speaking, the media offer a distorted picture of the market, and that media and market routines clearly strengthen each other. The Dutch 2007 financial crisis reporting, for example, was found to affect the stock market prices (Kleinnijenhuis, 2009) and Belgian financial news reporting contributed to the 2008 decline of consumer confidence (Rooman, 2009). US news played a mediating role in the BP oil spill crisis of 2010, because it was influenced by public relations and in turn affected public awareness, foreign news and the share price (Kleinnijenhuis et al., 2015). Several scholars in metaphor research noticed that there is a general tendency to handle vague language full of references to natural disasters (*economic Tsunami*) and diseases (*the arteries of the economy are blocked, this can lead to an infarct*) which avoid calling attention to a responsible actor (e.g., Catalano & Waugh, 2013; Woo, 2012). Metaphors chosen to depict

financial crises also often refer to violence (*economic arm-twisting*), mechanics (*overheating market mechanisms*) (Alejo, 2010; Charteris-Black & Ennis, 2001), military attack (*credit derivatives can become a weapon of mass destruction*), or games (*the rules of the game for countries*) (Hirte & Pühringer, 2013). Articles from before financial crises had much more positive metaphors, compared with articles during crises (Lopez & Llopis, 2010). By their choice of metaphors, journalists and financial elites may inflict their preferred ideological undertone upon the audience. Media metaphors may redirect responsibility from the companies' management to other actors: the economy, the government or the consumer (Awab & Norazit, 2013; Dalalau, 2013; Williams, Davidson, & Yochim, 2011). From the above literature, it can be concluded that throughout financial crises, financial articles and experts use the same themes and metaphors regardless of the ideology, the context, or the purpose of the news reporting.

3. Methodology

This study seeks to understand the effect of financial crisis metaphors from a social-scientific point of view. The research thus differs from studies of metaphor itself, in which, even where metaphor is examined in politics or international relations, the focus is often squarely on linguistic or conceptual aspects. This study uses a quantitative method entitled the Metaphor Power Index (MPI) method that is explained below. The section will firstly discuss however, some methodological issues concerned with the study of metaphor in relation to the social world.

3.1 Methodological choices

As can be learned from the exemplary studies by Chilton on security metaphors (1996) and by Musolff on the role of metaphor in racial prejudice (2007), metaphor studies of political and social subjects most often follow Lakoff & Johnson's (1980) conceptual metaphor theory and they tend to be qualitative and manual. Ways to distinguish methods for analyzing metaphor are qualitative versus quantitative, manual versus automatized, inductive versus deductive (Steen et al., 2010). The deductive approach (also called the top-down approach) and automated methods start from a predetermined set of conceptual metaphors, or a database of linguistic metaphors, and using this set, one looks for instances of them in a given text (Sardinha, 2011).

The automated corpus linguistic procedure from the late 1990s is a quantitative approach (Stefanowitsch & Gries, 2007) that focuses on larger sets of text, where the manual approach is too time consuming and even impossible (Cameron

& Deignan, 2006). A critique of these methods is that they are less focused on metaphors that depend on the context. The danger here is that using these does not ensure that all metaphors can be detected (Steen et al., 2010). According to the inductive or bottom-up approach, one does not start from a predetermined set of metaphors. Only after having collected metaphors from the text, may one develop some categorization (Steen et al., 2010). One manual inductive method is the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) method (Pragglejaz group, 2007). MIP was developed and tested by a group of ten metaphor researchers, so as to be a reliable tool for the identification of metaphors. However, even though it involves the use of external tools such as dictionaries, in contrast to the deductive approach, it still requires some subjective assessments by the researcher. And both MIP and the subsequently developed MIPVU (Metaphor Identification Procedure Free University) (Steen, 2008) do take a lot of time and effort to get decent results, which makes their use unrealistic in the case of large-scale (social-scientific) 'public opinion formation' research. The systematic focus on single lexical units plus problems with identifying similes add to the problems.

The manual Metaphor Power Index (MPI) method combines the advantages of induction — no linguistic metaphors need be missed and the context can be taken into account — with those of an automated corpus approach — larger sets of text can be analyzed — and of deduction- systematic categorization according to source domain concepts.

3.2 The Metaphor Power Index (MPI) method

The Metaphor Power Index (MPI) method enables researchers to quantify metaphorical (and emotive, rhetorical) power in public discourse (De Landtsheer, 2009). For every part of the text an MPI may be calculated. Metaphors are (1) identified and counted, and then categorized according to (2) their originality and (3) the content or source domain. MPI is calculated based on the Metaphor Frequency Index (MFI), the Metaphor Intensity Index (MII) and the Metaphor Content Index (MCI).

2.2.1 *Metaphor Frequency*

In order to count metaphors and generate MPI it is first necessary to identify metaphors. Because of the large-scale data-collection which is often necessary in social-scientific studies, one is generally forced to use a less exhaustive metaphor identification procedure than MIP.

According to my experiences, instructing a team of coders, with test coding, group discussions and inter coder reliability calculation, gives sufficient results in terms of productivity and reliability. For the current case study, ten BA

3 students in communication science at the University of Antwerp collected the metaphor data as part of a 2013–2014 research training seminar by the author entitled “Rhetoric of Financial Crises”. Two students were assigned coordinating tasks for monitoring the division of labour for coding and data entry. For my instruction on metaphor identification I used the concrete insights from classic metaphor theory (borrowing from Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Cacciari, 2001; Feder Kittay, 1987; Richards, 1936). A simple definition similar to “saying something in terms of something else” proved to be a useful instrument for the empirical identification of metaphor. A linguistic metaphor need not be a full sentence; it may be a phrase, a word, or a morpheme. Metaphor is not a unit of discourse, but a use of discourse. Metaphor vehicles like *red locomotive* do have a first-order (semantic) meaning, but they can obtain a second-order (pragmatic) meaning when context indicates to the reader that the first-order meaning of the expression is inappropriate (see also Cacciari, 2001; Feder Kittay, 1987; Richards, 1936). This is the case when we use *red locomotive* as follows: “Now that the largest markets of *the Red locomotive of the world economy* fail, China should in addition, look for a viable and sustainable economy on the domestic front (“De rode locomotief”, *De Tijd*, 06/03/2012). In this example we call *red locomotive* the metaphor vehicle belonging to the ‘source domain’ ‘Technique’ and the Chinese economy the ‘target domain’, while the ‘tension’ between the domains provides for the interpretation that China is the main economic world power but it is in trouble. The ‘target’ domain (economy) differs from the ‘source’ domain (technique, or mechanics). It is the ‘contrast’ between these ‘semantic fields’ that creates the metaphor and its power. The system allows more than one metaphor to be identified inside a sentence, and all identified stretches are counted as separate linguistic metaphors, as in the following example with a stretch of two linguistic metaphors that compare money to a car that had to be moved because it was wrongly parked: “The Eurosystem, which comprises the ECB and the central banks of the euro countries [...]. The reason for this is that *many Greeks have removed their money* [metaphor 1] and *have parked it abroad* [metaphor 2]” [“Het eurosysteem, dat de ECB en de centrale banken van de eurolanden omvat [...]. De reden hiervoor is dat *tal van Grieken geld hebben weggehaald* en *in het buitenland hebben geparkeerd*”]t (“*De Tijd*”, 20/4/2015).

The MFI shows the discursive frequency of metaphors (me) per 100 words (w). It indicates how ‘metaphorical’ a text or a corpus is, based upon its relative frequency of metaphors. The higher the number (*n*) of metaphors (me) used in relation to the number (*n*) of words (wo), the higher the MFI:

$$\text{MFI} = n_{\text{me}} \times 100 / n_{\text{wo}}.$$

2.2.2 Metaphor Intensity

The Metaphor Intensity Index (MII) deals with the novel and original character of metaphor (see also Black, 1979; Mooy, 1976; Tsoukas, 1991). The more rare, abnormal, novel and surprising the cognitive substitution of meaning, the more likely it is that a metaphor will be recognized (Gibbs & Colston, 2012). MII represents the perceived degree to which the 'different sphere of life' (for instance 'technique') still exists in (the new meaning of) the metaphor. Does one still connect *red locomotive* to an actual locomotive (in a technical sense), or is the term that much established in our daily language use that the association has disappeared and only the new meaning is perceived, i.e. the notion of China as a world economic power? Metaphors receive MII (contrast, incongruity, and originality) values ranging from (1) for 'weak' (w), and (2) for 'average' (a), to (3) for 'original' or 'strong' (s) metaphors. Linguistic metaphors categorized as 'strong' or 'average' will always be novel metaphors, in contrast to 'weak' metaphors that may also be conventional ones. For the categorization of metaphor intensity the same procedure is followed as in the case of metaphor identification: instruction, test coding, discussion, and inter coder reliability calculation. Intensity coding may seem rather subjective, more than the identification of metaphor itself or the categorization of metaphor according to content; the variable nevertheless proved to be even more 'productive' (in terms of correlations). The use of novel metaphors (or more intense, creative and/or new metaphors) such as *the red locomotive* leads to a higher MII. MII stands for the sum of the weighted values of metaphor intensity (3-point scale) divided by the total number of metaphors (nme):

$$MII = \frac{1w + 2a + 3s}{nme}$$

2.2.3 Metaphor Content

The MPI model takes into account the source domain of the metaphors by way of the Metaphor Content Index (MCI). The coding of metaphor content follows a procedure similar to the coding of intensity or the identification of metaphor. Metaphors from sources such as disease or disaster are almost always emotionally more powerful than sources from everyday reality or nature (Musolff, 2007; Zinken, 2004). For MCI, the MPI method uses an empirically validated scale (De Landtsheer, 2009) that ranks content categories in ascending degrees based on their emotional and manipulative potential and the extent to which they confirm or disturb the existing order in life (Table 1.). The MCI relies on descriptors for source domains that are relatively universal: 'everyday life material reality' (Popular metaphors, P), 'nature' (Nature metaphors, N), 'politics, intellect, technology, or mechanics' (Technical metaphors, T), 'violence and disaster' (Violence

Table 1. Metaphorical sources for financial targets and their weighted values

Content	Explanation	Example	Weighted values
(1) <i>Popular</i> or everyday-life metaphors (P)	These metaphors serve the basic function of making the abstract tangible and comprehensible to a large audience	"This company gradually claims the title of being the <i>yoghurt of the financial sector</i> " [Aldus maakt HSBC stilaan aanspraak op de titel van <i>yoghurt van de financiële sector</i>] ("FIFO", in De Tijd, 29/02/2012)	Popular, strong, Ps, value 1×3=3
(2) <i>Nature</i> metaphors (N)	This category of metaphors goes in two ways. The natural order can be confirmed and lead to the suggestion of citizens' control over the environment, but it can also express the idea of lack of control. In references to flora and fauna we witness both wild and domestic animals	"There was a megalomaniac enlargement strategy in which a sardine tried to eat a shark and greatly choked" [Er was een megalomane uitbreidingsstrategie waarbij een <i>sardienje een haai trachtte op te eten en zich danig verslikte</i>] ("Fortis", in De Morgen, 27/09/2013)	Nature, strong, Ns, value 2×3=6
(3) <i>Technical</i> metaphors (T). Navigation, construction, technological, political and other 'sophisticated' metaphors.	This imagery has an ambivalent character. It allows politicians to show multiple dimensions of complex problems. Metaphors of architecture advance the discussion, whereas mechanical metaphors usually expose the people's lack of control	"Now that the largest markets of the <i>Red locomotive of the world economy</i> fail, China should look for a viable and sustainable economy on the domestic front,..." [Nu de grootste afzetmarkten van de <i>rode locomotief van de wereldeconomie</i> het laten afweten, moet China bovendien op zoek naar een leefbare en duurzame economie op het thuisfront] ("The Red locomotive" in De Tijd, 06/03/2012)	Technical, strong, Ts, value 3×3=9
(4) <i>Violence</i> and disaster metaphors (V)	This category refers to negative emotions, such as anxiety, despair and aggression. However, these emotions allow citizens to be in control to some extent	"That threatens to <i>put a bomb under the so-called carry trade and low interest rates</i> with us" [Dat dreigt een bom te leggen onder de zogenaamde <i>carry trade</i> en de lage rente bij ons] (" <i>Japan develops stock market bomb</i> " in De Standaard, 17/02/2007)	Violence, strong, Vs, value 4×3=12
(5) <i>Drama</i> , sports, games, film, history and bible metaphors (D)	This category about 'emotion', 'fiction', 'winning' and 'losing', which provides a very unrealistic image of reality, appeals to many people, because of its perceived harmlessness and the possibility to escape from reality for some moments	"That this has not caused a <i>domino effect</i> , is due to the action of public authorities and central banks" [Dat dit geen <i>domino-effect</i> heeft veroorzaakt, is te danken aan het optreden van de overheid en de centrale banken] ("Create the drip loss" in De Tijd, 22/08/2008)	Drama, average, Da, value 5×2=10
(6) <i>Body</i> , disease, medical and death metaphors (B)	This category is attributed the highest power. It concerns very emotional metaphors that leave the suggestion that every control is lost, and that there is a fundamental need for a 'doctor' who can restore or cure the current situation	"...the Latvian economy shrank nearly 20% and <i>had to be put to the infusion of the IMF</i> " [de Letse economie kromp bijna 20% en <i>moest aan het infuus van het IMF worden gelegd</i>] ("Introducing Euro Crown on pruning Latvia" in De Telegraaf, 07/03/2013)	Body, strong, Bs, value 6×3=18

metaphors, V), 'entertainment and escape: sports, games, film, drama, history and bible' (Drama metaphors, D) and death, body and illness (Body metaphors, B).

Metaphors may belong to more than one source domain; the most prominent impression then is decisive. The values ranging from 1 to 6 are based on the source content's meaning in the psycholinguistic and social-psychological literature, and in particular the question of whether the receiver is still considered to be able to 'control' the situation (e.g., Musolff, 2007; Zinken, 2004). Popular metaphors (P) receive the lowest (1), and Body metaphors (M) the highest score (6). Between these extremes, Nature metaphors (N) get the score (2), Technical metaphors (T) the score (3), Violence metaphors (V) the value (4), and Drama metaphors (D) get the score (5). The example described above with metaphors comparing money to a car will be categorized in the category of popular metaphors. One might also qualify it as 'technical', but it is the most prominent impression that is decisive (everyday life experience).

The crisis content variable or MCI is calculated with the following formula, in which (*nme*) represents the total number of metaphors:

$$MCI = 1P + 2N + 3T + 4V + 5D + 6B/nme$$

2.2.4 *Metaphor Power*

The calculation of MPI is the result of multiplying MFI, the metaphor frequency per 100 words, by MII, the metaphor intensity index (1–3), by MCI, the metaphor content index (1–6):

$$MPI = MFI \times MII \times MCI.$$

MPI reveals the metaphorical style character of parts of a specific discourse. Logically, a difference can be expected between certain actors; those who use fewer and less intense metaphors, or metaphors that are expected to arouse no or mild emotions, receive lower MPI scores than their counterparts. Based upon the results of earlier studies using MPI, De Landtsheer, Kalkhoven & Broen (2011) concluded that an index number of '5' is a 'breaking point'. MPIs above 5 are perceived as high and they indicate an emotional or 'metaphoric style'; indices below 5 suggest the use of substantive or 'content style' and indicate low metaphorical power. Table 1 presents an overview of the metaphor content categorization with explanations, examples and weighted values.

4. Analyzing metaphor's power in the financial crises

The case study consists of a longitudinal metaphor analysis of a sample of financial newspaper articles from 2006 to 2013. This section presents the sample, the inter-coder reliability, the hypotheses and the results.

4.1 Sample

The sample is representative for the written press in Flemish-Belgium (newspapers: "De Standaard," "De Morgen," "Het Laatste Nieuws," "De Tijd") and in The Netherlands (newspapers: "NRC-Handelsblad," "De Volkskrant," "De Telegraaf," "Het Parool"). The year 2006 serves as a control year, because the literature shows that the financial crisis started in 2007 (NBB, 2012). Articles of the first and third quarters of each year were retrieved from online databases — Mediargus for Flemish-Belgium and LexisNexis for the Netherlands — using the following search terms (*financial* OR *financial* AND *market* OR *markets* OR *crisis* OR *crises*). Each search result was evaluated using a number of criteria. The article had to be either a news report or a comment (just written by journalists, not by external authors), at least 200 words long, related to the financial crises, and contain at least one metaphor. The article's title, newspaper, article type, year and particular quarter (1 or 3) were recorded in a central database. A random sample was then taken of 25 news reports and 15 comments for each quarter from any newspaper. Selections of comments from popular newspapers and previous years did not always reach the maximum sample size, but this was considered as a natural feature of the press content and no attempts have been made to raise the number. After the final sample, a list of 3,730 articles (2,042,596 words, with an average of 547.61 words per article) was distributed among eight coders each of whom had to encode articles from one newspaper, which they looked up in the online databases. The encoding was entered into an Excel form based on the encoding scheme. The result was that 1,953 Flemish-Belgian financial articles (987,088 words, with an average of 505.42 words per article) and 1,777 Dutch financial articles (1,055,508 words, with an average of 593.98 words per article) were coded. It seems that the news coverage is heavily imbued with metaphors: no less than 26,200 were used in 3,730 articles, representing an average of 7 per article.

4.2 Reliability

The coding was done by eight coders, and the coding process and data entering were monitored by two coding-coordinators (both students in the research training seminar run by myself). In addition to detailed instructions, test codings,

two practical sessions, and discussions, MPI reliability tests were performed at four points during the coding process. Because MPI is a ratio variable, Cohen's Kappa and its derivatives are inadequate, in contrast to Krippendorff's Alpha (Krippendorff, 2004), an indicator that supports all measurement levels and any number of encoders, and Cronbach's Alpha, which is based on the average correlation between the coders. Krippendorff's Alpha was calculated for all test articles, using the SPSS-macro of Hayes and Krippendorff, and was equal to 0.328. Krippendorff's Alpha approaches the commonly accepted reliability standard of 0.667 the most at the second measuring moment, probably because the used test articles were the most metaphorical (1: 0.2406; 2: 0.547; 3: 0.074; 4: 0.189).

4.3 Hypotheses

The idea behind the 'rhetoric of the financial crises' is that metaphors are used deliberately for certain purposes, mainly to convince readers, given the emotional capacity of metaphors. During crises tempers flare and more people feel called upon to express all kinds of opinions; this also turns the crisis into a clear, socially relevant, item in the newspaper. With the features of metaphors and their uses in mind, we expect that financial, political and media elites will deliberately use more intense rhetoric and 'metaphor style', resulting in a more elevated MPI in times of financial crisis, compared with non-crisis times.

H1: MPI will be more elevated during the height of the crisis (2008–2010) and there will be a clear difference between crisis time (2007–2013) and non-crisis time (2006).

It is furthermore expected that the extent to which metaphors are used serves as a predictor for how the economy is performing. The aim of my research is to investigate the relationship from 2006 unto 2013 in Flemish-Belgium and The Netherlands between MPI and the objective economic indicators. I examined four economic indicators with statistics taken from Eurostat, the first three being objective indicators, the last one being a subjective indicator: the Gross National Product (GNP) (where a lower value of the indicator represents a negative financial trend), Unemployment rates (where a higher value of the indicator represents a negative financial trend), Government Debt (where a negative value of the indicator represents a negative financial trend), and Consumer Confidence (confidence in the financial institutions). The Consumer Confidence Index represents the opinions of households about the general economic climate and their own financial situation (Eurostat). This indicator is calculated with a monthly survey in which positive respondents are balanced against negative respondents. A lower value of the index represents a negative financial trend. An effect of a low index could be that investors and persons withdraw their money from the banks. One

other objective financial indicator, the number of Bankruptcies, was examined with statistics from NBB and CBS. This resulted in the two following hypotheses:

H2: MPI will rise with a decrease in GNP, and with increases in Unemployment rates, negative Public Debt values, and the number of Bankruptcies (objective economic indicators).

H3: MPI will rise with a decrease in Consumer Confidence (subjective economic indicator).

It is expected that more and stronger metaphors will be used when the economy is performing badly and when confidence in the economy is low.

4.4 Results

This section compares the results of the metaphor analysis (MPI) with the economic indicators for the period 2006–2013. Figure 1 shows the MPI in financial articles for the eight years under study (2006–2013) for Flemish-Belgium and The Netherlands. Table 2 presents the MPI scores separately for Flemish-Belgium and The Netherlands (2006–2013). Table 3 presents the correlations between MPI and financial indicators (Gross Domestic Product, Unemployment Rate, Public Debt, Bankruptcies, Consumer Trust) for Flemish-Belgium and The Netherlands.

Figure 1. MPI in Flemish-Belgian and Dutch Financial News Reporting (2006–2013)

Table 2. Median MPI scores for Flemish-Belgium and The Netherlands in financial articles (2006–2013).

Year	MPI	MPI Flemish-Belgium	MPI Netherlands
2006	4.07	4.38	3.54
2007	4.73	5.74	3.86
2008	5.42	6.29	5.00
2009	5.48	6.08	5.01
2010	5.94	6.12	5.80
2011	5.81	6.84	4.94
2012	5.74	7.07	5.04
2013	6.38	7.01	5.50

The results for Flemish-Belgium and The Netherlands show that the MPI gradually increases. Starting at the lowest point in 2006 in both countries and reaching its peak in 2012–2013 in Flemish-Belgium and in 2010 in The Netherlands. The MPI over the years 2006–2013 shows a slight increase. There is a sharp rise in metaphor use as of 2007, both in Flemish-Belgium and The Netherlands, with a peak in 2010 in the Netherlands, that seems to react more intensively during the Euro crisis. Flemish-Belgian newspapers keep on using more metaphors with every crisis year. H1 states that MPI will be more elevated during the height of the crisis (2008–2010) and that there will be a clear difference between crisis time (2007–2013) and non-crisis time (2006).

H1 is thus confirmed. In times of crisis, more metaphors were used than in non-crisis times. In the year 2013, we see no lower MPI, the crisis is not over yet; journalists and financial elites are still strongly experiencing the effects of the crisis, and they continue their negative impression management.

Table 3. Correlations between Dutch and Flemish-Belgian economic indicators and the Dutch and Flemish-Belgian MPI in financial articles (2006–2013).

Indicator	Flemish-Belgium and Netherlands	Flemish-Belgium	Netherlands
Gross Domestic Product	–.053**	–.078**	–.056*
Unemployment Rate	.157**	–.033	.025
Public Debt	–.095**	–.130**	–.083**
Bankruptcies	–.073**	.077**	.048*
Consumer Trust	–.064**	–.039	–.032

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$. Sources: Eurostat.

According to H2, the MPI will rise when the objective economic indicators are down. The combined results for Flemish-Belgium newspapers and Dutch newspapers clearly confirm the hypothesis. All economic indicators have a significant

correlation with the MPI for both countries. In particular, the strong correlation between the Unemployment Rate and the Metaphor Power Index jumps out. I want to emphasize that a negative correlation between the Public Debt indicator and the Metaphor Power Index implies that a negative trend in public finances coincides with an increase in metaphor language, thereby confirming our hypothesis. The negative correlation between Bankruptcies (the only non-Eurostat indicator) and the MPI is contradictory to our expectations.

When we look at the results for each individual country a more nuanced and complex picture appears. Some correlations lose their significance, others become more strong. In Flemish-Belgium there is a negative correlation between the MPI and the GDP, a strong negative correlation between MPI and the Public Debt indicator that represents a negative trend, and a positive relation between the number of bankruptcies and the MPI. All of which confirm our expectations. In the Netherlands the strength of the correlations is weaker. Still we find a negative correlation between the GDP and the MPI, a negative correlation between Public Debt and the MPI, and again a positive correlation between bankruptcies and our MPI index. Hypothesis 2 is clearly confirmed when we look at the general picture, judging by all significant correlations. It is also confirmed for both Flemish-Belgium and the Netherlands separately for Gross Domestic Product, Public Debt, and Bankruptcies. The last financial indicator now indicates a positive correlation as our hypothesis stated. The Unemployment Rate loses a little of its significance, whereas it was the strongest for the general result.

Finally, H3 posits that MPI will rise with a decrease in Consumer Confidence (subjective economic indicator). This is partly confirmed by the data. There is a significant negative correlation between MPI and Consumer Confidence that loses its significance when both countries are taken separately.

4. Discussion

The various dimensions of the research allow us to reach a conclusive synthesis on the interchange of the Belgian-Flemish and Dutch financial media metaphors and the financial-economic climate. The use of metaphors and the MPI was found to be more pronounced during the financial crises. This is particularly obvious in the contrast between the non-crisis year 2006 and the gradual rise of MPI in the years thereafter. This means that 'more' metaphors were used, as well as 'more innovative' (novel) metaphors and 'more powerful' metaphors (from emotionally powerful source domains such as violence and disaster, body and illness, or drama and games). The findings from this quantitative study support my own hypotheses and

earlier findings, as well as findings from qualitative studies concerned with crises and metaphor content by other scholars.

The increase in unemployment rates and public debt, and the drop in trust in financial institutions and in consumer trust, seem to translate immediately into stronger media rhetoric and metaphor style. My hypotheses in respect to an interaction between media metaphor power and these financial indicators are more or less confirmed, at least for all indicators consulted for The Netherlands and Flemish-Belgium through Eurostat Statistics. But it is not perfectly clear in which way the interaction works; more research is necessary. How far does the influence of the media metaphors reach in presenting information in the financial sphere, for example, on a crisis? What aspects of crises are presented as important, and in what terms? Are there differences between the various media? Answering these questions in regard to the 2007–2013 financial crises is challenging but complicated. Over time, communication science has developed a sophisticated way to analyze how mass media influence the views of ordinary citizens (Kinder, 2003). There is a complex process in which the old paradigm of the ‘injection needle model’ is left behind. Information is organized by the media (‘framed’) in manners that encourage citizens to interpret this information in particular ways. By their tone and the degree of attention they give to problems, the media can emphasize importance of these problems, or influence their interpretation. Financial crises seem to be part of the ‘shortlist’ of problems that are eligible for these media routines that include ‘agenda-setting’ and ‘metaphor framing’. Metaphors are an important form of ‘framing’ (Steen, 2008), and it would be interesting to examine their role in connection with ‘media framing’ and ‘media content’ during financial crises. This might make it possible to get a more complete picture of financial metaphor as an indicator and a processing element of financial crises. We can simply conclude from the current study that economic conditions somehow affect the use of metaphor. The (study of the) effect of metaphor on economic conditions and the deliberate aspects of it meanwhile remains an ambitious project for the future.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the students of the Research Training Seminar on “The rhetoric of the financial crisis” at the University of Antwerp (and especially the student-coordinator Montana Spaans) for extensive data collection. Also, I am grateful to Nicolas Van de Voorde, Research Trainee within the Political Communication Research Unit, and Tom Smeekens, student-coordinator of the Research Training Seminar, for their valuable statistical contribution to this project. The editors of this special issue as well as the other reviewers of this article certainly deserve sincere words of thanks for their very helpful comments.

References

- Alejo, R. (2010). Where does the money go? An analysis of the container metaphor in economics: The market and the economy. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(4), 1137–1150. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2009.08.013
- Awab, S., & Norazit, L. (2013). 'Challenging' times or 'turbulent' times: A study of the choice of metaphors used to refer to the 2008 economic crisis in Malaysia and Singapore. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 10(2), 209–233. DOI: 10.1515/ip-2013-0010
- Black, M. (1979). More about metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp.19–43). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cacciari, C. (2001). Cognitive psychology of figurative thought and figurative language. In N. J. Smelser & P. B. Baltes (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences*, 8 (pp. 5632–5637). Amsterdam, Paris, New York, Oxford, Shannon, Singapore, & Tokyo: Elsevier. DOI: 10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/01532-1
- Cameron, L., & Deignan, A. (2006). The emergence of metaphor in discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(4), 671–690. DOI: 10.1093/applin/aml032
- Catalano, T., & Waugh, L. (2013). The language of money: How verbal and visual metonymy shapes public opinion about financial events. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 7(2), 31–60.
- CBS. Centraal Bureau voor Statistiek, The Netherlands [Central Office for Statistics, The Netherlands). Retrieved from www.cbs.nl
- Charteris-Black, J., & Ennis, T. (2001). A comparative study of metaphor in Spanish and English financial reporting. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20(3), 249–266. DOI: 10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00009-0
- Charteris-Black, J., & Musolff, A. (2003). 'Battered hero' or 'innocent victim'? A comparative study of metaphors for euro trading in British and German financial reporting. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22, 153–176. DOI: 10.1016/S0889-4906(02)00012-1
- Chilton, P. (1996). *Security metaphors: Cold War discourse from containment to common house*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Dalalau, D. (2013). Metaphors describing the economic and financial crisis in business press articles. *Studia Universitatis Petru Maior – Philologia*, 15, 167–178.
- Deetz, S., & Mumby, D. (1985). Metaphors, information and power. In B. D. Ruben (Ed.), *Information and behavior Vol. 1*, (pp. 369–386). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.
- Eurostat. European Statistics. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat>
- De Landtsheer, C. (1991). Function and the language of politics. A linguistic uses and gratifications approach. *Communication & Cognition*, 24(3–4), 299–344.
- De Landtsheer, C. (2009). Collecting political meaning from the count of metaphor. In A. Musolff & J. Zinken (Eds.), *Metaphor and discourses* (pp.73–96). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- De Landtsheer, C., Kalkhoven, L., & Broes, L. (2011). De beeldspraak van Geert Wilders, een Tsunami over Nederland? [The metaphors of Geert Wilders, a Tsunami over the Netherlands], *Tijdschrift voor Communicatiewetenschap*, 39(4), 5–21.
- Feder Kittay, E. (1987). *Metaphor. Its cognitive force and linguistic structure*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gibbs, R.W. Jr, & Colston, H. L. (2012). *Interpreting figurative meaning*. New York: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139168779

- Gibbs, R. W., Jr., Leggett, J. S., & Turner, E. A. (2002). What's special about figurative language in emotional communication? In S. R. Fussell (Ed.), *The verbal communication of emotions* (pp. 125–150). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gregg, R. B. (2004). Embodied meaning in American public discourse during the Cold War. In F.A. Beer & C. De Landtsheer (Eds.), *Metaphorical World Politics* (pp. 59–73). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Hirte, K., & Pühringer, S. (2013). The financial crisis as a tsunami: Discourse profiles of economist in the financial crisis. Retrieved from <http://www.econ.jku.at/members/Schneider/files/lehre/disscolloquium/Puehringer.pdf>
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Kinder, D. R. (2003). Communication and politics in the age of information. In D. O. Sears, L. Huddy, & R. Jervis (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of political psychology* (pp. 357–393). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kleinnijenhuis, J. (2009). Invloed van economisch nieuws op de kredietcrisis [The influence of economic news on the credit crisis] *Bank en effectenbedrijf*, 4, 20–24.
- Kleinnijenhuis, J., Schultz, F., Oegema, D., & Utz, S. (2015). The mediating role of the news in the BP oil spill crisis 2010: How US news is influenced by public relations and in turn affects public awareness, foreign news and the share price. *Communication Research*, 42(3), 408–428. DOI: 10.1177/0093650213510940
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and human feeling*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). Measuring the reliability of qualitative text analysis data. *Quality & Quantity*, 38(6), 787–800. DOI: 10.1007/s11135-004-8107-7
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lopez, A. M. R., & Llopis, M. A. O. (2010). Metaphorical pattern analysis in financial texts: Framing the crisis in positive or negative metaphorical terms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(12), 3300–3313. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.06.001
- Mooy, J. J. (1976). *A study of metaphor: On the nature of metaphorical expressions with special reference to their reference*. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company.
- Musolf, A. (2007). What role do metaphors play in racial prejudice? The function of anti-Semitic imagery in Hitler's Mein Kampf. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 41(1), 21–43. DOI: 10.1080/00313220601118744
- National Bank of Belgium Statistics. <http://www.nbb.be/pub/stats/stats.htm?l=en>
- Ortony, A. (Ed.). (1979/1993). *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22(1), 1–39. DOI: 10.1080/10926480709336752
- Richards, I. A. (1936). *A philosophy of rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rooman, H. (2009). The banks were blown down by the media? A quantitative analysis. Master's thesis in Political Communication, University of Antwerp.
- Sardinha, T. B. (2011). Metaphor and corpus linguistics. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, 11(2), 329–360. DOI: 10.1590/S1984-63982011000200004
- Sopory, P., & Dillard, J. P. (2002). The persuasive effects of metaphor: A meta-analysis. *Human Communication Research*, 28(3), 382–419. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2002.tb00813.x
- Statbel. Statistics Belgium. Retrieved from www.statbel.fgov.be

- Steen, G. (2008). The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23(4), 213–241. DOI: 10.1080/10926480802426753
- Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T. (2010). *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/celcr.14
- Stefanowitsch, A., & Gries, S. T. (2007). *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Thibodeau, P. H., & Boroditsky, L. (2011). Metaphors we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 6(2), e16782. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0016782
- Thibodeau, P. H., & Boroditsky, L. (2013). Natural language metaphors covertly influence reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 8(1), e52961. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0052961
- Toncar, M. F., & Munch, J. M. (2003). The influence of simple and complex tropes on believability, importance and memory. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 11(4), 39–53.
- Tsoukas, H. (1991). The missing link: A transformational view of metaphors in organizational science. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(3), 566–585.
- White, M. (2004). Turbulence and turmoil in the market or the language of a financial crisis. *Ibérica*, 7, 71–86.
- Williams, A. E., Davidson, R., & Yochim, E. C. (2011). Who's to blame when a business fails? How journalistic death metaphors influence responsibility attributions. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 88(3), 541–561.
- Woo, G. (2012). Natural hazard metaphors for financial crises. Retrieved from DOI: 10.1063/1.1358203
- Zinken, J. (2004). Metaphoric practices in the German *Wende* discourse. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(5–6), 1–16. DOI: 10.1080/01434630408668916

Author's address

Prof. Dr. Christ'l De Landtsheer
 Department of Communication
 Political Communication Research Unit
 University of Antwerp
 Sint-Jacobstraat 2 (M.473)
 2000 Antwerp, Belgium.
 christl.delandtsheer@uantwerpen.be

Biographical note

Christ'l De Landtsheer is Professor of Communication at the University of Antwerp, Belgium. Among her books are "Metaphorical World Politics" (Michigan State University Press, 2004, with Francis A. Beer); "Politically Speaking: A Worldwide Examination of Language Used in the Public Sphere" (Praeger, 1998, with Ofer Feldman); "Beyond Public Speech and Symbols: Explorations in the Rhetoric of Politicians and the Media" (Praeger, 2000, with Ofer Feldman).

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
 © JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

The “Belgian Tetris”

Assessing the political impact of metaphors on citizens’ representations of Belgian federalism

Julien Perrez and Min Reuchamps

University of Liege, Belgium / Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium

As metaphors not only reflect perceived reality, but can also function as cues through which citizens come to understand complex political processes, the aim of this study is to look at how specific metaphors might impact on the citizens’ framing of Belgian federalism. To measure the impact of metaphors on political representations, we conducted an experiment among 493 citizens based on an article published in the newspaper “Le Soir”, in which Belgian federalism was compared to a Tetris game in both a text and an image. The participants were distributed across four experimental conditions according to the type of input they had been exposed to (text and image, text only, image only, no input) and were asked to perform a free description task. The productions of the participants were analyzed using keyword and content analyses. The results suggest that the participants who had been exposed to the experimental text tended to frame their perception of Belgian federalism in different ways. They also show that reading the text had more of an impact on the representations than looking at the image, but that this impact was in both cases short-lived.

Keywords: conceptual metaphors, federalism, framing, political representations, Belgium

1. Introduction

The fact that we “live by” metaphors has now been widely accepted by the scholarly community of linguists around the world, following the seminal work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Metaphors are not only figures of speech serving rhetorical purposes, but also and above all powerful conceptual tools to depict abstract and complex realities through familiar domains of reference. Metaphors can thus be found in our daily life, including our political life. Yet in this domain, the political

Metaphor and the Social World 5:2 (2015), 222–243. DOI 10.1075/msw.5.2.03per
ISSN 2210-4070 / E-ISSN 2210-4097 © John Benjamins Publishing Company

impact of metaphors is often taken for granted. Therefore, a more global understanding of what this impact could consist of is needed. As Koller (2009, p. 121) claims: “metaphor helps construct particular aspects of reality and reproduce (or subvert) dominant schemas.” To be able to account for how metaphors, through discourse, actively shape political reality, it is important to look at the relationships between metaphorical discourses and their context.

As metaphors not only reflect perceived reality, but can also function as cues through which citizens come to understand complex political processes, and through which they shape political behaviours, the aim of this study is to look at how specific metaphors might impact on citizens. Too often such political impact is assumed. Yet the identification of metaphors in political discourse does not necessarily imply that these metaphors matter politically. While the use of metaphors is probably meaningful from the perspective of the producer, the question of their impact on individuals has not yet been examined in greater detail.

This article builds on an experiment performed in Belgium concerning citizens’ representations of federalism. In this country, the future of federalism is a hotly debated political issue since it concerns the future of Belgium itself (Reuchamps, 2013). Several metaphors have been used to express in more familiar terms the complexity of Belgian federalism and its dynamics (Perrez & Reuchamps, 2014; Reuchamps & Perrez, 2012). Among them, the ‘Belgian Tetris’ metaphor has been proposed in the media as a way to explain the nature of Belgian federalism in terms of its power distribution. Our experiment is based on this real-life metaphor. Comparing various experimental conditions will make it possible to: (1) measure the impact of the Tetris metaphor on citizens’ representations of Belgian federalism; (2) assess to what extent the different metaphorical media (text and/or image) contribute differently to this impact; and (3) to measure the impact of this metaphor over time. In answering these questions, this study will contribute to a better understanding of the role and functions metaphors play in political discourse, and more globally in our everyday political interactions.

2. The political impact of metaphors

There are good reasons to assume that metaphors have an impact on our political thinking. Many scholars have demonstrated that metaphor is a central cognitive process of human cognition; it is key for abstract conceptualisation and reasoning (for an overview, see Johnson, 2010). Psychologists Bowdle and Gentner (2005) have explored how metaphors establish mapping between concepts from different domains and have shown that metaphors are processed differently depending on their degree of conventionality — conventional vs. novel — and their grammatical

form — metaphor vs. simile. While individuals appear to process conventional metaphors as quickly as they process literal meaning, they need more time to comprehend novel metaphors, especially when these are not expressed as similes. This is an important finding for research on the impact of metaphors, as the impact of conventional metaphors may be quite different from the impact of novel metaphors. This distinction should be borne in mind in any analysis of the political domain.

In a set of several interrelated experiments, Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2011) explored how metaphors about crime policy might influence reasoning. When respondents were presented with crime as a “virus infecting a city”, they were more likely to propose a prevention-inspired solution with educational campaigns and social reforms. By contrast, when respondents were presented with crime as a “wild beast preying on a city”, their solutions were much more based on repression, with the objectives of catching and jailing criminals as well as enacting harsher enforcement laws. These experiments suggested that metaphors, even with a one word change, can have a political impact and that the influence of their framing effect is often covert, as respondents do not recognize metaphors as influential in their decisions. Yet, metaphors seem to instantiate frame-consistent knowledge structures that lead to structurally consistent policy solutions.

Building on these findings, Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2013) further explored the influence of natural language metaphors on social issues and policies. In a new series of four experiments, respondents were again presented with a short text on the increase of crime in a fictitious town where crime was metaphorically presented either as a beast or a virus. This time, however, they did not ask respondents to generate a solution of their own, but they provided them with competing solutions and asked them to choose the best ones. Their results suggest that presenting crime as a beast led the participants to choose punitive measures, whereas the virus metaphor increased the participants’ propensity to opt for prevention solutions (even though punitive measures were still strongly present). This led the researchers to the conclusion that “metaphors can instantiate coherent knowledge-structures that influence how we build a representation of the problem and evaluate potential solutions, and they can do so even when they slip by unnoticed” (Thibodeau & Boroditsky, 2013, p. 7).

On the basis of a recent set of three experiments, including an extended replication of the studies by Thibodeau and Boroditsky, Steen, Reijnierse and Burgers (2014) questioned the conclusion that metaphors subtly but covertly influence people’s reasoning. Their experiments did not yield the same results and more refined tests showed that possible alternative explanations should be explored. In fact, Steen et al. (2014, p. 20) found that simply reading about crime — without any metaphorical framing — increased people’s preferences for repression-inspired, rather than prevention-inspired, solutions.

There is much still to be explored and understood about the influence of metaphors. Previous studies do however emphasise the need to do three things when designing an experiment to investigate the political impact of metaphors: first, to set a control condition to compare any changes against; second, as metaphors are communicated through different media (oral, written, visual, for instance), to not only focus on textual material but also to check for the effect of supporting visual material; third, to control for individual and political variables. As political impact can vary a lot in nature and over time, we designed an experiment that relies on one real-life metaphor, as used in the media, and looked for its impact on a specific population, with special attention to surrounding variables. The aim of this article is accordingly to assess the political impact of this real-life metaphor both in the short-term and in the longer term. In this study, political impact can thus be defined as the actual impact of a metaphor on the way people see and understand a complex political issue, such as, in this case, the distribution of power in a federal state, where this question has been for long at the top of the political agenda (Deschouwer & Reuchamps, 2013).

3. Data and method

3.1 Experimental material

To measure the possible impact of metaphors on citizens’ political representations, we developed an experimental set-up based on an article published in the newspaper “Le Soir” (13–14 July, 2013) in which Belgian federalism was compared to a Tetris game. The original article consisted of a large central picture and accompanying text (208 words),¹ which were used as experimental material. The authentic nature of our experimental text was considered to be an advantage, in that it had been produced by a journalist in a natural setting to present the state reform to its readers.

1. The original article was entitled ‘La nouvelle répartition des compétences en Belgique’ (‘The new distribution of competences in Belgium’). As highlighted by an anonymous reviewer, the comprehension of the word ‘competence’ might be problematic. This usage refers to the legal authority of a political body to deal with a particular matter. The anonymous reviewer suggested that the word ‘jurisdiction’ could be considered a better English alternative for the concept of ‘competence’. However, considering the high frequency of the word ‘competence’ in political science literature (Deschouwer, 2012), the term is retained here. For copyright reasons, the original article (including the picture) has not been reproduced here. The wording of the original text and its translation into English can be found in the Appendix.

3.2 Deconstructing the Tetris

In past research on metaphors in political discourse, buildings, journeys, machines and family relationships appear to be the preferred source domains to describe political systems and processes (see among many others Charteris-Black, 2011; Lakoff, 1996; Musolff, 2004; Reuchamps & Perrez, 2012). Using a computer game as a cognitive reference point can therefore be viewed as an original way of depicting a political system. In this newspaper article, the mapping between the Tetris game and Belgian federalism is directly mentioned in the title of the short text next to the image and overtly realised in the sentence *C'est le grand Tetris belge* ('this is the big Belgian Tetris') and reinforced by the use of the words *étage* ('floor' or 'level') and *bloc* ('block'). Moreover, this mapping is made explicit by the presentational construction introduced by *C'est* ('This is ...'). Applying Steen's (2008) model, this metaphor can be regarded as a direct metaphor at the linguistic level and novel metaphor at the conceptual level. As it was also used "to change the addressee's perspective on the referent or topic that is the target of the metaphor, by making the addressee look at it from a different conceptual domain or space, which functions as a conceptual source" (Steen, 2008, p. 222), we would suggest that it is an instance of deliberate metaphor (see also Negrea-Busuioc & Ritchie, 2015). More specifically, we think the author of the newspaper article used the metaphor with the didactic goal of presenting the new state reform as comprehensively as possible.

Before turning to the core discussion of the conceptual consequences of the use of the metaphor on citizens' understanding of the state reforms, we will initially focus on interpreting it. More specifically, we point to the relevant implications of the Tetris metaphor when applied to the domain of Belgian federalism.

Firstly, Tetris is a *game*, and more specifically a dynamic *puzzle game* in which time is a crucial factor and differently-shaped pieces must fit together. Applied to the domain of politics, this mapping highlights the notion of complexity in the system. It is complicated to get the right blocks (in this case the different federal state competences) in the right place (in this case the different substate entities).

With respect to the game's scenario, we can identify different *levels* (the different federal entities) and different *blocks*, (namely the competences), moving down from a higher level (the federal government) to a lower level (the regional and community governments). These notions of blocks and levels relate to the conceptual domain of *construction*, which is reinforced by the fact that the combination of blocks at the lower level visually leads to the construction of a building. When applying this idea of construction to Belgian federalism, more specific inferences can be derived, namely: (i) the fact that the construction process only concerns the lower level, which, when transposed to Belgian federalism, suggests that the

construction process is limited to the substate entities; following from this, (ii) the idea that the construction of the substate entities occurs at the expense of the federal state, which is falling apart (or losing blocks). Besides these two main interpretations, some more specific suggestions could be indirectly derived, such as (iii) the fact that it is impossible to win this game, suggesting that further federalisation of the state is somehow an inevitable process; and (iv) the fact that this process is unidirectional and non-reversible (from the higher level to the lower level). However, in the framework of the Belgian federal system, a reverse movement is possible, e.g. moving competences from the lower level to the higher level (known as a re-federalisation process in Belgian terms). These different interpretations were used in the content analysis of the data (sec. 4.4).

3.3 Experimental design

In order to assess to what extent the Tetris metaphor might have an influence on citizens' representations of Belgian federalism, we designed a test consisting of three experimental conditions and one control condition. In the first experimental condition (full condition), participants were exposed to the original article (text and picture). In the second and third experimental conditions, the participants were exposed respectively to the text only (text condition) or the picture only (image condition). In the control condition, the participants were not exposed to any material at all. The experimental task immediately followed the stimulus stage. It consisted of two interrelated tasks, namely a free description task, in which the participants were asked to describe their own representation of Belgian federalism and a questionnaire measuring their political knowledge of Belgian federalism and attitudes towards its future development.

Four weeks after this first experimental session, a post-test was held, in which the first task of the second stage — the free description — was replicated. In this second experimental session, the participants were not exposed to any experimental input.

3.4 Participants

The participants were 1st-year bachelor's students from the Université de Liège and the Université catholique de Louvain in Belgium, respectively enrolled in a Modern Languages program and a Social and Political Sciences program. The analysis of our data is based on a sample of 493 students for the experimental in-

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

intervention and 300 for the post-test.² The subjects were randomly assigned to the different experimental conditions (Table 1). The students who participated in the post-test had all taken part in the experimental intervention.

Table 1. Distribution of participants across experimental conditions

	Experiment		Post-test	
	N	%	N	%
Control condition (Q1)	126	25.6	82	27.4
Full condition (Q2)	125	25.4	79	26.4
Image condition (Q3)	114	23.1	65	21.7
Text condition (Q4)	128	26.0	73	24.4
Total	493	100.0	300	100.0

3.5 Procedure

The whole experiment (including experimental intervention and post-test) was conducted online using LimeSurvey. For the intervention, the experimental protocol consisted of 4 to 6 different stages (depending on the experimental condition). These can be summarised as follows:

- Stage 1 presented the experimental stimulus, either the Tetris illustration (image condition and full condition) or the experimental text (text condition), or no stimulus (control condition).
- Stage 2 presented the experimental text (full condition only).
- Stage 3, participants were asked to freely describe their own perception of Belgian federalism (free description task; all conditions).
- Stage 4, participants were confronted with 5 multiple-choice questions tackling their general political knowledge about Belgian federalism (e.g., “Which political function can you fulfil without being directly elected?”).
- Stage 5, participants were asked to fill in socio-demographics.
- Stage 6, participants were asked to describe their perception of their own identity on a 10-point Likert scale.

The participants could go through each stage at their own pace. Once one stage had been completed, they could not return to it. In the post-test, stage 3 was fully replicated and all other stages were omitted.

2. The difference in participation between the experimental intervention and the post-test can be explained by the fact that fewer students actually turned up for the post-test. This tendency was equally distributed across the experimental conditions (see Table 1).

4. Results

Data were analysed with the various exposure conditions as a between-subjects independent variable, the experimental intervention and the post-test as a within-subjects independent variable and the citizens’ representations of Belgian federalism as the dependent variable. The descriptions of Belgian federalism by participants (produced in Stage 3) were analysed using different techniques: we looked at the description length (sec. 4.1), at the lexical influence of the experimental text (sec. 4.2), performed a keyword analysis (sec. 4.3), and finally conducted a corpus-based content analysis of the participants’ free descriptions (sec. 4.4).

4.1 Length of descriptions

The aim of this first analysis was to determine the extent to which exposure to the experimental input had an impact on the description task, by measuring the mean length (number of words) of the free descriptions (Table 2).

Table 2. Mean length (N words) of the free descriptions across the experimental conditions (Experimental intervention and post-test)

	Experiment				Post-test			
	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Control condition	41.7	22.9	3	120	37.4	18.7	3	80
Full condition	50.2	21.3	3	128	39.4	20.0	3	85
Image condition	43.4	23.6	5	126	36.1	20.6	3	98
Text condition	47.7	23.9	3	127	37.1	22.1	3	126
Total	45.8	23.1	3	128	37.6	20.3	3	126

The results in Table 2 point to a linear trend suggesting that participants who had been exposed to more visual and textual material tended to produce longer descriptions (no input < visual input < textual input < visual and textual input). A one-way ANOVA found that this tendency is significant ($F_{(3,489)} = 3.652$, $p < .05$). However, further post-hoc analyses (Tukey) suggested that only the difference between the control condition and the full condition was significant ($p < .05$).

Interestingly, this effect disappeared in the post-test. Though the participants from the full condition still produced longer descriptions, differences in description length between the different experimental groups were not significant ($F_{(3,295)} = .346$, $p = .792$). Further post-hoc analyses (Tukey) did not reveal any significant differences either. It can further be observed that the mean length of descriptions decreased in the post-test, suggesting the influence of the input material

did not last over time ($t_{(1,299)} = 7.833$, $p < .0001$). This appeared to be the case for all experimental conditions.

4.2 Lexical influence of the experimental text

A second dimension that might have had an impact on descriptions produced by participants was the lexical influence of the input text. To measure this influence, we derived the degree of lexical overlap between the experimental text and the free descriptions, by calculating the number of similar lexical items divided by the total number of words of the text. Though each experimental group showed a minimal degree of lexical overlap with the input text (even the groups who were not exposed to the text), the results suggest that the answers of the participants who were exposed to the input text (full condition and text condition) showed a higher degree of lexical overlap with the input text (Table 3).

Table 3. Lexical influence of the input text on the free description task (experimental intervention and post-test)

	Experiment				Post-test			
	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Control condition	.19	.14	.0	.78	.21	.15	.0	.78
Full condition	.23	.12	.3	.67	.24	.14	.0	.86
Image condition	.20	.13	.0	.71	.25	.19	.0	.85
Text condition	.25	.12	.0	.75	.25	.16	.0	.88
Total	.22	.13	.0	.78	.24	.16	.0	.88

A one-way ANOVA with the degree of lexical overlap as the dependent variable and the experimental condition as an independent variable found that this lexical impact was significant ($F_{(3,489)} = 6.502$, $p < .001$), confirming that reading the text does have an influence on participants' descriptions. Further post-hoc comparisons showed that only the differences between the control condition and the text condition, on the one hand, and between the image condition and the text condition, on the other, were significant (respectively $p < .001$ and $p < .01$). However, this lexical influence of the text disappeared in the post-test, as shown in Table 3. This tendency was confirmed by a one-way ANOVA with the degree of lexical overlap as dependent variable and the experimental condition as independent variable ($F_{(3,295)} = .922$, $p = .430$).

Although the input text appeared to lexically influence the descriptions of the participants in the experimental intervention, it should be noted that the mean lexical coverage of the text remained relatively low. This suggests that the participants did not merely reproduce the textual information, but rather that the text

contained words which were typical of political language in general. This interpretation seems to be confirmed by the lexical coverage observed in the post-test, which was found to be higher than in the experimental intervention for each experimental condition, even though the participants were not exposed to any form of input material at this stage of the experiment.

4.3 Keyword analysis

The first two analyses focussed on pure formal aspects of the participants’ descriptions of Belgian federalism. The two subsequent analyses (secs 4.3, 4.4) sought to determine to what extent participants from the different experimental conditions talk differently about Belgian federalism having been exposed to the Tetris metaphor. To determine this, descriptions from participants from the four experimental conditions were divided into eight different subcorpora: four for the experimental intervention and four for the post-test (Table 4).

Table 4. Size of the subcorpora (N words)

	Experiment	Post-test
Control condition	5.406 words	3.247 words
Full condition	6.469 words	3.282 words
Image condition	4.972 words	2.678 words
Text condition	6.199 words	2.919 words

To measure the impact of the Tetris metaphor, we firstly performed a keyword analysis using the corpus processing software Wordsmith Tools 6 (Scott, 2012). Such an analysis made it possible to compare two text corpora and to automatically extract the words that appear more prominently in one corpus or the other. In order to determine to what extent participants who had been exposed to the input material talked differently about Belgian federalism, various keyword analyses were performed using the control condition corpus as a reference corpus. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 5 for the experimental intervention and Table 6 for the post-test. The italicised words are those that were significantly more frequent in the reference corpus (control condition corpus). Above the line are the words that were significantly more frequent in the corpora that were compared to it, respectively the full condition corpus (Q2), the image condition corpus (Q3) and the text condition corpus (Q4). The level of significance was calculated on the basis of log-likelihood ratio and was set at 0.05.

Table 5. Keyword comparison of the experimental corpora (respectively full condition (Q2), image (Q3) and text (Q4) conditions) with the control condition corpus (Q1) (Experimental intervention)

Key word	%Q2	%Q1	Keyness Key word	%Q3	%Q1	Keyness Key word	%Q4	%Q1	Keyness
etat ('state')	2.71	1.27	domaines ('domains')	0.27	0.00	etat ('state')	2.72	1.27	33.29
domaines ('domains')	0.17	0.00	s'occupe ('is in charge of')	0.23	0.02	domaines ('domains')	0.20	0.00	16.32
compétences ('competences')	1.70	0.93	immigration ('immigration')	0.13	0.00	régions ('regions')	2.03	1.19	13.69
pouvoirs ('powers')	0.94	0.44	immigration ('immigration')	0.11	0.00	communautés ('communities')	1.86	1.12	11.52
fédérés ('substate')	0.20	0.02	sécurité ('security')	0.11	0.00	enseignement ('education')	0.29	0.05	10.91
nouvelles ('new')	0.13	0.00	charge ('in charge of')	0.11	0.00	tétris ('tétris')	0.12	0.00	10.04
fonctions ('functions')	0.13	0.00	fédéral ('federal')	1.41	0.86	au profit de ('in favour of')	0.12	0.00	10.04
exercées ('exercised')	0.10	0.00	police ('police')	0.10	0.00	peu ('little')	0.34	0.09	9.38
emploi ('employment')	0.09	0.00	importance ('importance')	0.10	0.00	été ('been')	0.46	0.16	9.27
sncb ('national railway company')	0.09	0.00	compétence ('competences')	0.15	0.02	désormais ('from now on')	0.11	0.00	8.79
certaines ('some')	0.26	0.07	7.23			créé ('created')	0.11	0.00	8.79
exemple ('examples')	0.19	0.03	7.10			exemple ('example')	0.20	0.03	7.59
autres ('others')	0.32	0.10	6.99			chômage ('unemployment')	0.09	0.00	7.53
s'occupe ('is in charge of')	0.15	0.02	6.97			était ('was')	0.15	0.02	7.38
partagées ('shared')	0.15	0.02	6.97			plus ('more')	1.02	0.59	7.01
<i>flamande ('flemish')*</i>	0.06	0.23	-6.85	1.37	2.12	partie ('part')	0.26	0.07	7.00
pays ('country')	0.45	0.82	-7.01	0.55	1.07	système ('system')	0.40	0.75	-6.91
belgique ('belgium')	0.61	1.07	-8.03	0.42	0.93	belgique ('belgium')	0.63	1.07	-7.21
système ('system')	0.38	0.75	-8.05			gouvernement ('government')	0.06	0.24	-7.34
nous ('we')	0.04	0.23	-8.75			politique ('political')	0.14	0.44	-10.20
est ('is')	2.13	3.15	-12.67			niveau ('level')	0.05	0.28	-11.64
						pays ('country')	0.29	0.82	-16.48
						est ('is')	1.85	3.15	-21.62

* The bottom section of the Table (italicized) shows the keywords that are more frequent in the control condition corpus (Q1) compared respectively with Q2, Q3 and Q4.

Table 6. Keyword comparison of the experimental corpora (respectively full condition (Q2), image (Q3) and text (Q4) conditions) to the control condition corpus (Q1) (Post-test)

key word	%q2	%q1	key- ness	key word	%q3	%q1	keyness	key word	%q4	%q1	key- ness
provinces (‘provinces’)	0.32	0.00	15.20	s’occupent (‘are in charge of’)	0.25	0.00	11.14	défense (‘defense’)	0.16	0.00	7.46
divisé (‘divided’)	0.26	0.03	7.32	provinces (‘provinces’)	0.18	0.00	7.96				
				résultat (‘result’)	0.18	0.00	7.96				
				propre (‘own’)	0.28	0.03	7.66				
				partagent (‘share’)	0.46	0.12	6.95				

When looking at the lexical differences between the control corpus (experimental intervention) and the other corpora (Table 5), it is interesting to note that the words that emerged from the control corpus were general words such as *système* (‘system’), *Belgique* (‘Belgium’), *pays* (‘country’) or *gouvernement* (‘government’). By contrast, participants who were exposed to a stimulus tended to mention the words *compétences* (‘competences’) or *domaines* (‘domains’), and to explicitly mention some of these state competences — see for instance *SNCB* (‘national railway company’) and *emploi* (‘employment’) in the full condition corpus; *immigration* (‘immigration’), *sécurité* (‘security’) and *police* (‘police’) in the image condition corpus; *enseignement* (‘education’) or *chômage* (‘unemployment’) in the text condition corpus. When focussing on the participants who were exposed to the textual stimulus, some other words significantly emerged such as *Etat* (‘state’), both in the full and in the text condition, or *regions* (‘région’), *communautés* (‘communities’) and *Tetris* in the text condition.

Participants who had been exposed to any form of input material, be it textual, visual or both, tended to significantly use different words in their own descriptions of Belgian federalism. Interestingly, in the post-test (Table 6), most of the differences disappeared (except for some isolated words such as *provinces* (‘provinces’)), suggesting that the descriptions no longer fundamentally differed from each other and consequently that any form of influence of the input material was not a long-lasting influence. These tendencies are in line with the results presented in the previous section (sec 4.2).

4.4 Content analysis

The results of the keyword analyses (sec. 4.3) suggest that exposure to the input material leads to a significantly different use of words. However, in order to establish the more specific influence of the Tetris metaphor, we wanted to assess the extent to which exposure to it might lead the participants to frame their description

of Belgian federalism differently. To this end, we performed a semi-automatic content analysis based on the possible interpretations of the Tetris metaphor discussed in Section 3.2.

For each interpretation of the metaphor we designed an onomasiological profile, which is a list of lexical items corresponding to a possible interpretation. It should be noted that these lists of lexical items were designed in an intuitive fashion, by collecting relevant lexical items from the descriptions of the participants and expanding them with possible synonyms and derivative forms. Some examples of lexical items relating to each interpretation of the metaphor are presented in Table 7. Using the corpus processor Unitex (Paumier, 2015), we subsequently calculated the frequency of each profile by running concordance analyses. The resulting concordances were then manually disambiguated by suppressing possible duplicates and checking that each concordance matched the original interpretation of the metaphor (output examples can be seen in Table 7). This stage was performed independently by both authors. Problematic cases were further discussed to come to an agreement.

Table 7. Onomasiological profiles of the potential interpretations of the Tetris metaphor.

Fields	Example Expressions	Example Usage
Game	<i>case</i> ('square'), <i>compétition</i> ('competition'), <i>défaite</i> ('defeat'), <i>gagner</i> ('win'), <i>jeu</i> ('game'), <i>jouer</i> ('play'), <i>joueur</i> ('player'), <i>match</i> ('match'), <i>participant</i> ('participant'), <i>participer</i> ('participate'), <i>perdant</i> ('loser'), <i>perdre</i> ('lose'), <i>pion</i> ('pawn'), <i>puzzle</i> ('jigsaw'), <i>règle</i> ('rule'), <i>stratégie</i> ('strategy'), <i>tactique</i> ('tactics'), <i>Tetris</i> ('Tetris'), <i>vainqueur</i> ('winner'), <i>victoire</i> ('victory')	<i>Tel un jeu de Tétris, de plus en plus de pouvoirs (de différents types) sont légués au "bas de l'échelle"</i> (Pre-test-full condition-071) (Like a <u>Tetris game</u> , more and more powers (of different types) are handed down to the 'bottom of the ladder') <i>Dans le cas de du fédéralisme belge, l'Etat est en train de perdre de plus en plus de compétences.</i> (Post-test-control condition-128) (In the case of the Belgian federalism, the State is <u>losing</u> more and more competences)
	<i>casse-tête</i> ('headache', 'puzzle'), <i>cogitation</i> ('cogitation'), <i>complexe</i> ('complex'), <i>complexifier</i> ('make more complex'), <i>complication</i> ('complication'), <i>complexité</i> ('complexity'), <i>compliqué</i> ('complicated'), <i>difficile</i> ('difficult'), <i>difficulté</i> ('difficulty'), <i>ne pas comprendre</i> ('not understand'), <i>peu/pas compréhensible</i> ('little or not understandable'), <i>problème</i> ('problem'), <i>réflexion</i> ('thinking')	<i>le partage des pouvoirs s'avère un peu chaotique et complexe à comprendre</i> (Pre-test-image condition-086) (power-sharing turns out to be a bit chaotic and <u>complex to understand</u>) <i>le fédéralisme belge manque parfois de logique et crée des problèmes car il y a 3 langues différentes</i> (Post-test-control condition-070) (Belgian federalism is sometimes lacking logic and creating <u>problems</u> because there are three different languages)

Table 7. (continued)

Fields	Example Expressions	Example Usage
Construction	<i>base</i> ('basis'), <i>bâtiment</i> ('building'), <i>bâtir</i> ('build'), <i>bloc</i> ('block'), <i>brique</i> ('brick'), <i>chantier</i> ('construction site'), <i>ciment</i> ('cement'), <i>construction</i> ('construction'), <i>construire</i> ('build'), <i>créer</i> ('create'), <i>échafaudage</i> ('scaffolding'), <i>édifice</i> ('building'), <i>étage</i> ('floor'), <i>fondations</i> ('foundations'), <i>immeuble</i> ('building'), <i>maison</i> ('house'), <i>niveau</i> ('level'), <i>pilier</i> ('pillar'), <i>stable</i> ('stable'), <i>structure</i> ('structure')	<i>Le fédéralisme à la belge est bancal car il repose sur des conflits communautaires</i> (Pre-test-text condition-120) (Belgian federalism is shaky since it is <u>relying on</u> community conflicts) <i>Le fédéralisme en Belgique est particulier. Il s'est construit au fur et à mesure des revendications émises par les deux communautés.</i> (Post-test-control condition-117) Federalism in Belgium is peculiar. It is <u>constructing</u> itself depending on the demands voiced by the two communities)
	<i>abattre</i> ('pull down', 'destroy'), <i>clivage</i> ('divide'), <i>décomposer</i> ('break down'), <i>décomposition</i> ('decomposition'), <i>déconstruction</i> ('deconstruction'), <i>découper</i> ('divide'), <i>découpage</i> ('division'), <i>démolition</i> ('demolition'), <i>démolir</i> ('demolish'), <i>destruction</i> ('destruction'), <i>détruire</i> ('destroy'), <i>diviser</i> ('divide'), <i>fracture</i> ('fracture'), <i>morceler</i> ('divide up'), <i>scission</i> ('split'), <i>séparation</i> ('separation')	<i>On parle en Belgique de fédéralisme de dissociation ou de désagrégation, puisque la tendance est à l'autonomie plutôt qu'à la mise en commun.</i> (Pre-test-image condition-045) (One speaks in Belgium of federalism of dissociation or of <u>disaggregation</u> , since the tendency is for autonomy rather than for common-sharing) <i>Chaque Réforme prélève compétences pour les attribuer au pouvoirs fédérés. Mais tout se décompose peu à peu en profit des autres pouvoirs.</i> (Pre-test-text condition-111) (Each reform takes out competences in order to allocate them to the substate powers. But all is <u>breaking down</u> little by little to the benefit of the other powers)
De-construction	<i>attribuer</i> ('allocate'), <i>confier</i> ('entrust'), <i>déléguer</i> ('delegate'), <i>délégation</i> ('delegation'), <i>donner</i> ('give'), <i>distribuer</i> ('allocate'), <i>obtenir</i> ('obtain'), <i>passer de ... à ...</i> ('pass on to'), <i>recevoir</i> ('get'), <i>redistribuer</i> ('reallocate'), <i>répartir</i> ('share out'), <i>répartition</i> ('sharing out')	<i>Le pouvoir qu'elles reçoivent est pris à l'Etat fédéral pour ainsi le donner aux communautés et régions</i> (Pre-test-full condition-003) (The power they receive is taken from the federal State in order to <u>give</u> it to communities and regions) <i>une forme de fonctionnement d'un Etat où certaines compétences sont gérées par l'ensemble du pays alors que d'autres sont réparties par régions ou communautés</i> (Post-test-text condition-013) (a form of functioning of a State where some competences are dealt with by the country altogether while others are <u>distributed</u> among regions or communities)
Transfer		

The results of the analyses for the experimental intervention (Table 8 and Figure 1) show that participants from different experimental conditions did indeed tend to stress different dimensions of Belgian federalism in their descriptions. Firstly, it appears that the subjects who were exposed to the textual material tended to produce more utterances relating to one of the possible interpretations of the Tetris metaphor ($X^2 = 23.153$, $df = 3$, $p < .0001$). This is much more strikingly the case for the participants from the text-only condition than for the participants from the full condition. Secondly, it appears that the subjects who were exposed to the textual material (full condition and text condition) tended (to a significant degree) to frame their descriptions around the notion of transfer of competences. To a lesser extent, both groups referred more frequently to the game domain. This effect was mainly due to the explicit references to the notion of Tetris in free descriptions from respondents from the full and text conditions. Interestingly these references to the game domain did not emerge in descriptions from subjects from the image condition. Thirdly, subjects who were not exposed to the textual stimulus tended to behave similarly as well. For instance, they tended to highlight the complexity of the federal system significantly more frequently than subjects who had been exposed to just the textual input. Relating this observation to the high frequency of the notion of transfer of competences suggests that reading the text helped the subjects understand how Belgian federalism is working. Finally, participants in the text condition also tended to emphasise the notion of deconstruction of the federal state.

When focussing on results of the post-test descriptions (Table 8 and Figure 2), it appears that all the tendencies that were observed in the experimental intervention had disappeared. The participants from different experimental conditions tended to behave similarly, inasmuch as they all referred equally frequently to the game, complexity, deconstruction and transfer interpretations. This tendency however was different for the construction interpretation, which appeared significantly more prominently in descriptions from participants from the full condition.

Table 8. Frequency of the different onomasiological profiles in the different subcorpora

Domain	Experiment					Post-test			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Game	4	12	3	18	***	4	6	1	6
Complexity	22	15	26	5	***	8	12	9	4
Construction	41	37	33	55		12	33	17	16
Deconstruction	47	35	48	63	*	26	29	18	25
Transfer	31	89	33	78	***	30	38	25	36
TOTAL	145	188	143	219	***	80	118	70	87

(Q1 = control, Q2 = full, Q3 = image, Q4 = text; significance levels: * < .05, *** < .001)

Figure 1. Frequency of different onomasiological profiles in the different subcorpora (experimental intervention)

Figure 2. Frequency of different onomasiological profiles in the different subcorpora (post-test)

On a more global level, it should be noted that the participants from the full condition appeared to produce significantly more utterances related to the different interpretations of the Tetris metaphor than other participants ($X^2 = 14.499$, $df = 3$, $p < .005$). This observation, combined with the observation from the experimental intervention that participants from the text condition produced more utterances that related to possible interpretations of the Tetris metaphor, might suggest that reading the text has a more direct influence on the representations of the participants, but that this influence decreases over time, whereas being exposed to the image *and* reading the text might have a longer impact on the participants representations of Belgian federalism.

5. Discussion

The aim of this article was to study the impact of the Belgian Tetris metaphor on citizens' representations of Belgian federalism. Using an original newspaper article (including text and an image) produced in a natural setting, in which Belgian federalism had been explicitly compared to a Tetris game, we developed an experimental test, including the experimental intervention and a post-test, in which the participants, who had been exposed in various degrees to relevant input material (no input, image, text, image and text), were asked to freely describe their own representation of Belgian federalism. These descriptions were analysed using formal, keyword and content analyses based on relevant semantic fields associated with the Tetris metaphor. In doing so, it was our intention to determine the extent to which differing levels of exposure to the Tetris metaphor resulted in different representations of Belgian federalism and to which this potential influence of the metaphor endured over time. The different conclusions that can be drawn from our results are summarised below.

At first, our data did not make it possible to claim that the Tetris metaphor in itself has a direct impact on representations of Belgian federalism. This tendency is indirectly confirmed by the fact that descriptions from citizens who were exclusively exposed to the visual stimulus (the image of Tetris) did not produce descriptions that differed significantly from those of citizens from the control condition. However, our results showed that participants who were exposed to textual information tend to produce longer descriptions; to use different words in their descriptions, as suggested by the keyword analyses; and to frame these using different semantic fields, as confirmed by the content analyses. Indeed, the subjects who read the text tended to highlight to a greater extent the notion of transfer of competences from the federal level to the substate level, whereas citizens from the control condition and from the image condition tended to focus on the complexity

of the system in general, without further specifying this notion of transfer of competences. These different observations seem to confirm that reading the text had an impact.

This first main conclusion leads us to reframe the central question of our research and to shift our focus of attention to the role of the Tetris metaphor on the text’s global coherence. More specifically, considering that the metaphor explicitly appeared in the title of the article and that the mapping between the domains of Belgian federalism and the Tetris game was directly and deliberately realised in the text and reinforced by other lexical units (such as *block* for instance), it is hard to understand the text without acknowledging the central role of the metaphor in the way the author had structured the textual information. These considerations lead us to think that the metaphor did have an indirect impact on citizens’ representations in that it plays a central role in establishing the text’s global coherence. However, further research is needed to determine the exact nature of the role of the metaphor on the text’s coherence. This will make it possible to assess to what extent the observed influence of the text on the citizens’ representations can be attributed to the Tetris metaphor itself and to what extent this metaphor has a facilitating effect on the integration of textual information.

Turning to the nature of this impact, our results suggest that the influence of the text is short-lived. Indeed, the different analyses performed on descriptions from participants in the post-test did not reveal any significant differences between the different experimental conditions. Furthermore, further comparisons between citizens’ descriptions in the experimental intervention and the post-test showed that the influence of the text decreased drastically, as reflected by the length of the descriptions, or the much less frequent references to the notion of transfer of competences in descriptions from citizens who had been exposed to the textual material. When looking more specifically to the results of the post-test, an interesting tendency emerged however, namely the fact that the citizens who had been exposed to the visual and the textual stimulus (full condition) tended to produce more utterances related to the possible interpretations of the Tetris metaphor. Although this was the case for the five semantic fields which were analysed, this was only significant for the construction interpretation. This finding suggests that participants who had been exposed to more stimuli tended to integrate more information in their long-lasting representations of Belgian federalism. More specifically, the prominence of the construction domain might function as an indication that the Tetris metaphor has in the long-run been interpreted as an instance of the conceptual metaphor ABSTRACT SYSTEMS ARE BUILDINGS. Although appealing, this hypothesis needs, however, to be verified by further experimentation.

6. Conclusion

In political discourse, metaphors appear to function as cognitive cues making it possible to present complex realities in more familiar ways. This concretely means that metaphors are mobilised by political actors in a specific communication context to make sense of particular political processes. Our study aimed to assess to what extent such metaphors might influence the citizen's comprehension of such political processes by looking more particularly at the possible communicative effects of the Belgian Tetris metaphor. Though our study does not allow us to claim that the use of such a metaphor in itself will directly determine the mental representations of the citizens on Belgian federalism, it suggests that the metaphor may have had an indirect impact in helping the reader to integrate the textual information and to understand (at least some aspects of) these complex political processes. In this way, metaphors may be said to have had an impact on individuals.

Where to go from here? Avenues for future work point in, at least, two directions. On the one hand, the nature of metaphors needs to be further investigated. When looking at political discourse, an important distinction has to be made between pedagogical metaphors, which try to simplify a complex reality, and strategic metaphors, which try to 'sell' a given reality. While the distinction between these two types might be somewhat theoretical and should not exclude the possibility that a metaphor could be of both types, future research has to address the understanding of the circumstances of the metaphor's production and its underlying objective if we want to understand more finely its possible reception by individuals. On the other hand, the study of the impact of metaphors should seek to grasp the very nature of this impact. Thus, the different kinds of impact should be theorised. For political scientists, it means differentiating not just between impacts on political opinions and impacts on political attitudes, but also between short-term, mid-term and long-term effects. For linguists, comparisons between two or more metaphors, different in their nature and in their framing, represents a promising path of research, especially when trying to understand their interaction and their circulation between individuals.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers and the Editors of "Metaphor and the Social World," Graham Low and Alice Deignan, for their valuable comments on earlier versions of this article. We are of course responsible for any errors that remain. Because their answers made this article possible, we are greatly indebted to the several hundred respondents to our surveys. We would also like to express our gratitude to Jehan Bottin, Maximilien Cogels,

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Maxime Lazard, Benoît Lecloux and Aleksí Otto Eerola for their research assistance. The research reported in this article was supported by the *Fonds spéciaux pour la recherche* of the Université catholique de Louvain and of the Université de Liège, Belgium, and by the Belgian Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique — FNRS under grant no. PDR-T.1036.15.

References

- Bowdle, B. F., & Gentner, D. (2005). The career of metaphor. *Psychological Review*, 112(1), 193–216. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.112.1.193
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor* (2nd ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230319899
- Deschouwer, K. (2012). *The politics of Belgium: Governing a divided society* (2nd ed.). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Deschouwer, K., & Reuchamps, M. (2013). The Belgian Federation at a crossroad. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 23(3), 261–270. DOI: 10.1080/13597566.2013.773896
- Johnson, M. (2010). Metaphor and cognition. In D. Schmicking & S. Gallagher (Eds.), *Handbook of phenomenology and cognitive science* (pp. 401–414). London: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-90-481-2646-0_22
- Koller, V. (2009). Missions and empires: Religious and political metaphors in corporate discourse. In A. Musolff & J. Zinken (Eds.), *Metaphor and discourse* (pp. 116–134). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lakoff, G. (1996). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Musolff, A. (2004). *Metaphor and political discourse. Analogical reasoning in debates about Europe*. London: Palgrave-Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230504516
- Negrea-Busuioc, E., & Ritchie, L. D. (2015). When ‘seeking love is travel by bus’: Deliberate metaphors, stories and humor in a Romanian song. *Metaphor and the Social World*, 5(1).
- Paumier, S. (2015). *UNITEX 3.1BETA : Manuel d’utilisation*. Paris: Université Paris-Est Marne-la-Vallée.
- Perrez, J., & Reuchamps, M. (2014). Deliberate metaphors in political discourse: the case of citizen discourse. *Metaphorik.de*, 25, 7–41.
- Reuchamps, M. (2013). The future of Belgian federalism through the eyes of the citizens. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 23(3), 353–368. DOI: 10.1080/13597566.2013.773893
- Reuchamps, M., & Perrez, J. (2012). Métaphores conceptuelles dans les discours citoyens en Belgique. In J. Perrez & M. Reuchamps (Eds.), *Les relations communautaires en Belgique : Approches politiques et linguistiques* (pp. 133–158). Louvain-la-Neuve: Academia-L’Harmattan.
- Scott, M. (2012). *WordSmith Tools version 6*. Liverpool: Lexical Analysis Software.
- Steen, G. J. (2008). The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23(4), 213–241. DOI: 10.1080/10926480802426753
- Steen, G. J., Reijnders, W. G., & Burgers, C. (2014). When do natural language metaphors influence reasoning? A follow-up study to Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2013). *PLoS ONE*, 9(12), e113536. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0113536

- Thibodeau, P. H., & Boroditsky, L. (2011). Metaphors we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 6(2), e16782. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0016782
- Thibodeau, P. H., & Boroditsky, L. (2013). Natural language metaphors covertly influence reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 8(1), e52961. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0052961

Appendix

Le Tetris belge

De 1831 à 1970, la Belgique politique se résumait à l'Etat central, les provinces et les communes. Sauf les prérogatives attribuées aux pouvoirs locaux, l'Etat s'occupait de tout. En 1970, le Constituant a créé de nouvelles institutions: les Communautés et les Régions. Et chaque réforme de l'Etat a été l'occasion de prélever des compétences à l'Etat (appelé désormais Etat fédéral) pour les attribuer aux pouvoirs fédérés. C'est le grand Tetris belge, où l'on voit l'étage du dessus qui se décompose peu à peu, morceau par morceau, au profit des autres pouvoirs. Dans certains cas, le législateur transfère des blocs homogènes (comme l'Enseignement, attribué aux Communautés en 1989). Dans d'autres, il ne transfère que des éléments d'une compétence (c'est le cas de la fiscalité: le fédéral reste compétent mais accorde aux pouvoirs fédérés certaines prérogatives). Désormais, on distingue ainsi trois types de compétences. Celles exclusivement exercées par l'Etat (la Défense, par exemple). Celles exclusivement exercées par les Régions et les Communautés (Enseignement, Urbanisme, Travaux publics, etc.). Et celles où chaque pouvoir a une possibilité d'intervention. Dans le domaine de l'Emploi, par exemple, l'Etat est compétent dans certains domaines (législation sur le chômage, par exemple) et les Régions sont compétentes pour d'autres (placement et formation des chômeurs).

Source : "Le Soir", 13-14/07/13, p. 8, written by Pierre Bouillon

The Belgian Tetris

From 1831 to 1970, Belgian politics came down to the central state, the provinces and the municipalities. Except for the powers devolved to the local authorities, the State took care of everything. In 1970, the constituent power created new institutions: communities and regions. And every state reform has been the occasion to take competences from the state (henceforth called the federal state) to redistribute them to federal authorities. This is the big Belgian Tetris, where we see the upper floor that is falling apart (decomposing), block by block, to the benefit of other authorities. In certain cases, the legislator is transferring homogeneous blocks (like education, handed over to the communities in 1989). In other cases, what is involved is just transferring some elements of a competence (this is the case with fiscality: the federal state remains competent but has assigned certain prerogatives to the federal entities). From now on, we therefore make a distinction between three types of competences. The ones that are exclusively exercised by the federal state (like Defense, for example). The ones that are exclusively exercised by the Regions and Communities (Education, Town planning, Public works, and so on). And the ones for which each power has some possibility of intervention. In the area of employment, for instance, the (federal) State is responsible for certain domains (unemployment legislation, for instance) and the Regions are in charge of other ones (training courses for unemployed people).

Source : "Le Soir", 13-14/07/13, translated by Julien Perrez and Graham Low.

Corresponding author's address

Prof. Julien Perrez,
Université de Liège,
Département de Langues et littératures modernes,
Place Cockerill 3,
4000 Liège, Belgium
Julien.Perrez@ulg.ac.be

Biographical note

Julien Perrez is Assistant Professor in the Department of Modern Languages at the University of Liège (ULg, Belgium), where he teaches Dutch Linguistics. His research interests include foreign language learning (especially by French-speaking learners of Dutch), the expression of spatial relations in typologically diverging languages and the study of metaphors in political discourse.

Min Reuchamps is Professor of Political Science at the Institut de sciences politiques Louvain-Europe of the Université catholique de Louvain (UCL, Belgium). His research interests include federalism and multilevel governance, Belgian politics, democratic innovations as well as language and politics.

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

How viruses and beasts affect our opinions (or not)

The role of extendedness in metaphorical framing

W. Gudrun Reijnierse*, Christian Burgers**, Tina Krennmayr**
and Gerard J. Steen*

*University of Amsterdam / **VU University Amsterdam

Based on the assumption that extended metaphor constitutes a case of deliberate metaphor and therefore has the potential to influence people's opinions, this paper investigates whether extending a metaphorical frame in a text leads people to perceive policy measures that are in line with that frame as more effective for solving a crime problem than other policy measures. The metaphorical frames 'Crime is a virus' and 'Crime is a beast' were extended in one experiment each via a series of additional conventional metaphorical expressions having crime as the target domain and beasts/viruses as the source domain. Participants (N = 354, Experiment 1; N = 361, Experiment 2) were randomly assigned to one of five experimental conditions with increasing numbers of sentences containing metaphorical expressions, and rated the effectiveness of a set of policy measures to solve the crime problem described in the text. The data yield limited support for our hypothesis. When controlling for political affiliation, the ratings for frame-consistent measures trended in the hypothesised direction in Experiment 2. Experiment 1 yielded a trend for frame-inconsistent measures. These results suggest that metaphorical framing effects may be more subtle than has been assumed.

Keywords: metaphor, framing, framing effects, reasoning, experiments

1. Introduction

One of the most important theoretical claims about metaphor is that it can influence reasoning, for example via the process of highlighting and hiding: metaphorical source domain concepts can lead us to pay attention to specific aspects of a target concept while other aspects are left aside or hidden (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 10). For instance, when talking about solving a crime problem, one can

Metaphor and the Social World 5:2 (2015), 244–262. DOI 10.1075/msw.5.2.04rei
ISSN 2210-4070 / E-ISSN 2210-4097 © John Benjamins Publishing Company

say that crime is a *virus* and that it should be prevented by making people *immune*, thereby highlighting the idea that reforming people's behaviour can solve the problem. Alternatively, one can say that crime is a *beast* and that it should be prevented by *trapping* criminals, thereby highlighting the idea that strict law enforcement can solve the problem (cf. Thibodeau & Boroditsky, 2011, 2013; Steen, Reijnierse, & Burgers, 2014). In the crime-as-a-virus approach, this idea of law enforcement is hidden, while in the crime-as-a-beast approach, the idea of reform is hidden.

The very fact that highlighting and hiding are at the core of metaphor may make it the framing device *par excellence*, as framing is defined as "[...] select[ing] some aspects of a perceived reality and mak[ing] it more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the described item" (Entman, 1993, p. 52). The angle of how to think about a given issue may influence the way in which that issue is actually understood or evaluated by addressees (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007, p. 11). From here, it is only a short step to argue that the choice of a metaphorical frame may have the potential to exert an effect on social-policy questions (Schön, 1979), and that politicians could use this to propagate their own views. For example, in the example about crime discussed above, left-wing politicians might prefer to solve a crime problem by focusing on reform and consequently frame it in terms of a virus. By contrast, right-wing politicians might prefer to approach the issue from an enforcement-oriented standpoint, and frame it in terms of a beast. By investigating the effect of different frames, we can learn more about the possible impact of political viewpoints (represented in the form of a metaphorical frame) on voters' opinions and behaviours.

Empirical studies investigating the effects of metaphorical framing show mixed results. Some studies (e.g., Robins & Mayer, 2000; Thibodeau & Boroditsky, 2011, 2013) have found that people prefer different policy measures when they read different metaphorical frames. Participants in Thibodeau and Boroditsky's (2011, 2013) studies read a text about a city's crime problem in which crime was either framed metaphorically as a beast or as a virus. Then, they were asked to indicate their preferred solution to the crime problem. Across experiments, Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2011, 2013) found that participants in the crime-as-a-beast condition were more likely to prefer enforcement-oriented, direct solutions to the problem, such as increasing street patrols and prison sentences, than those in the virus-condition. Participants in the crime-as-a-virus condition displayed a higher preference for reform-oriented solutions than those in the beast-condition, concentrating on prevention such as reforming education and expanding welfare programs.

This approach has been critiqued for the lack of a non-metaphorical control condition that could serve as a baseline (Hartman, 2012; Steen et al., 2014). Without such a control condition, it is not possible to determine whether the effect is due to the metaphoricity of the frame, or a general framing effect (see Lau & Schlesinger, 2005, p. 106). Indeed, some studies comparing metaphorical with non-metaphorical frames found that the former have a bigger influence on people's opinions than the latter (e.g., Hartman, 2012; Kalmoe, 2014; Scherer, Scherer, & Fagerlin, 2015). Nay and Brunson (2013) investigated whether support for removing surplus conifers increased as a result of framing the conifer increase metaphorically as an invasion, compared with non-metaphorically as encroachment/expansion. Participants in the invasion-frame rated conifer removal as significantly more acceptable than participants in the expansion-frame (p. 163). On the other hand, other studies found no difference between metaphorical and non-metaphorical frames (e.g., Steen et al., 2014).

These contrasting findings raise the question under which precise conditions a metaphorical framing effect may or may not take place (Steen et al., 2014, p. 22). One essential variable to consider may be the number and type of metaphorical expressions used in the experimental texts. Tewksbury, Jones, Peske, Raymond, and Vig (2000) investigated extended non-metaphorical frames and found that increased presence of a frame within a single text made participants more likely to accept policy measures that were in line with (or suggested by) that frame. Conversely, in a meta-analysis on the persuasive effects of metaphor, Sopory and Dillard (2002, p. 404) investigated the role of extendedness versus non-extendedness of metaphorical frames and did not find statistically significant differences between extended and non-extended metaphorical frames. Steen et al. (2014, p. 20) also found no effect of what they call "metaphorical support": participants' preferences for solutions to a crime problem were not influenced by whether they read a single or multiple metaphorical expressions.

The absence of a metaphorical framing effect in Steen et al.'s (2014) studies could be caused by the fact that, in these studies, the metaphorical expressions extending the initial frame were ambiguous between both frames they investigated ('Crime is a beast' and 'Crime is a virus'). Their experimental texts included metaphorically-used words like 'vulnerabilities', 'weakened', and 'succumbed' (p. 4),¹ which can be interpreted both in terms of the crime-as-a-beast and the crime-as-a-virus frame.

1. It should be noted that Steen et al. (2014) used the experimental texts used by Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2011, 2013). However, Thibodeau and Boroditsky did not investigate metaphor extendedness as such.

Based on these diverging observations, we examine the influence of textual extendedness as a condition for the appearance of a metaphorical framing effect in the present paper. We do so under the assumption that extended metaphor constitutes a case of deliberate metaphor (Krennmayr, 2011; Steen, 2011, in press) and that it therefore has the potential to draw the addressee's attention away from the target domain to the source domain (cf. Steen, 2008, 2011). This may consequently sway his preference for policy measures. We thus hypothesize that:

H1: Extending a metaphorical frame in a text by increasing the number of metaphorical sentences expressing it will lead participants to display higher ratings of perceived effectiveness of policy measures that are in line with that frame.

2. Method

To investigate our hypothesis, we report two experiments in which we separately extended the metaphorical frames 'Crime is a beast' and 'Crime is a virus' via a series of additional conventional metaphorical expressions having crime as the target domain and beasts/viruses as the source domain ("textual extension", Semino, 2008).

2.1 Ethics statement

Data were collected in accordance with ethical guidelines of our institution.² Participants were asked to tick a box to provide informed consent on the first page of the survey, on which it was also indicated that their answers would be treated anonymously, that they could quit the survey at any moment, and that — by participating — they agreed that their data would be analysed for the purpose of our study.

2.2 Design and Materials

Both experiments used a single-factor, between-subjects design. The independent variable was the number of metaphorical sentences in the stimulus text, which varied between 1 to 4. We also included a non-metaphorical control condition.

The experimental materials were loosely based on those used by Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2011, 2013), and Steen et al. (2014), in the sense that they were based in the fictitious city of Addison, and used the same frames (metaphorical: 'Crime is a beast', 'Crime is a virus'; non-metaphorical: 'Crime is a problem', the latter only used by Steen et al., 2014). The texts resembled a short news report in

2. See <http://fsw.vu.nl/en/departments/communication-science/research/good-researchpractice-guidelines/index.asp>

which the Mayor of the city of Addison made an announcement about crime in his city. All metaphorical expressions were positioned in the Mayor's quote, which was preceded by two sentences forming a general introduction to provide some context to the text. Both experiments contained five different versions of the experimental text. In each experiment, the number of words was the same across conditions, which only differed in the number of sentences containing metaphorically-used expressions — from zero (in the non-metaphorical control condition), up to four.

Contrary to earlier studies that used these frames (Thibodeau & Boroditsky, 2011, 2013; Steen et al., 2014), the additional metaphorical expressions that we used could unambiguously be assigned to a single metaphorical frame. With the help of the Macmillan dictionary (Rundell, 2002) and MIPVU (Steen, Dorst, Herrmann, Kaal, Krennmayr, & Pasma, 2010), we selected metaphorical expressions having crime as the target domain and either viruses (Experiment 1) or beasts (Experiment 2) as the source domain. This yielded words like 'cure' and 'symptom' for Experiment 1, and 'predatory' and 'prey on' for Experiment 2. The noun 'plague', which has a meaning related to illness (Macmillan sense description 1; hereafter MM1 etc., where MM refers to Macmillan, and the number refers to the numbered sense descriptions in the online version of the dictionary), but also one related to animals (MM3), was discarded because it could be connected with both the virus and the beast frame. Table 1 gives an overview of the experimental texts.

Table 1. Overview of the experimental materials for Experiments 1 and 2

General In his latest speech, Mayor Smith of the city of Addison announced that crime has introduced steadily increased in his city over the past 10 years/year. Smith said:

Sentence	Condition				
	<i>Non-metaphorical control</i>	<i>1 sentence with metaphors</i>	<i>2 sentences with metaphors</i>	<i>3 sentences with metaphors</i>	<i>4 sentences with metaphors</i>
Exp. 1	"Crime is a problem. It is a threat we must prevent from increasing. Even safe communities are showing signs of violence.	"Crime is a virus. It is a threat we must prevent from increasing. Even safe communities are showing signs of violence.	"Crime is a virus. It is a disease we must prevent from spreading. Even safe communities are showing signs of violence.	"Crime is a virus. It is a disease we must prevent from spreading. Even healthy communities are showing symptoms of violence.	"Crime is a virus. It is a disease we must prevent from spreading. Even healthy communities are showing symptoms of violence.

	We need a new policy to make our city secure before the situation gets completely out of hand."	We need a new policy to make our city secure before the situation gets completely out of hand."	We need a new policy to make our city secure before the situation gets completely out of hand."	We need a new policy to make our city secure before the situation gets completely out of hand."	We need a new cure to make our city immune before the situation gets completely out of hand."
Exp. 2	"Crime is a problem .	"Crime is a beast .	"Crime is a beast .	"Crime is a beast .	"Crime is a beast .
	It is a dangerous issue taking over many of the city's communities.	It is a dangerous issue taking over many of the city's communities.	It is a dangerous animal preying on many of the city's communities.	It is a dangerous animal preying on many of the city's communities.	It is a dangerous animal preying on many of the city's communities.
	It is unpredictable and serious , going out of control.	It is unpredictable and serious , going out of control.	It is unpredictable and serious , going out of control.	It is feral and predatory , going out of control.	It is feral and predatory , going out of control.
	We need to stop it before safe neighborhoods are affected , too."	We need to stop it before safe neighborhoods are affected , too."	We need to stop it before safe neighborhoods are affected , too."	We need to stop it before safe neighborhoods are affected , too."	We need to trap it before safe neighborhoods are infested , too."

Note: the first row of this table contains the general introduction to the text that was the same in all five conditions. Participants in Experiment 1 read that crime had increased over the past 10 years, whereas participants in Experiment 2 read that it had increased over the past year. Words printed in boldface indicate the manipulated elements. All illness-related terms are metaphorical extensions of the coordinating frame 'Crime is a virus'. All beast-related terms are metaphorical extensions of the coordinating frame 'Crime is a beast'. American English spelling conventions were used as the experiment was carried out in the United States.

We also controlled for conventionality, as the distinction between novel and conventional metaphor might interact with the emergence of a metaphorical framing effect (Sopory & Dillard, 2002, p. 407; Steen, in press; see also Krennmayr, Bowdle, Mulder, & Steen, 2014). In line with MIPVU (Steen et al., 2010, p. 33) and Semino (2008, p. 19), metaphors were considered novel if the metaphorical meaning is not (yet) present in the dictionary. Consequently, the noun 'diagnosis', which has only one sense description in Macmillan ('a statement about what disease someone has, based on examining them'), but could also be applied metaphorically to determine features of the crime problem, was not allowed in Experiment 1. In the same way, the verb 'domesticate' was discarded from Experiment 2 because it only has an animal-related sense description in the dictionary ('to train an animal to live with or work for humans') and was therefore considered a novel metaphor.

Finally, following a suggestion for further research in Steen et al. (2014, p.21), we presented the crime problem in Experiment 1 as a long-term problem, and in Experiment 2 as a short-term problem by adding a reference to time in the sentence introducing the announcement of Mayor Smith: crime was said to have increased *over the past 10 years* in Experiment 1, and *over the past year* in Experiment 2. In much the same way as the virus frame might lead to preference for reform-oriented policy measures, and the beast frame to enforcement-oriented policy measures to solve the crime problem, long-term problems may lead to a preference for reform-oriented, and short-term problems to a preference for enforcement-oriented measures.

2.3 Instrumentation

Dependent variables

Participants were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of a series of policy measures, again loosely based on Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2011, 2013). Two sets of measures were created, one in line with the crime-as-a-virus frame, focusing on reform, and the other in line with the crime-as-a-beast frame, focusing on enforcement (see Table 2). A pre-test was carried out to ensure that the eight policy measures formed two distinct groups of measures displaying reliable scales of reform- versus enforcement-orientedness.

Table 2. Enforcement-oriented and reform-oriented policy measures used as the dependent variables in Experiments 1 and 2

ENFORCEMENT-ORIENTED	REFORM-ORIENTED
Increase prison sentences	Reform education practices*
Increase street patrols	Create after school programs*
Punish criminals faster***	Expand economic welfare programs**
Set higher maximum penalties***	Create jobs**

Note: measures marked with * and ** were combined in Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2011, 2013); measures marked with *** were added in the present study to create an even distribution of enforcement- and reform-oriented measures.

A valid total of 49 participants ($M_{age} = 33.08$, $SD_{age} = 11.07$, 38.8% female) rated the reform- and enforcement-orientedness of the policy measures on a 7-point Likert-scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). The results of this pre-test showed that, on average, participants rated enforcement-oriented measures significantly higher than reform-oriented measures when rating their degree of enforcement, $t(48) = 5.09$, $p < .001$, $r = .59$. Reform-oriented measures scored significantly higher than enforcement-oriented measures when rated for their degree of reform, $t(48) = 7.70$, $p < .001$, $r = .74$. Also, enforcement-oriented

measures were rated significantly higher in the enforcement-oriented than in the reform-oriented question, $t(48) = 7.87$, $p < .001$, $r = .75$, and reform-oriented measures were rated significantly higher in the reform-oriented than in the enforcement-oriented question, $t(48) = 6.36$, $p < .001$, $r = .68$.³ We consequently concluded that we could use these two sets of measures in our main experiments.

Control variables

Metaphors have the ability to make texts more vivid and less complex (e.g., Ortony, 1975). To control for these aspects, we measured perceived complexity and perceived vividness of the experimental texts. Perceived complexity was measured with a scale developed by Burgers, de Graaf, and Callaars (2012). Participants were asked whether they found the text difficult to understand, comprehensible (reverse coded), and clear (reverse coded) on a 7-point Likert-scale (Experiment 1: Cronbach's $\alpha = .74$; Experiment 2: Cronbach's $\alpha = .72$). Perceived vividness of the text was also measured with a scale developed by Burgers et al. (2012). Participants indicated on a 7-point Likert-scale whether they found the text vivid and colourful (Experiment 1: Cronbach's $\alpha = .83$; Experiment 2: Cronbach's $\alpha = .89$).

2.4 Procedure

Data were collected online through Qualtrics (www.qualtrics.com). After an opening page, participants were first asked to read a text about crime in the city of Addison. They were randomly assigned to one of the five conditions. A hidden timer recorded the number of seconds they spent reading the text. Next, participants were asked to list three keywords of the text, in order to filter out those who had not read it. Then, they were asked to rate the two sets of policy measures (see Table 2) for their effectiveness, given the situation in Addison described in the text. Frame-consistent measures were presented first. In Experiment 1, participants thus first rated the set of reform-oriented solutions (Cronbach's $\alpha = .71$), followed, on a new page, by the enforcement-oriented solutions (Cronbach's $\alpha = .88$). In Experiment 2, participants first rated the enforcement-oriented measures (Cronbach's $\alpha = .80$), and then the reform-oriented (Cronbach's $\alpha = .80$) ones. We then collected ratings for the degree of complexity and vividness of the text, and asked participants to fill out a cloze question in which they were asked to complete the first sentence of the quote of Addison's Mayor ('Crime is a _____').

Then participants were asked to indicate their age, gender, nationality, native language, level of education, and political affiliation. Finally, they were thanked for participating, informed that the text was fictional, and they received

3. Details, data and data analyses concerning this pre-test are available at <https://osf.io/63ym9/>.

a confirmation code to collect their remuneration. On average, completing the survey took 6 minutes and 37 seconds for Experiment 1, and 7 minutes and 38 seconds for Experiment 2.

2.5 Participants

Participants in both experiments were collected and paid via Amazon's Mechanical Turk (www.mturk.com). To ensure high-quality work, the MTurk HIT approval rate was set to 95%. Only MTurk Workers located in the USA could participate. Turkers who had participated in any of our earlier studies on a similar topic could not take part.⁴ Participants received \$0.50 for completing the survey. Data were collected on 28 October (Experiment 1) and 13 November (Experiment 2) 2014.

We set our sampling criteria before collecting data. Using G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007), we calculated that 305 completed surveys were needed to be able to detect a medium effect ($f = .25$, Cohen, 1992) with a power of .80, and alpha set at .05. We aimed for 400 completed questionnaires per experiment, because we also set exclusion criteria: participants had to be over 17 years of age, have US nationality, and/or English as their first language, and they should be able to name at least one correct key word. Participants who spent <5 or >60 seconds on reading the text were also excluded. Demographic characteristics of the participants are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3. Demographic characteristics of the participants in Experiments 1 and 2

	Experiment 1*		Experiment 2**	
Age — years (<i>SD</i> ; range)	32.71	(10.90; 18–65)	32.35	(11.12; 18–74)
Gender — % female (<i>N</i>)	40.4	(143)	56.6	(205)
Education — % (<i>N</i>)				
Elementary school	0	(0)	0.3	(1)
Middle school / Junior high school	0.6	(2)	0.0	(0)
(Senior) high school	33.9	(120)	33.2	(120)
Undergraduate study	54.2	(192)	52.4	(189)
Graduate study	11.3	(40)	14.1	(51)
Political affiliation — % (<i>N</i>)				
Republican	15.2	(54)	18.6	(67)
Democrat	42.1	(149)	38.2	(138)
Independent	42.7	(151)	43.2	(156)

4. Excluding Turkers was done by first directing them to a Qualtrics questionnaire that checked the Worker's MTurk ID; see Peer, Paolacci, Chandler, and Mueller (2012).

Table 3. (continued)

	Experiment 1*		Experiment 2**	
<i>Position of Independent participants — % (N)</i>				
More conservative	17.2	(26)	14.1	(22)
More liberal	33.8	(51)	42.9	(67)
In between	49.0	(74)	42.9	(67)

Note: *Total valid N = 354 **Total valid N = 361.

Experiment 1 ('Virus')

A total of 400 participants completed the survey. Applying our exclusion criteria yielded a valid N of 354. Participants were equally distributed across the five conditions regarding age ($F(4,349) < 1$), gender ($\chi^2(4) = 2.79, p = .59$), level of education ($\chi^2(8) = 13.06, p = .11$),⁵ and political affiliation ($\chi^2(8) = 2.64, p = .96$).

Experiment 2 ('Beast')

A total of 397 participants completed the survey. Applying our exclusion criteria yielded a valid N of 361. Participants were equally distributed across the five conditions regarding age ($F(4,356) < 1$) and gender ($\chi^2(4) = 4.31, p = .37$), but not regarding level of education ($\chi^2(8) = 18.47, p = .02$, Cramer's $V = .02$).⁶ Inspection of standardized residuals showed that relatively fewer participants had finished an undergraduate degree ($N = 31$) and relatively more participants had finished a graduate degree ($N = 21$) in the condition without metaphorical sentences. There was no effect of level of education on perceived effectiveness of enforcement-oriented ($F(2,358) < 1$) or reform-oriented measures ($F(2,358) < 1$). Level of education thus did not influence our overall findings.

Regarding political affiliation, participants were also not distributed evenly across conditions ($\chi^2(8) = 16.40, p = .04$, Cramer's $V = .04$). Inspection of standardized residuals showed that there were relatively fewer Democrats ($N = 17$) in the condition with two metaphorical sentences. There were also relatively fewer Republicans ($N = 6$) in the condition with three metaphorical sentences. Significant effects were found between political affiliation and perceived effectiveness of enforcement-oriented ($F(2,358) = 10.24, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .05$), as well as reform-oriented measures ($F(2,358) = 17.44, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .09$). Post-hoc tests with Bonferroni-corrections showed that Republicans rated the perceived effectiveness of enforcement-oriented measures significantly higher than both Democrats and Independents ($p < .001$), and that they rated the perceived

5. Because only two participants completed Middle school/Junior high school, we collapsed these with participants who completed (Senior) high school.

6. Because only 1 participant completed Elementary school, this participant was collapsed with those who completed (Senior) high school.

effectiveness of reform-oriented measures significantly lower than both Democrats and Independents ($p < .001$). Given these results, political affiliation will be added to the main analysis as a factor.

3. Results

3.1 Control variables

Experiment 1 ('Virus')

There was a significant effect of the number of metaphorical sentences on perceived vividness of the text ($F(4,349) = 6.15$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$) and complexity of the text ($F(4,349) = 2.50$, $p = .04$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$). Regarding vividness, post-hoc tests with Bonferroni-corrections showed that participants in the condition with four metaphorical sentences found the text more vivid than participants in the condition with zero ($p < .001$), one ($p = .01$), two ($p = .04$), and three metaphorical sentences ($p = .03$). Regarding complexity, Bonferroni-corrections showed two trends: participants in the condition with four metaphorical sentences found the text less complex than participants who read one ($p = .08$), and two ($p = .06$) metaphorical sentences. These findings are in line with our expectations.

Experiment 2 ('Beast')

There was a significant effect of the number of metaphorical sentences on the perceived vividness of the text ($F(4,356) = 12.82$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$). Post-hoc tests with Bonferroni-corrections indicated that participants in the conditions with two, three, and four metaphorical sentences found the text more vivid than those in the condition without metaphors (at least $p = .001$). Moreover, participants who read three metaphorical sentences found the text more vivid than participants in the condition with one metaphorical sentence ($p < .001$). For participants in the condition with four metaphorical sentences, this was a trend ($p = .06$). These findings are in line with our expectations. We found no effect of the number of metaphorical sentences on the perceived complexity of the text ($F(4,356) = 1.58$, $p = .18$). Overall, average scores were low (less than 2 on a scale from 1–7 in all conditions), which may be because the crime-as-a-beast frame is rather familiar to participants. This was not problematic for our main analyses.

3.2 Hypothesis testing

Data were first analysed with a one-way independent ANOVA with number of metaphorical sentences as the independent variable and perceived effectiveness

ratings as the dependent variable (3.2.1). Because previous analyses (see 2.5) had shown a significant influence of political affiliation on perceived effectiveness of enforcement- as well as reform-oriented measures in Experiment 2, political affiliation was added as a factor in the analyses of both experiments, and data were also analysed with a two-way independent ANOVA with number of metaphorical sentences and political affiliation as independent variables and perceived effectiveness ratings as the dependent variable (3.2.2). Table 4 shows descriptive statistics.

Please note that in Experiment 1 ('Virus'), the reform-oriented measures are considered frame-consistent, and that, in Experiment 2 ('Beast'), the enforcement-oriented measures are considered frame-consistent.

3.2.1 ANOVA without political affiliation as a fixed factor

Experiment 1 ('Virus')

The number of metaphorical sentences did not affect the perceived effectiveness of reform-oriented ($F(4,349) = 1.11$, $p = .35$) or enforcement-oriented ($F(4,349) = 1.43$, $p = .22$) policy measures. H1 is thus not supported by the data.

Experiment 2 ('Beast')

The number of metaphorical sentences did not affect the perceived effectiveness of enforcement-oriented ($F(4,356) = 1.77$, $p = .14$) or reform-oriented ($F(4,356) < 1$) policy measures. H1 is thus not supported by the data.

Table 4. Number of participants and mean scores (with standard deviations) of perceived effectiveness of reform- and enforcement-oriented policy measures for Experiments 1 and 2 as a factor of the number of sentences with metaphorical expressions in the experimental text

		Experiment 1 — Crime is a virus			Experiment 2 — Crime is a beast	
No. of sentences with metaphors	N	Type of measures		N	Type of measures	
		Reform-oriented	Enforcement-oriented		Reform-oriented	Enforcement-oriented
No metaphors	72	5.25 (1.04)	4.57 (1.52)	76	5.60 (1.21)	4.69 (1.26)
1 sentence	75	5.18 (.86)	4.94 (1.48)	72	5.39 (1.13)	4.95 (1.36)
2 sentences	71	5.29 (1.02)	4.97 (1.45)	67	5.42 (1.07)	4.83 (1.25)
3 sentences	69	5.29 (1.21)	4.50 (1.57)	76	5.50 (.99)	5.13 (1.16)
4 sentences	67	5.52 (.94)	4.77 (1.49)	70	5.50 (1.06)	5.13 (1.23)
Total	354	5.30 (1.02)	4.75 (1.51)	361	5.48 (1.09)	4.95 (1.26)

Note: the perceived effectiveness of the measures was calculated by combining the average scores of all four reform-oriented and all four enforcement-oriented measures.

3.2.2 ANOVA with political affiliation as a fixed factor

Experiment 1 ('Virus')

No main effect was found for the number of metaphorical sentences on the perceived effectiveness of reform-oriented measures ($F(4,339) < 1$), but the main effect of the number of metaphorical sentences on the perceived effectiveness of enforcement-oriented measures was a trend ($F(4,339) = 2.22$, $p = .07$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$). Post-hoc tests with Bonferroni-corrections showed one trend. Participants in the condition with three metaphorical sentences rated the enforcement-oriented measures as less effective than participants in the conditions with two metaphorical sentences ($p = .09$). H1 is thus not supported by the data in the sense that frame-consistent measures do not show higher ratings when participants read more sentences with metaphors. For the frame-inconsistent measures, however, the data showed a trend: the more metaphorical sentences participants read, the less effective they found these measures to be.

There was a significant main effect of political affiliation on the perceived effectiveness of reform- ($F(2,339) = 16.15$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$) as well as enforcement-oriented ($F(2,339) = 8.49$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$) policy measures. Post-hoc tests with Bonferroni-corrections revealed that Republicans perceived the reform-oriented measures as significantly less effective than both Democrats ($p < .001$) and Independents ($p = .01$), and that Independents perceived them as significantly less effective than Democrats ($p < .01$). Republicans perceived the enforcement-oriented measures as significantly more effective than both Democrats ($p < .001$) and Independents ($p = .001$).

There was no interaction effect between political affiliation and number of metaphorical sentences on the perceived effectiveness of the reform-oriented measures ($F(8,339) = 1.32$, $p = .23$), indicating that there was no difference in how participants with different political affiliations were affected by the number of metaphors they read. For the enforcement-oriented measures, this interaction effect displayed a trend ($F(8,339) = 1.74$, $p = .09$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$). Post-hoc tests with Bonferroni-corrections showed that Democrats in the condition with three metaphorical sentences rated the enforcement-oriented measures as significantly less effective than Democrats in the condition with one sentence with metaphors ($p = .03$).

Experiment 2 ('Beast')

The main effect of metaphorical sentences on the perceived effectiveness of enforcement-oriented measures was a trend ($F(4,346) = 2.23$, $p = .07$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$). Post-hoc tests with Bonferroni-corrections yielded no significant results. However, post-hoc comparisons using the LSD test showed that participants in the condition with three metaphorical sentences rated the enforcement-oriented measures

as significantly more effective than participants in the condition with zero ($p = .01$) and two ($p = .03$) metaphorical sentences. Participants in the condition with four metaphorical sentences rated the enforcement-oriented measures as significantly more effective than participants in the non-metaphorical control condition ($p = .05$). No main effect was found for the number of metaphorical sentences on the perceived effectiveness of reform-oriented measures ($F(4,346) < 1$). The data thus partially support H1, albeit that the results display a trend.

There was a significant main effect of political affiliation on the perceived effectiveness of enforcement- ($F(2,346) = 10.63, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .06$) as well as reform-oriented ($F(2,346) = 15.77, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .08$) policy measures. Post-hoc tests with Bonferroni-corrections revealed that Republicans perceived the enforcement-oriented measures as significantly more effective ($p < .001$), and the reform-oriented measures as significantly less effective ($p < .001$) than both Democrats and Independents. The difference between Democrats and Independents displayed a trend: Democrats perceived the reform-oriented measures as more effective ($p = .09$) than Independents.

There was no interaction effect between political affiliation and number of metaphorical sentences on the perceived effectiveness of the enforcement-oriented ($F(8,346) < 1$), or reform-oriented ($F(8,346) < 1$) measures, indicating that there was no difference in how participants with different political affiliations were affected by the number of metaphors they read.

4. Conclusion and discussion

This paper investigated whether extended metaphors influence the perceived effectiveness of policy measures. In Experiment 1, we extended the metaphorical frame 'Crime is a virus' via a series of additional conventional metaphorical expressions (crime as target domain; viruses as source domain). In Experiment 2 we did the same for the metaphorical frame 'Crime is a beast' (crime as target domain; beasts as source domain). Overall, our data show limited support for the hypothesis that extended metaphors influence people's opinions. We found no support for our hypothesis that extended metaphors would show higher ratings of perceived effectiveness of frame-consistent policy measures without controlling for political affiliation. When controlling for political affiliation, we also found no support for our hypothesis in Experiment 1. However, we did find a trend in the opposite direction for frame-inconsistent policy measures: the more metaphorical sentences participants read, the less effective they rated the enforcement-oriented policy measures. Experiment 2 displayed a trend in the expected direction of H1. The more metaphorical sentences participants read, the more effective they found

frame-consistent enforcement-oriented policy measures. No effect was found for frame-inconsistent measures in this experiment.

In both experiments, we found political affiliation to influence the perceived effectiveness of the policy measures. Republicans found the enforcement-oriented policy measures significantly more effective than Democrats and Independents. In Experiment 1, Independents also perceived the reform-oriented measures as significantly more effective than Republicans. Experiment 1 also yielded a trending interaction effect for the perceived effectiveness of frame-inconsistent policy measures, indicating that Democrats, Republicans, and Independents were affected differently by the number of metaphorical sentences they read. Specifically, Democrats in the condition with three metaphorical sentences rated the enforcement-oriented policy measures as significantly less effective than Democrats in the condition with one metaphorical sentence. In Experiment 2, no interaction effects were attested, indicating that there was no difference in how participants with different political affiliations were affected by the number of metaphors they read.

The literature on (metaphorical) framing suggests several issues that may have influenced our results. For example, there is the question of whether or not participants had existing knowledge about the topic of the experimental text (see the metaphor framing termination hypothesis in Robins & Mayer, 2000). Or there may be a role for degree of exposure to the topic (Goodall, Slater, & Myers, 2013), personal characteristics of the participants such as political sophistication (Hartman, 2012), and personality traits (Kalmoe, 2014).

We argue, however, that there are alternative explanations for our findings, which are related to other aspects of the studies. The fact that the data trended in the predicted direction in Experiment 2, but not in Experiment 1 may be caused by the fact that the distance between the crime problem described in the text and the proposed policy measures is smaller in the crime-as-a-beast frame than in the crime-as-a-virus frame. If a wild animal has escaped, the first reaction of authorities is typically to try and catch it and prevent it from escaping again — solutions that can easily be connected to the enforcement-oriented policy measures participants were presented with. However, when a dangerous flu virus appears, authorities will try to prevent it from spreading. Yet none of the reform-oriented policy measures we used were directly related to putting a stop to the spread of violence; they were all focused on preventing future criminal acts from happening by reforming society. While these measures may help to make society more secure in the long run, they may not have been considered to be effective measures to reduce crime given the situation described in the text.

After all, crime remains an issue that requires immediate action, even if it is described as a long-term problem. The general theme of our experiments may therefore have been biased towards enforcement-oriented solutions. This bias may

also have caused the trend in the opposite direction for frame-inconsistent policy measures in Experiment 1: participants may have considered the enforcement-oriented measures to be more clearly ineffective solutions in the crime-as-a-virus frame than they found the reform-oriented measures to be effective in it. Robins and Mayer (2000, p. 84) noticed a similar problem in their studies, arguing that some metaphorical frames seem to favour certain solutions more than others — if participants read the metaphor *TRADE IS WAR* this would naturally promote favouring trade tariffs, whereas this would not be the case for the metaphor *TRADE IS A TWO-WAY STREET*. It is thus essential for researchers to carefully consider this possible bias when constructing experimental materials and deciding about the metaphorical frames to be used.

A first step that we are planning to take in this respect in our Lab is to investigate whether crossing the configuration of metaphorical frames and long-term versus short-term crime problems yields different results. In the current study, we presented crime as a long-term problem in Experiment 1, and as a short-term problem in Experiment 2, because this configuration was thought to be consistent with the reform- and enforcement-oriented policy measures, respectively. In the near future, we will test what happens when we present the crime-as-a-beast frame as a long-term, rather than a short-term problem, and the crime-as-a-virus frame as a short-term, rather than a long-term problem.

More importantly, however, the fact that our results show limited support for the influence of extended metaphor on people's opinions may also be attributed to the fact that we asked participants to rate the effectiveness of possible *solutions* to the crime problem. Our hypothesis tacitly assumed that, after reading a text of only five sentences, participants not only (unconsciously) accepted the metaphorical frame to accurately describe the situation, but that they were also able to use that frame when asked to think of a way to solve the problem. This is a rather big leap in the decision-making process. Consequently, the distance between the task of rating the effectiveness of a series of policy measures and our research question of investigating whether a metaphorical framing effect takes place might have been too big. This may have made it impossible to find out whether people actually reason by working out the entailments of the metaphorical frame they were presented with (see Robins & Mayer, 2000, p. 84). If we want to know whether participants pick up a metaphorical frame, future experiments need to investigate earlier stages in the decision-making process and examine whether people already reason along the lines of the frame they read when they are asked to define the problem or identify its cause (see Hartman, 2012, p. 293). The results of the two experiments reported in this paper at least show that the influence of metaphorical frames on people's opinions may be more subtle than we have been assuming.

Acknowledgments

The contribution of Gudrun Reijnierse was supported by grant no. PGW-11-30, awarded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). The contribution of Christian Burgers was supported by VENI grant no. 275-89-020 awarded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), www.nwo.nl. This research was carried out within the Metaphor Lab Amsterdam, a joint venture of the Network Institute (VU University Amsterdam) and the Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication (ACLC) (University of Amsterdam), www.metaphorlab.org. The data and data-analytical procedures of the Experiments are available at <https://osf.io/63ym9/>.

References

- Burgers, C., de Graaf, A., & Callaars, S. (2012). Differences in actual persuasiveness between experiential and professional expert evidence. *Journal of Argumentation in Context*, 1(2), 194–208. DOI: 10.1075/jaic.1.2.03deg
- Cohen, J. A. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155–159. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x
- Faul F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191. DOI: 10.3758/BF03193146
- Goodall, C. E., Slater, M. D., & Myers, T. A. (2013). Fear and anger responses to local news coverage of alcohol-related crimes, accidents, and injuries: Explaining news effects on policy support using a representative sample of messages and people. *Journal of Communication*, 63(2), 373–392. DOI: 10.1111/jcom.12020
- Hartman, T. K. (2012). Toll booths on the information superhighway? Policy metaphors in the case of net neutrality. *Political Communication*, 29(3), 278–298. DOI: 10.1080/10584609.2012.694983
- Kalmoe, N. P. (2014). Fueling the fire: Violent metaphors, trait aggression, and support for political violence. *Political Communication*, 31(4), 545–563. DOI: 10.1080/10584609.2013.852642
- Krennmayr, T. (2011). *Metaphor in newspapers*. LOT Dissertation Series, 276. Utrecht: LOT.
- Krennmayr, T., Bowdle, B. F., Mulder, G., & Steen, G. J. (2014). Economic competition is like auto racing. Building metaphorical schemas when reading text. *Metaphor and the Social World*, 4(1), 65–89. DOI: 10.1075/msw.4.1.04kre
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lau, R. R., & Schlesinger, M. (2005). Policy frames, metaphorical reasoning, and support for public policies. *Political Psychology*, 26(1), 77–114. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2005.00410.x
- Nay, C. G., & Brunson, M. W. (2013). A war of words: Do conflict metaphors affect beliefs about managing “unwanted” plants? *Societies*, 3(2), 158–169. DOI: 10.3390/soc3020158
- Ortony, A. (1975). Why metaphors are necessary and not just nice. *Educational Theory*, 25 (1), 45–53. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-5446.1975.tb00666.x

- Peer, E., Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Mueller, P. (2012). Screening participants from previous studies on Amazon Mechanical Turk and Qualtrics. Unpublished manuscript, retrieved from <https://experimentalturk.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/screening-amt-workers-on-qualtrics-5-2.pdf>.
- Robins, S., & Mayer, R. E. (2000). The metaphor framing effect: Metaphorical reasoning about text-based dilemmas. *Discourse Process*, 30(1), 57–86. DOI: 10.1207/S15326950dp3001_03
- Rundell, M. (Ed.). (2002). *Macmillan English dictionary for advanced learners*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Scherer, A. M., Scherer, L. D., & Fagerlin, A. (2015). Getting ahead of illness: Using metaphors to influence medical decision making. *Medical Decision Making*, 35(1), 37–45. DOI: 10.1177/0272989X14522547
- Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 9–20.
- Schön, D. (1979). Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 137–163). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sopory, P., & Dillard, J. P. (2002). The persuasive effects of metaphor: A meta-analysis. *Human Communication Research*, 28(3), 382–419. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2002.tb00813.x
- Steen, G. J. (2008). The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23(4), 213–241. DOI: 10.1080/10926480802426753
- Steen, G. J. (2011). The contemporary theory of metaphor – now new and improved! *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 9(1), 26–64. DOI: 10.1075/rcl.9.1.03ste
- Steen, G. J. (In press). Elaborating, testing and interpreting Deliberate Metaphor Theory. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T. (2010). *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/celcr.14
- Steen, G. J., Reijnierse, W. G., & Burgers, C. (2014). When do natural language metaphors influence reasoning? A follow-up study to Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2013). *PLoS ONE*, 9(12), e113536. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0113536
- Tewksbury, D., Jones, J., Peske, M. W., Raymond, A., & Vig, W. (2000). The interaction of news and advocate frames: Manipulating audience perceptions of a local public policy issue. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77(4), 804–829. DOI: 10.1177/107769900007700406
- Thibodeau, P. H., & Boroditsky, L. (2011). Metaphors we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 6(2), e16782. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0016782
- Thibodeau, P. H., & Boroditsky, L. (2013). Natural language metaphors covertly influence reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 8(1), e52961. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0052961

Corresponding author's address

W.G. (Gudrun) Reijnierse
 Dept. of Speech Communication, Argumentation Theory, and Rhetoric
 University of Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication
 Spuistraat 134, 1012 VB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
w.g.reijnierse@uva.nl

Biographical note

Gudrun Reijnierse is a PhD researcher at the University of Amsterdam, investigating the distinction between deliberate and non-deliberate metaphor. She uses corpus linguistic and psycholinguistic methods to (re)discover the value of deliberate metaphor in (English) discourse. She is currently developing a method for the identification of deliberate metaphor.

Christian Burgers (PhD 2010, Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands) is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication Science at VU University Amsterdam. In his research, he studies the use and effects of metaphor, hyperbole and irony across domains of discourse. He has published in important international journals in communication (e.g., *Communication Research*, *Human Communication Research*) and linguistics (e.g., *Metaphor & Symbol*, *Journal of Pragmatics*).

Tina Krennmayr is an Assistant Professor at VU University Amsterdam. She does corpus research on metaphor variation in discourse, in particular on metaphor in newspapers, and develops methods for metaphor identification. She is also interested in the application of metaphor research to foreign language learning. She has published on the integration of corpus research in ESP teaching and the development of figurative language use by non-native speakers of English across different levels of writing proficiency.

Gerard Steen is professor of Language and Communication at the University of Amsterdam. His main interest is metaphor in discourse, and more generally language use in discourse approached via genre. He is associate editor of *Metaphor & Symbol* and main editor of *Metaphor in Language, Cognition and Communication*. He currently serves as director of the Metaphor Lab Amsterdam.

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

The allegorical character of political metaphors in discourse

Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr.
University of California, Santa Cruz

When people talk about politics, they often employ metaphors, sometimes in extended sequences, in which a metaphorical idea is referred to across a larger segment of discourse (e.g., talk about political debates as wars, boxing matches, or games of chess). Empirical studies from psychology indicate that, at least in some cases, metaphors can have great persuasive value. My primary claim in this article is that many political metaphors in discourse are often understood as instances of allegory. Allegories refer to extended metaphors in which an entire narrative introduces and elaborates upon a metaphorical source domain to present a rich symbolic understanding of people and events. I describe several notable instances of political allegory and go on to suggest that people can readily interpret many of these allegories via 'embodied simulations' by which they imagine themselves participating in the very actions referred to in the language. These embodied simulations are automatic and sometimes tap into enduring allegorical themes that have symbolic value within different cultural communities.

Keywords: allegory, conceptual metaphor, fiction, poetry, psychology

1. Introduction

Politics and metaphors are natural bedfellows. Consider a short narrative from September 2012 by the political commentator Chris Mathews on his American TV programme "Hardball." ¹ The speech gives Mathews's predictions of what should likely occur during the upcoming Presidential televised debate between President Barack Obama and his Republican rival Mitt Romney.

Let me finish tonight with next week's first debate in Denver. I'll be out there to watch the two of them *go at it*. I have no real idea what to expect. I think Romney

1. <http://www.msnbc.com/hardball/matthews-first-presidential-debate-will>

will *take some hard shots*; he may spend the whole 90 minutes *blasting away at the President*, serving him with one indictment after another, *hoping that something will stick*. I think Obama *will play with him, parry the assaults, block the blows, try to keep his head clear* so he can avoid getting hurt. I think it will start slow with both men trying to be cautious, *neither able to land a punch*, not hard enough to register with the tens of millions watching. Then it will happen: Romney will deliver what is clearly a pre-rehearsed moment, a sound byte. It will be something about Obama not delivering on a promise, something about the economy he said he'd do but hasn't. He will expect the President to *defend himself*. When he does, pointing to what he inherited from Bush, Romney *will pounce*. He'll say that Obama's not running against Bush. This will be the Romney strategy: get Obama to *pass the buck* on the tough economic recovery and then *land his Sunday punch*.

This narrative nicely illustrates how metaphor can sometimes structure political discourse. Mathews employs various conventional expressions (in italics) to convey the metaphorical theme that POLITICAL DEBATES ARE BOXING MATCHES (e.g., "Romney will take some hard shots," "blasting away at the President," "block the blows," "try to keep his head clear," "Romney will pounce"). This particular conceptual metaphor is related to the more general metaphorical concept ARGUMENTS ARE WAR, in which the main participants (i.e., Obama and Romney) are seen as combatants whose goal is to physically defeat the opponent and win support of the audience viewing the debate.

Many political narratives, both in speech and writing, elaborate on a single metaphorical idea, such as when Mathews expresses his predictions about what will happen in the Obama vs. Romney debate using different phrases related to the POLITICAL DEBATES ARE BOXING MATCHES conceptual metaphor. My main argument in this article is that people may not simply interpret the different conventional metaphors in Mathews's speech as being tied to a single, extended metaphorical concept, but understand the entire discourse as conveying symbolic ideas about the nature of political debates and contests. People understand many political narratives, such as Mathews's speech, as expressing broader allegorical themes. Allegory involves an extended metaphor in which the entire narrative introduces and elaborates upon a metaphoric source domain (i.e., a boxing match) to evoke larger life themes (e.g., the struggle between two political opponents in a debate).

One way that people interpret these larger allegorical themes is through their creation of embodied simulation processes in which listeners imagine themselves as physically performing the specific actions mentioned in the discourse (e.g., taking hard shots, blocking the blows, keeping his head clear, pouncing) (Bergen, 2012; Gibbs, 2006; Gibbs & Colston, 2012). None of this is peculiar to political metaphor, as embodied simulation processes appear to be an automatic part of how people understand many aspects of language. People create partial embodied

simulations of speakers' linguistic messages that involve moment-by-moment 'what must it be like' processes that make use of ongoing tactile-kinesthetic experiences (Gibbs, 2006). Still, embodied simulation processes may be especially relevant for explaining some of the most notable facets of some political metaphors such as their durability and persuasiveness.

2. The psychology of political metaphor

Metaphor enthusiasts, going back to the ancient Greeks, have long noted the importance of metaphor in political discourse. In fact, one of Plato's most famous dictums was that people should be suspicious of metaphor precisely because it is often used by poets and politicians to deceive audiences about the truth of real-world events. Contemporary scholars have observed that metaphors may influence political discourse in at least four circumstances (Barry et al., 2009). First, a social/political problem may be best explained using metaphor as an issue first gains public notice (e.g., the "gay plague" was a frequent metaphor during the early days of the AIDS crisis). Second, metaphors may be useful to citizens who are usually uninterested in political affairs (e.g., using a boxing metaphor to spark interest in the often dull Presidential debates). Third, people tend to employ metaphors when dealing with complicated problems involving confusing or abstract concepts (e.g., what should be the political response to the AIDS crisis?). Finally, metaphorical reasoning may be influential in the public's assessment of social/political policy given the richness of metaphor in media discourse about politics.

Empirical findings from linguistics and psychology are consistent with these observations about political metaphor. For example, linguistic studies have demonstrated that individuals will often adopt different conceptual metaphors when making political arguments (Beer & De Landtsheer, 2004; Charteris-Black, 2005; Lakoff, 1996; Musolff, 2004). Consider one case of metaphor used for political purposes in the southwestern part of the United States, which has been the site of several public battles over the issue of bilingual education. Some citizens and educators who opposed bilingual education viewed the failure of students to properly learn English, and their continued use of their native Spanish, as instances of the metaphor *LANGUAGE AS A PRISON* (Santa Ana, 2002), as in "They consider English fluency the key to unlock the handcuff of poverty, a key they themselves never possessed" (Johnson, 2005, p.627). This underlying metaphorical idea assumes that languages other than English keep people in the prison of poverty, with English serving as the tool to liberate themselves from repression.

In the state of Arizona in 2000, Proposition 203, entitled "English for the Children," was placed in front of the voters to eliminate many of that state's

bilingual education programs. Within the media, Proposition 203 was seen as a “war” in which “heroic military forces” were “sent in to battle evil bilingual programs” (Johnson, 2005, p. 622). Children speaking Spanish, and the Spanish language itself, were characterized as a problem, with bilingual educators and proponents of bilingual education viewed as the “opposing force,” with children, school, and society seen as “victims.” The ‘Proposition 203 as War’ metaphor emerged as a rallying cry for supporters “gearing up to fight” and “battle the powerful bilingual lobby,” which “has increasingly come under fire,” while some proponents of 203 have countered, “why not bring out the heavy artillery” to combat the forces of the English-only group.

Johnson’s (2005) linguistic analysis of the WAR metaphor in the media talk of Proposition 203 demonstrated how metaphorical language, even phrases that were quite conventional, were widely used in ethnocentric political movements. The rhetorical strategies to conceive of Proposition 203 as a WAR certainly reflected the thoughts of some citizens with dominant-class interests, yet also facilitated the “reproduction and perpetuation of such ideas” (Johnson, 2005, p. 633). Indeed, many psychological studies have shown that metaphor can significantly change people’s attitudes toward various political and social topics (Bosman, 1987; Read et al., 1990), which is why opponents often battle so fiercely over the proper metaphorical characterization of political issues, as seen in the Proposition 203 debate.

The fact that political topics can be described in multiple metaphorical ways also appears to influence problem-solving and decision-making when people are faced with political dilemmas. For example, one study asked college students to solve dilemmas over whether or not nations should impose trade tariffs as presented in terms of one of two different metaphors, as shown in the two narratives below (Robins & Mayer, 2000: 62).

TRADE IS WAR metaphor frame

International trade is a war. Tariffs, or trade rules, are barricades that shield the vital interests of countries from harm. Victory is achieved when a country maintains its own safeguards but is able to penetrate the markets of its adversary. The trade deficit means that we are losing ground on the battlefield of the trade war. Tariffs would shield us from such loss and help us reclaim our trade territory.

TRADE IS A TWO-WAY STREET metaphor frame

International trade is a two-way street. Tariffs, or trade rules, are obstacles in the road that impede the flow of trade traffic. Success in trade is achieved by removing all obstacles on both sides of the street allowing the free passage of goods. The trade deficit means that these obstacles are causing stop and go traffic on the road of trading. Tariffs would prevent us from speeding up again and reaching our trading destination.

These two metaphorical frames offer different solutions to the trade tariff dilemma.

College students read one of these two stories and were then asked their opinion about, in this case, the effectiveness of trade barriers. As expected, individuals' resolutions of dilemmas described in these short stories were influenced subtly by the particular metaphors used to frame the debate (i.e., the metaphor framing effect). For example, more people who read the *TRADE IS WAR* story favoured tariffs than those who read the *TRADE IS A TWO-WAY STREET* story. Once again, only a few of the participants were at all aware of the metaphors' influence on their reasoning.

Different studies in this same series revealed that metaphor processing can be quickly terminated, under certain conditions. Thus, in some situations, a metaphor seemed unnecessary and could interfere with a person's reasoning process, especially when the reader can use existing domain general knowledge to understand the situation. For instance, if people read a vignette that included information inconsistent with the metaphor, the metaphor framing effect was significantly diminished. This was demonstrated when people were asked to rate a proposed solution to a dilemma, and when they rated the aptness of the metaphor presented in a story. In summary, people use metaphor to make decisions about everyday dilemmas, but the metaphor's influence is attenuated when readers can organize the information using other kinds of knowledge. Roughly similar findings have been reported more recently (Thibodeau & Boroditsky, 2011).

Studies like these demonstrate that people's metaphorical conceptions of different topics shape their reasoning about social and political dilemmas. One reason why certain political metaphors may have an impact on observers is grounded in the embodied nature of certain linguistic expressions. For example, during the 2012 Presidential campaign in the US, Obama released a TV commercial that placed the word "Forward" center stage on the screen. The ad went on to list some of Obama's accomplishments during his first term in office, each of which implied upward movement, such as "Things are looking up," "blue skies," and other achievements including "4.2 million jobs saved," and "100 billion invested in science and research," all while these statements were scrolling upward on the TV screen (Matlock, 2012). Psycholinguistic research demonstrates, in fact, that people often infer motion from metaphorical statements, even when there is no actual motion (e.g., "Things are looking up") (Bergen, 2012; Matlock, 2004; Perlman & Gibbs, 2013). The experience of real motion when they observe multimodal metaphorical political ads, such as that shown by the Obama campaign, may lead people to have a favourable impression of the candidate. Metaphor's impact in politics is partially related to people's embodied understandings of what these verbal and non-verbal constructs mean.

The psychological studies described above suggest that metaphor potentially has a powerful influence on people's interpretation of political discourse, which shapes their judgments of politicians and political debates. Metaphors may be seen as information-processing tools that enable people to manage difficult, abstract problems. But it is important to not overinflate the importance that metaphor has in political contexts. Not all metaphors work equally well in persuading people to adopt specific beliefs or impressions. Many of the positive effects of metaphor on political reasoning may also be short-lived in the minds of people who are influenced by some metaphorical appeal. Some studies even show that the presence of metaphor in a message can undermine people's reaction to that appeal, especially when people are not interested in the source domain of the metaphor (e.g., talk of sports when referring to political debates) (Ottati, Graesser & Rhoads, 1999). In other situations, people may be more convincing when engaged in political debates not by offering one's own metaphor, but by embracing the one used by an opponent. For example, research shows that people were more persuasive in political debates when they adopted and extended the metaphoric arguments of their opponents, rather than when introducing new metaphors into the discourse (Mio, 1996).

These complexities in the empirical research suggest that the power that metaphors have in political discourse depends on a variety of personal and situational factors, including the people involved, their prior opinions about specific politicians and issues, the particular metaphors employed, the contexts in which these metaphors are used, and the extent to which metaphors help people imaginatively, bodily project themselves into political situations. Metaphor scholars should resist drawing grandiose conclusions about the impact that metaphors may, or may not, have based on single studies or from linguistic analyses alone. Understanding the ways that metaphors create particular ways of thinking about political topics requires, at the very least, some study of what people experience with metaphorical narratives, not just looking at the structure of metaphor in discourse.

3. Allegorical understanding of political metaphor

The psychological evidence shows that people's political thinking can sometimes be influenced by specific linguistic metaphors (Thibodeau & Boroditsky, 2011). Even a single metaphorical statement may alter people's understanding of some political issue or debate. Still, political metaphors do not always appear one-by-one or alone in discourse, but are sometimes systematically related, as is the case in Chris Mathews's commentary about the upcoming Presidential debate in which

he produced different verbal expressions linked to the prominent conceptual metaphor POLITICAL DEBATES ARE BOXING MATCHES.

My claim is that many extended metaphors in discourse, such as those seen in Mathews's speech about the Presidential debate, are often understood as instances of allegory. As stated earlier, allegories refer to extended metaphors in which an entire narrative introduces and elaborates upon a metaphorical source domain (e.g., the Presidential debate is presented as a boxing match). One of the important elements of allegory, which may differentiate it from simple extended metaphor, is its rich symbolic character (Gibbs, 2011). The debate between President Obama and his Republican rival Mitt Romney was not just a competition between two opponents, but a symbolic battle between two 'characters' who hold very different political visions of the future for the United States. One may even argue that the winner of a boxing match is a classic mythological 'hero'. Because Romney wishes to take the metaphorical 'championship belt' given to the winner of major boxing competitions, he must do everything in his power to defeat the reigning champion through verbal means alone.

Viewing Romney's attack and Obama's defense of his Presidency as an epic boxing match, which many people have a strong emotional and aesthetic attachment toward, imbues the competition with additional meaning and consequence. As Mathews wishes his audience to understand, the Presidential debate has all the drama, with its associated subplots, of physical battles between well-trained athletes performing in significant, culturally acclaimed, contests. Political cartoonists even depicted the first Presidential debate between Obama and Romney as a literal boxing match. There was even a video game of Obama and Romney boxing that one could play on the Internet by adopting one of the two participants' points of view in the contest.²

Allegory within political discourse takes many forms. Many famous instances of allegory in literature never explicitly refer to the target domain that is really the main topic which is to be better understood through reading of the text. Perhaps the most famous example of this is seen in George Orwell's novel "Animal Farm," which is widely recognized as an allegorical, and satirical, account of Stalin's Russia from the period of 1923–1945. Dozens of scholarly books and hundreds of essays have been published detailing the various possible allegorical messages conveyed by "Animal Farm." In the United States, high-school students are commonly asked to spell out the allegorical messages within "Animal Farm," which again can be challenging given its lack of explicit mentions of the target domain.

2. <http://www.breitbart.com/Breitbart-TV/2012/11/05/Play-The-Romney-Obama-Boxing-Game>).

Consider one short excerpt, early on in the novel, when ‘old Major,’ the prize Middle White boar, had had a strange dream on the previous night and then described it to the other animals.

Now, comrades, what is the nature of this life of ours? Let us face it: our lives are miserable, laborious, and short. We are born, we are given just so much food as will keep the breath in our bodies, and those of us who are capable of it are forced to work to the last atom of our strength; and the very instant that our usefulness has come to an end we are slaughtered with hideous cruelty. No animal in England knows the meaning of happiness or leisure after he is a year old. No animal in England is free. The life of an animal is misery and slavery: that is the plain truth. (Orwell, 1945, p. 4).

When readers encounter this passage, there is little reference to the main target themes (apart from the use of “comrades”) referring to the Soviet leaders, their system of government, and the people who supported and opposed the rise of the Soviet Union in the 1940s. In a similar way, Mikhail Bulgakov’s novel “Head of a Dog,” which is also an attack on the emerging Soviet regime around 1925, and Arthur Miller’s play “The Crucible,” an account of the Salem Witch Trials in 17th-century America that is widely recognized as a commentary on the rise of McCarthyism in the US during the early 1950s, both make no mention of the actual topic that is the main focus of these works’ larger allegorical messages.

Hamilton (2011) has aptly noted that political allegories, such as all of the above, are created to allow authors to make forceful, yet satirical, political statements while providing these writers some deniability about the import of their works. After all, “Animal Farm” says nothing, literally speaking, about the Soviet regime. By only alluding to the real topic of one’s writing, authors of allegory may create more persuasive messages than if they stated their arguments in a detailed literal manner. Many social psychological studies have shown that people are resistant to overt appeals to change their attitudes, and even move toward more contrary positions when confronted by direct persuasive attempts (Cialdini, 2007; Crano, 2015). Allegory adopts a ‘misdirection’ strategy of forcing people to draw inferences about some underlying symbolic theme, which may prompt them to think of an implied topic in a new way.

Still, some forms of allegory may make brief mention of the relevant target domain, but nonetheless be recognized as having allegorical intent. Chris Mathews’s speech is a good example in which he explicitly notes that he is talking about the upcoming Presidential debate, while then launching into his extended boxing match metaphor. But even individual metaphorical statements can allude to deeply-held allegorical beliefs. Many of the individual phrases used to describe political actions are motivated by enduring conceptual metaphors that, once more,

have larger allegorical messages. Consider, for instance, just a few random conventional political phrases and expressions: “dirty campaigns” (UNETHICAL IS DIRT), “landslide elections” (WINNING IS A FORCE OF NATURE), “Carter forged a peace agreement” (POLITICAL AGREEMENTS ARE CREATING SOMETHING BY PHYSICAL FORCE), “peddling influence” (POLITICAL PERSUASION IS SELLING MATERIALS), “the Senate bill was dead on arrival in the House” (POLITICAL EFFORTS ARE HUMAN BEINGS), and “the government’s new plan ground to a halt after meeting opposition” (POLITICAL PLANS ARE MACHINES). Although each phrase may be related to a specific conceptual metaphor, people typically have richer understandings of these political expressions precisely because of their allegorical beliefs about human hygiene, how nature sometimes works, commercial exchanges, the life and death of people, and the complexities of machines. We understand these source domains in mythical terms and apply these beliefs in systematic ways to better conceptualize complex political ideas and events (see Musolff, 2004, for discussion of a related concept of ‘metaphorical scenarios’ which also convey moral themes).

4. Do people really get allegory?

The fact that students often have to be explicitly taught to understand the broader allegorical themes of novels, such as “Animal Farm,” raises the question of whether allegory can be readily understood by most people. Psychological studies show, in fact, that people may not always easily infer analogical relationships when faced with different problems to solve (Gick & Holyoke, 1983). People may be good at interpreting individual conventional metaphorical expressions, as has been shown in psycholinguistic studies (Gibbs, 1994; Gibbs & Colston, 2012), but may be less capable of drawing inferences from physical events in text to infer broader allegorical messages.

Still, some empirical research demonstrates that students, untutored in the ways of allegory, can readily infer allegorical messages (Gibbs & Boers, 2005). Robert Frost’s famous poem “The Road Not Taken” describes a man’s journey walking through the woods, and ends with him considering the dilemma of which of two paths to follow. The poem concludes with the following lines (Frost, 1979, p. 128):

Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.

Frost uses concrete language to refer to broader symbolic themes regarding the choices people make in life and the consequences that follow from these decisions.

One study asked university students to write out their interpretations of the Frost poem when it was presented in different three-line segments. There are several points worth making about these data.

First, the participants provided extremely few personal associations to the different segments, which clearly suggests that people focused on the poet's messages. This shows that interpreting poetry, at least in these college students' view, is not a matter of radical deconstruction, but is significantly constrained by textual and/or authorial meaning.

Second, although readers mentioned mundane events about the simple topics in the poem, they mostly offered metaphorical and allegorical interpretations (72% for the Frost poem). Consider one example where a reader gave a specific metaphorical reading of the three lines shown above, and also articulated a broader understanding of the allegorical theme implicit in the poem. As this reader wrote (Gibbs & Boers, 2005: 57):

This part of the poem is dealing with the choices we have to make in life. The two roads represent different pathways in life that one may or may not choose to take. Frost is saying that as a singular entity, you may only have a singular history which is comprised of the choices you have made. Different choices, or trying to clear a new road between the two existing ones (indecision) would result in a new person. The last line deals with the hesitancy to make a life changing decision. Options must be weighed carefully.

In general, the university students, who were studying Psychology, not Literature, were quite adept at inferring both specific metaphorical readings of the different three-line segments and the poem's overall allegorical meanings.

A different empirical study examined people's abilities to infer allegorical messages from literary fiction. Consider the following passage from a novel titled "The Anthologist" by Nicolson Baker, which is about a poet who is editing a large volume of recent American poetry for a publisher. The volume is complete, except that the poet/editor still has to write the introductory essay in which he should discuss the book's contents and give some historical context for the poems. The problem is that he is simply unable to write the essay because of an old-fashioned case of writer's block, some of which is due to different career and marital problems he had recently experienced. In what follows, the poet/editor talks about his dilemma (Baker, 2009, p. 189).

I wish I could spill forth the wisdom of twenty years of reading and writing poetry. But I am not sure I can... Now it's like I'm on some infinitely tall ladder. You know the way that old aluminum ladders have the texture, that kind of not too appealing roughness of texture, and that kind of cold gray color? I'm clinging to this telescoping ladder that leads up into the blinding blue. The world is somewhere

very far below. I don't know how I got here. It's a mystery. When I look up I see people climbing rung by rung. I see Jorie Graham. I see Billy Collins. I see Ted Kooser. They're all clinging to the ladder too. And above them, I see Auden, Kunitz. Whoa, way up there. Samuel Daniel, Sara Teasdale, Herrick. Tiny figures clambering, climbing.

The wind comes over, whsssew, and it's cold, and the ladder vibrates, and I feel very exposed and high up. Off to one side there's Helen Vendler, in her trusty dirigible, filming our ascent. And I look down and there are many people behind me. They're hurrying up to where I am. They're twenty-three-old energetic climbing creatures in their anoraks and goggles, and I'm trying to keep climbing. But my hands are cold and going numb. My arms are tired to trembling. It's freezing, and it's lonely, and there's nobody to talk to. And what if I just let go? What if I just loosened my grip, and fell to one side, and just — ffffshhhoooooww. Let go.

Would that be such a bad thing?

This passage metaphorically describes the poet/editor's plight as he struggles to write the introductory essay, establish his place within the world of poetry, and reclaim some harmony within his personal life. Fully understanding the text requires readers to engage in an extended metaphorical comparison in which the poet imagines his present obstacle "like" he was in the unworldly situation of clinging to an "infinitely tall ladder" which telescopes "up into the blinding blue." In this way, the passage unobtrusively shifts from a single simile into a full-blown allegory, much like that seen in many instances of allegorical fiction.

The reason for viewing the 'climbing ladder' narrative as allegory rather than just extended metaphor is because of the elaborate ways the underlying metaphor is fleshed out in the discourse. For example, the poet's life is not just conceived of as a journey (e.g., *LIFE IS A JOURNEY*), but as a very specific, unique and fantastical kind of journey in which many symbolic ideas are given concrete realization. Each of the entailments that arise from the mapping of journey taking onto leading a life are not mere static inferences, but symbolic realizations that give personal and moral meaning to each source-to-target-domain correspondence. Indeed, it is the moral character of allegories that make them something more than mere extended metaphors.

Can people draw these extended metaphorical inferences when reading the above passage? One psychological study indicated that ordinary university students provided consistent evidence of understanding the "climbing ladder" story as generally referring to the conceptual metaphor *LIFE IS A JOURNEY*, and specifically saw the ladder as the path along the journey, with an indefinite final destination, and different poets as travelers along the path toward fame, poetic creativity, and even literary heaven (Gibbs & Blackwell, 2012). Not only did the students interpret specific phrases as having metaphoric meaning, they also exhibited

significant allegorical coherence in the sense of inferring an overall allegorical theme that linked their understanding of different phrases in the text. At the same time, students did not simply recruit the general conceptual metaphor of *LIFE IS A JOURNEY* and only report its typical entailments (i.e., the ladder is the path, the poets are travelers, the top of the ladder is the goal, etc.). Instead, students showed a more sophisticated understanding, offering idiosyncratic interpretations of the story parts that gave their meaning products a unique character that speaks to the heart of everyone's individual allegorical experience.

One possibility is that people created their allegorical understandings of the 'climbing ladder' story by engaging in embodied simulation processes.. Embodied simulation, again, broadly refers to the reenactment of previous sensorimotor states during immediate processing of linguistic and nonlinguistic stimuli, and when imagining different possible actions. For example, understanding simple abstract metaphorical events, such as 'grasping the concept,' is constrained by aspects of people's embodied experience as if they are immersed in the discourse situation, even when these events can only be metaphorically and not physically realized (i.e., it is not physically possible to grasp an abstract entity such as a 'concept') (see Gibbs, 2013; Gibbs, Gould & Andric, 2006; Wilson & Gibbs, 2007). Participants' responses to questions about their bodily experiences when reading the 'climbing ladder' excerpt strongly indicated that they were indeed imagining themselves engaging in the complex scenario of being stuck on the high ladder, not knowing how to advance or whether to give up this pursuit.

There are surprisingly no empirical studies that have looked at allegory understanding within the context of political speeches or narratives (but see Pfaff & Gibbs, 1997, for a study on political satires with allegorical meanings). One recent set of studies from my own laboratory has, however, provided some preliminary evidence on people's interpretations of Chris Mathews's narrative about the Presidential debate. My hypothesis is that people understand this narrative as an allegory and do so through embodied simulation processes. Under this view, people readily interpret the different metaphorical phrases by imagining themselves engaging in imaginative simulations of what it must be like to perform the actions mentioned in the text (e.g., "take some hard shots," "blasting away at the President," "block the blows," "keep his head clear," "land his Sunday punch"). More importantly, people's allegorical understandings should be evident from their rich, symbolic interpretations of what these different metaphorical expressions mean in context.

A first study had a group of 12 University of California, Santa Cruz undergraduates, majoring in Psychology, read the Mathews speech, one segment at a time alone on a single page. Presented below are the six different segments of Mathews's speech that students read individually. The phrase highlighted in bold

contains the metaphorical words for which students had to write out their interpretations on the next page.

- (1) I'll be out there to watch the two of them go at it. I have no real idea what to expect. **I think Romney will take some hard shots.**
- (2) **Romney may spend the whole 90 minutes pounding away at the President,** serving him with one indictment after another, hoping that something will stick.
- (3) **I think Obama will play with him, parry the assaults, block the blows.**
- (4) **Obama will try to keep his head clear** so he can avoid getting hurt.
- (5) I think it will start slow with both men trying to be cautious, **neither able to land a punch.**
- (6) Then it will happen: Romney will deliver what is clearly a pre-rehearsed moment, a sound byte. It will be something about Obama not delivering on a promise, something about the economy he said he'd do but hasn't. He will expect the president to defend himself. When he does, pointing to what he inherited from Bush, **Romney will pounce.**

Participants' written responses to the different metaphorical phrases can be analyzed along several dimensions. For example, people gave correct metaphorical interpretations for the above boldfaced utterances 93% of the time, indicating a good understanding of these conventional expressions' metaphorical meanings. My main interest, though, was with whether people gave indications of more elaborative interpretations of these conventional phrases, ones that reflect their allegorical understandings of the narrative. Consider some examples of participants' elaborated responses to the target utterances.

Target phrase: "I think Romney will take some hard shots."

Response: "He will attempt to make President Obama look bad to make himself look better."

Response: "Romney will heavily criticize Obama for his 1st term in office that he may have difficulty responding to."

Target phrase: "Romney may spend the whole 90 minutes pounding away at the President."

Response: "Romney will spend 90 minutes saying things to the President that he won't have a response to."

Response: "Romney wants Obama to crack under the pressure."

Target phrase: "I think Obama will play with him, parry the assaults, block the blows."

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Response: "Obama will recognize what Romney is trying to do and will thwart Romney's attempts to make him (Obama) mess up."

Response: "Obama knows he will win so he's just playing or allowing Romney to think he is somehow better."

Target phrase: "Obama will try to keep his head clear so he can avoid getting hurt."

Response: "He should ignore the harmful comments made so he doesn't say something he shouldn't just because of his emotions."

Response: "He will ignore Mitt's barbaric statements and propositions and focus on what he is trying to accomplish. He should ignore the b.s. Mitt uses to try and make him lose his cool."

Target phrase: "When he does, pointing to what he inherited from Bush, Romney will pounce."

Response: "Romney lures Obama into a trap and when he takes the bait, Romney will attack Obama's character."

Response: "Romney thinks Obama didn't keep his promises, but Bush put us in a hole and Mitt wouldn't have done any better. He will use his snarky rich white Republican attitude and use it as a ploy to make Obama look weak."

These elaborated responses show that the participants are not simply offering clichéd interpretations or simple paraphrases of the metaphorical statements (e.g., "will pounce" simply means to attack), but are also articulating inferences which can be reasonably made given the utterance in context. Overall, 52% of all interpretations for the conventional metaphors were elaborative in the above manner. Over half of all the responses therefore showed how participants immediately inferred broader allegorical messages beyond what each phrase metaphorically meant. My suggestion is that people are giving these elaborated responses because of their enhanced experience of the source domain, which is critical to the overall allegorical theme of the POLITICAL DEBATES ARE BOXING MATCHES idea. Rather than serving as a distraction to the task of interpreting these political metaphors, bodily based metaphors enhance people's more elaborative, allegorical interpretations of these figurative phrases in context.

A second study more directly examined people's bodily and allegorical experiences when understanding the Mathews's speech. Ten undergraduate students once again read the speech and then gave ratings or wrote out their responses to the following questions.

1. How much did you imagine yourself being physically involved in a political debate as you read the narrative by Chris Mathews?
2. How much did you imagine yourself being physically involved in a boxing match as you read the narrative by Chris Mathews? (Rate on a 7-point scale).
3. Please describe in words in the space below anything you may have physically felt when reading the narrative. Be as descriptive as possible.

4. How much in the past have you heard of or thought of political debates sometimes being like boxing matches? (Rate on a 7-point scale).
5. Please describe in words why political debates may sometimes be talked about as if they were boxing matches.
6. Were there particular words or phrases in the narrative that led you to think of the metaphor of political debates as boxing matches while you were reading the story?
7. In what ways are political debates NOT like boxing matches?

These questions were all answered after people read the entire speech, rather than asking them to interpret each metaphorical utterance one-by-one as they encountered them (as done in Study 1). As expected, participants typically stated that they imagined themselves engaging in a physical boxing match when reading the narrative. People described their experiences as if they too were physically struggling, sometimes throwing punches and sometimes defending themselves against punches. Nonetheless, students still recognized that their physical sensations were all experienced within the context of a challenging political debate. No student simply interpreted the speech as a completely literal depiction of a boxing match.

Furthermore, when asked to elaborate on why political debates are sometimes talked about as boxing matches, people said that both situations involve competition in which one opponent aims to defeat the other, often by whatever means necessary. Once again, my suggestion is that people may interpret allegorical texts by imagining themselves as actors in the texts, and bodily experience the exact actions and events depicted, including taking hard shots, blocking blows, keeping one's head clear, and landing a big (Sunday) punch (Gerrig, 1993; Green, 2004). Thus, the persuasiveness of some political allegory fundamentally arises from full-bodied imaginative engagement with the actions described (e.g., the political opponents slugging it out in the boxing ring) such that certain narratives have a strong personal feel to them.

Finally, one remarkable set of responses indicated that some participants saw boxing matches as political events. Boxing matches are not just physical encounters between two people, with one eventually overcoming the other through physical expertise. Instead, boxing matches are often 'symbolic' in the sense of the two combatants representing different types of people (e.g., with respect to experience, personal appearance, boxing styles, national or ethnic backgrounds, and geographical locations). Audiences cheer for one boxer, as opposed to another, for a wide variety of reasons, including many that have little to do with a performer's physical abilities alone.

If people see boxing matches in highly symbolic terms, then it is quite possible that many source domains in political metaphors are themselves allegorical. We do

not, therefore, map physical source domains onto more abstract target domains, as in *POLITICAL DEBATES ARE BOXING MATCHES*, to create allegorical meanings, but may just see the isomorphism between the allegorical natures of boxing matches and political debates. This conclusion offers new insights into the ways conceptual metaphors emerge in experience and may be understood in the context of different discourse genres, including politics.

The allegorical character of political metaphors is not specific to the domain of politics. My contention is that many of the common conceptual metaphors identified within cognitive linguistic studies, for example, such as *LIFE IS A JOURNEY*, also have rich affective and cultural meanings which suggest that they too are allegorical in many respects. Many political metaphors have an allegorical character, but so do many other conceptual metaphors. This conclusion points to the larger possibility that so-called conceptual metaphors are mostly complex allegorical structures.

5. Conclusion

People often talk about political ideas and events in extended metaphorical ways, many of which involve the consistent, systematic use of particular source domains. But understanding these extended uses of metaphor have greater symbolic power than that captured by the direct entailments or correspondences between source and target domain mappings (e.g., *POLITICAL DEBATES ARE BOXING MATCHES*). People have rich experiences with many political target and source domains to create larger allegorical understandings of the metaphors in political narratives such as that seen in the Chris Mathews's speech on the Presidential debate. These experiences enable them to imaginatively project themselves into the bodily actions alluded to in metaphorical discourse via automatic embodied simulation processes. Part of the appeal that certain political metaphors may have in different contexts is the fact that people have significant experiences with both the source and target domains individually, which makes specific metaphors vivid, memorable, and perhaps persuasive. Of course, not all people will respond to political allegories in the same way. As mentioned earlier, studies show that people will resist certain metaphorical portrayals of ideas which diverge from their own beliefs and personal experiences. Having little interest in boxing, for example, may make Mathews's speech less intriguing for some viewers. Yet Mathews may still have successfully got some of his audience to attend to the Presidential debate precisely because of their interest in, and knowledge of boxing matches and their larger symbolic nature.

Much of the discussion about political metaphor assumes that there is something special or different about metaphor use in this domain, but I am not at all convinced this is necessarily true. Metaphors in politics may not be all that different from those seen in many other contexts, such as advertisements, journalism, academic discourse, or even many aspects of ordinary speech in which speakers aim to get others to adopt specific ideas or beliefs. The allegorical character of political metaphors is also not specific to the domain of politics. My contention is that many of the common conceptual metaphors identified within cognitive linguistic studies, such as *LIFE IS A JOURNEY*, also have rich affective and cultural meanings which suggest that they too are allegorical in many respects.

This conclusion points to the larger possibility that so-called conceptual metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) are mostly complex allegorical structures. One provocative finding in newer studies of political metaphor is that people often view source domains as being allegorical in nature. The fact that people readily understand Frost's poem "The Road Not Taken" as an allegory is not simply due to their frequent mapping of journeys onto more abstract domains, such as life. Instead, people's in-the-moment experiences of going on journeys, for example, are inherently metaphorical, and indeed allegorical given their complex symbolic nature. Conceptual metaphor theory is noted for its claim that metaphors are conceptual given the mapping from embodied source domains onto target domains, which give rise to various entailments that are seen as metaphorical. But many source domains are already understood in allegorical terms, which is one reason why people often talk about complex political ideas and events using allegorical source domains (e.g., *BOXING MATCHES*).

For this reason, it may be best to view conceptual metaphors, including those for politics, as emerging both from the constant impulse to interpret abstract events in terms of concrete, embodied domains of experience, but also to see conceptual metaphors as arising from our symbolic understandings of the source domains themselves. There are clearly high-level metaphorical mappings involved when people read a novel like "Animal Farm," or listen to Mathews's speech on the upcoming Presidential debate. At the same time, part of our understanding of these political, allegorical metaphorical works is based on our understanding of the symbolic, even political, nature of barnyard animals interacting and people trying to defeat one another in the boxing ring.

References

- Baker, N. (2009). *The anthologist*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Barry, C., Brescoll, V., Brownell, K., & Schlesinger, M. (2009). Obesity metaphors: How do beliefs about the causes of obesity affect support for public policy? *Milbank Quarterly*, 87, 7–47. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0009.2009.00546.x
- Beer, F., & De Landtsheer, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Metaphorical world politics*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Press.
- Bergen, B. (2012). *Louder than words: The new science of how the mind creates meaning*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bosman, J. (1987). Persuasive effects of political metaphors. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 2, 97–113. DOI: 10.1207/s15327868ms0202_2
- Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cialdini, R. (2007). *Influence: The psychology of persuasion*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Crano, W. (2015). Useful strategies in the war on words. In M. Hanne, W. Crano, & J. Mio (Eds.), *Warring with words: Narrative and metaphor in politics* (pp.272–288). New York: Psychology Press.
- Frost, R. (1979). *The poetry of Robert Frost: The collected poems, complete and unabridged*. New York: Holt.
- Gibbs, R. (1994). *Poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language and understanding*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R. (2006). *Embodiment and cognitive science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R. (2011). The allegorical impulse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 26, 121–130. DOI: 10.1080/10508406.2011.556498
- Gibbs, R. (2013). Walking the walk while thinking about the talk: Embodied interpretation of metaphorical narratives. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 42, 363–378. DOI: 10.1007/s10936-012-9222-6
- Gibbs, R., & Blackwell, N. (2012). Climbing the stairs to literary heaven: A case study of allegorical interpretation of fiction. *Scientific Study of Literature*, 2, 197–217. DOI: 10.1075/ssol.2.2.02gib
- Gibbs, R., & Boers, E. (2005). Metaphoric processing of allegorical poetry. In Z. Maalej (Ed.), *Metaphor and culture* (pp. 44–61). Tunis: University of Manouba Press.
- Gibbs, R., & Colston, H. (2012). *Interpreting figurative meaning*. New York: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139168779
- Gibbs, R., Gould, J., & Andric, M. (2006). Imagining metaphorical actions: Embodied simulations make the impossible plausible. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 25, 221–238. DOI: 10.2190/97MK-44MV-1UUF-T5CR
- Hamilton, C. (2011). Allegory, blending, and censorship in modern literature. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 40, 23–42. DOI: 10.1515/jlse.2011.002
- Johnson, E. (2005). WAR in the media: Metaphors, ideology, and the formation of language policy. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29, 621–640. DOI: 10.1080/15235882.2005.10162855
- Lakoff, G. (1996). *Moral politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Now, comrades.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Matlock, T. (2004). Fictive motion as cognitive simulation. *Memory & Cognition*, 32, 1389–1400. DOI: 10.3758/BF03206329

- Matlock, T. (2012). Framing political messages with grammar and metaphor. *American Scientist*, 100, 478–483. DOI: 10.1511/2012.99.478
- Mio, J. (1996). Political metaphors and persuasion. In J. Mio & A. Katz (Eds.), *Metaphor: Implications and applications* (pp. 127–146). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Musolff, A. (2004). *Metaphor and political discourse. Analogical reasoning in debates about Europe*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave-Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230504516
- Orwell, G. (1945). *Animal farm*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Ottati, V., Graesser, A., & Rhoads, S. (1999). The effect of metaphor on processing style in a persuasion task: A motivational resonance model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 688–697. DOI: 10.1037/0022–3514.77.4.688
- Perlman, M., & Gibbs, R. (2013). Drawing motion that isn't there: Psycholinguistic evidence on the spatial basis of metaphorical motion verbs. In C. Paradis, J. Hudson, & U. Magnusson (Eds.), *The construal of spatial meaning: Windows into conceptual space* (pp. 43–59). New York: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199641635.003.0004
- Pfaff, K., & Gibbs, R. (1997). Authorial intentions in understanding satirical texts. *Poetics*, 25, 45–70. DOI: 10.1016/S0304–422X(97)00006–5
- Read, S., Cesa, I., Jones, D., & Collins, N. (1990). When is the federal budget like a baby? Metaphor in political rhetoric. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 5, 125–149. DOI: 10.1207/s15327868ms0503_1
- Robins, S., & Mayer, R. (2000). The metaphor framing effect: Metaphorical reasoning about text-based dilemmas. *Discourse Processes*, 30, 57–86. DOI: 10.1207/S15326950dp3001_03
- Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American public discourse*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Thibodeau, P., & Boroditsky, L. (2011). Metaphors we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 6(2), e16782. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0016782
- Wilson, N., & Gibbs, R. (2007). Real and imagined body movement primes metaphor comprehension. *Cognitive Science*, 31, 721–731. DOI: 10.1080/15326900701399962

Author's address

Prof. Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr.
Department of Psychology
University of California, Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
USA
gibbs@ucsc.edu

Biographical note

Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr. is Distinguished Professor of Psychology at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

BOOK REVIEWS

Tay, D. (2013). *Metaphor in Psychotherapy. A Descriptive and Prescriptive Analysis*. [Metaphor in Language, Cognition, and Communication, 1]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 211pp. ISBN 9789027202055

Reviewed by Julia T. Williams Camus (University of Cantabria, Spain)

A common problem encountered when a given issue is approached from different disciplines is that there is a potential lack of common understanding about the object under study. In sociology, this phenomenon is known as a boundary object (Star & Griesemer, 1989, p. 393) and is defined as a scientific object which is relevant to a number of “intersecting social worlds”. In this sense, metaphor could be regarded as a boundary object. The relevance of metaphor in psychotherapy has long been noted, and there is a wealth of literature attempting to guide psychotherapists on the management of metaphors in clinical practice. However, the lack of methodological and conceptual consensus within the field could hinder advances in their appropriate use in actual practice. Psychotherapists appear to have no common understanding as to what metaphor is, and recent metaphor research has not managed to influence and inform them. Nevertheless, in “Metaphor in Psychotherapy”, Dennis Tay makes a significant contribution in this direction with recent insights gathered from metaphor studies.

The book also sheds light on a number of issues involved in theoretical and applied research of direct concern for metaphor scholars. Tay’s “Metaphors in Psychotherapy” is thus in line with recent works which have placed an emphasis on the study of metaphor in specific contexts of use, guided by the premise that a close look into metaphors in their natural environment can inform contemporary metaphor research. Therefore, the book can be seen as a two-way bridge, connecting the field of metaphor studies and psychotherapy. On the one hand, a major objective of the analysis of the metaphors in psychotherapy is to show how a close examination of the genre of psychotherapeutic interaction can provide a new perspective on theoretical aspects in contemporary metaphor research. On the other, Tay aims to highlight how theoretical aspects gathered from metaphor research carried out in cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics and discourse analysis could bring about an enhancement in the clinical use and management of metaphors. These two objectives, respectively defined as the *descriptive* and *prescriptive* aims, provide the backbone to the empirical chapters of the book.

Metaphor and the Social World 5:2 (2015), 282–288. DOI 10.1075/msw.5.2.06wil
ISSN 2210-4070 / E-ISSN 2210-4097 © John Benjamins Publishing Company

The book is structured into eight chapters, where the introductory chapter first sketches the main theoretical foundations of Tay's approach, defines the descriptive and prescriptive aims of his study, and outlines the general organization of the book. In Chapter 2, Tay provides the theoretical foundation supporting his main claim: that the nature of psychotherapy as a discourse activity provides a fertile ground which can inform a number of aspects of metaphor theory and that the practice of psychotherapy can be enhanced by the insights provided by contemporary metaphor research. Tay begins by differentiating psychotherapeutic talk from ordinary conversation and suggests that the context of psychotherapeutic activity involves five characteristics or 'layers' which may have an influence on the use of metaphor: namely, the context of the individual patient's life history and subjective experiences; the socio-cultural context of therapy and its participants; the theoretical context of therapy; the interactional context between therapist and patient and the co-text of therapeutic talk. The influence that each of these layers has on metaphor is explored in the empirical part of the book.

Having presented the contextual variables which he views as having a bearing on metaphor use, Tay then introduces the theoretical aspects of metaphor which he deals with in the book: how a combination of embodied, cultural and individual-specific knowledge is drawn upon as ideational resources in the formation of metaphors (Chapter 3); the strategic development or elaboration of metaphors to meet discourse objectives (Chapter 4); the adoption and extension of, or deviation from, metaphoric source/target concepts as established in talk by the discourse participants (Chapter 5), the constancy and variation of metaphors of therapy as evidenced across different levels of a therapeutic discourse community (Chapter 6) and the patterned co-occurrence of metaphorical expressions with contextual features (Chapter 7). Tay gives a concise, yet informative overview of each of these theoretical topics which proves useful in following his empirical analyses and also provides a neat introduction for those therapists unfamiliar with contemporary metaphor research. The end of the second chapter deals with the prescriptive aim, and here Tay tackles a major issue of concern in discourse analysis, which is how the findings from research carried out in this field can reach and positively influence the areas or domains from which the data is gathered. While the presence and importance of metaphor has been noted in psychotherapy, regardless of the different theoretical backgrounds, a unified and coherent framework for the use of metaphor seems difficult to achieve unless agreement is reached on a common definition of what metaphor is. In addition, Tay argues that research into metaphor coming from the field of psychotherapy has not been affected by the recent advances made by metaphor scholars.

Chapter 3 deals with how the various ideational resources of metaphors are deployed simultaneously and creatively to construct and to elaborate metaphors

during psychotherapeutic interaction. This is illustrated by a case study of four therapeutic sessions in which the metaphors emerging from therapist and patient talk are drawn not only from embodied and cultural dimensions, but also from the resources offered by the individual experience of the patient. Also crucially, the case study shows how underlying the combination of metaphors from the ideational resources was an inferential consistency that gave rise to a problem-solution framework. This pattern allowed the therapist and patient to achieve mutual understanding and to work towards the therapeutic goal. The second half of the chapter is concerned with the prescriptive aim. Here, Tay illustrates how an understanding of the complementary interplay between the ideational resources could improve existing therapeutic protocols of metaphor use. He critically examines Kopp and Craw's (1998) seven-step interview protocol, in which the authors adopt a patient-centred perspective and highlight the validity and utility of patients' conceptualisations. However, they point out that it is the therapist's role to guide the patient in an active but non-coercive way in the development of their images and in relating these representations to the therapeutic objectives in question. Tay suggests that an awareness of how the embodied, cultural and individual dimensions of metaphors complement each other could help in such guidance and provides a list of six image schemas to incorporate into the protocol which may prove useful to locate the structural and logical relations between the various images used by the patient.

Chapter 4 explores the strategic development or elaboration of metaphors to meet specific discourse objectives. The author revisits Wee's (2005) framework in which the metaphor processing models of correspondence and class-inclusion are implemented in metaphor production through two distinct rhetorical strategies. Wee associates particular strategies with specific discourse objectives. He suggests, for instance, that in popular science texts, correspondence metaphor types will be common for conceptual explication. In contrast, in management texts, class inclusion metaphor types are used strategically to highlight management maxims. For the sake of methodological rigour and in order to keep the levels of metaphor in language and thought separate, Tay replaces Wee's 'correspondence' and 'class inclusion' labels with the 'alignment' and 'category' types, respectively, for the analysis of metaphoric discourse.

In this chapter, Tay includes excerpts from therapeutic sessions to illustrate how these two types of metaphor development strategies can be related to different therapeutic discourse objectives at hand and how they are used both by therapists and patients. Thus, 'conceptual explication' of the target domain, which is an important discourse objective in psychotherapy, is facilitated by the 'alignment metaphor type'. In addition, the purpose of 'principle highlighting' in psychotherapy is fulfilled by the 'category' metaphor type. Although these two types are introduced

separately, Tay emphasises that the shifting discourse circumstances may require speakers to draw on both metaphor types and provides examples from two excerpts where the two types appear in combination. When it comes to the prescriptive aim, Tay shows how an awareness of metaphor development strategies could help improve both therapists' and patients' use of metaphor. He further discusses Kopp & Crows' (1998) 7-step interview protocol and a 6-stage model developed by Sims and Whynot (1997) in relation to the two metaphor types discussed in this chapter. Tay points out that although both protocols highlight the importance of metaphors in clinical practice, they fail to provide clear guidelines on how to expand and develop the patient's metaphors or to explore the existing connections between source and target. Tay proposes an appendix connecting source and target concepts which could be added to the sixth steps of the experts' protocols.

Chapter 5 addresses the issue of metaphorical consistency and variability. Contrary to strong cognitivist positions, which expect to find metaphorical consistency both at the conceptual and discourse levels, analyses of metaphor in actual text and talk point towards a "dynamic variability in metaphor use". In a similar vein, the psychotherapeutic literature, both from the communicative and interpretative paradigms, advocates metaphorical consistency on the basis that it will lead to '*meaning conjunction*' between therapist and patient. However, Tay argues that an appreciation of the potential of metaphorical variability could prove beneficial for therapists because it does not necessarily imply a '*meaning disjunction*'.

Using Goatly (1997) as a basis, Tay defines four analytical categories for the study of the combinatory patterns of source and target concepts: consistent source-target association; same source but different target concepts; same target but different source concepts; and shifting source and target concepts. In this fifth chapter, Tay examines how different therapeutic circumstances can induce each of the four discourse strategies of metaphorical consistency and variability and their implications for psychotherapy. While metaphorical consistency is generally seen as beneficial in psychotherapy, Tay shows that, although this pattern may suggest co-operation and mutual understanding between the participants, it does not necessary lead to an agreement over the issue at hand. Therefore, therapeutic change cannot be achieved by metaphorical consistency alone. On the other hand, far from hindering successful verbal interaction, metaphor variability is shown to perform important communicative functions in the examples analysed by Tay. The use of the same source with different targets served as a discourse strategy allowing the therapist to move smoothly from one topic to another and helped the patient to establish connections between issues that may seem only distantly related. Tay also shows that when different sources were used for the same target, the therapeutic discussion was enriched since the alternative conceptualisations helped to highlight different aspects of the target while preserving the entailments

of previous sources. In addition, when the sources used exhibited a degree of conceptual similarity, for instance the domains of war and sports, a shift to the latter served to attenuate the strength of the former's entailments. This chapter makes an important contribution to psychotherapy in terms of the prescriptive aim, in the sense that it brings to the fore the largely overlooked or misinterpreted phenomenon of metaphor variability and underscores its potential strengths in clinical practice.

While the previous empirical chapters are concerned with the use of metaphors arising in actual therapeutic talk, Chapter 6 presents a shift in focus. Drawing on Gee's (2005) distinction between actual *discourse* and a more abstract notion of *Discourse*, Tay moves on to consider the metaphors of therapy. In particular, he presents an analysis of how the THERAPY IS A JOURNEY metaphor is derived from and instantiated across four different levels of specificity within the discourse of cognitive-behavioural therapy. These levels consist of the primary and conceptual metaphoric level, theorisation, therapist training models and actual therapeutic talk. In the prescriptive aim, Tay addresses the issue of feedback in psychotherapy since the establishment of channels of feedback appears to be an issue of concern within the field. He relates how three of the four levels — theorisation, training and practice — can provide an abstract framework for a feedback system.

Chapter 7 looks at "the co-textual environment of metaphors". In this chapter, Tay makes a significant contribution to the study of metaphor signalling (Goatly, 1997), and tuning devices (Cameron & Deignan, 2003). The author argues that metaphor scholars have approached the study of these devices at clause level, and this should be broadened to gain a better understanding of how they function in extended metaphors in discourse. He argues that by applying the notion of metaphor types discussed in Chapter 4 it is possible to locate 'strategic junctures' where these discourse markers in conjunction with the alignment and category metaphor types can be seen to contribute to wider discourse objectives.

Tay identifies and manually analyses a total of ten extended metaphors to ascertain the presence of discourse markers in these strategic junctures. Within the ten extended metaphors, he finds a total of 78 strategic junctures in which 94 discourse markers were present, leading him to suggest that there might be a correlation between strategic junctures and the presence of discourse markers. For instance, in his analysis of an elaboration of a category type metaphor, Tay shows how discourse markers co-occurred at the strategic junctures of this metaphor type, namely (i) where the source and target concepts are introduced, (ii) where the superordinate concept is stated, and (iii) where the source concept is elaborated as a valid exemplar for a given category. For the alignment metaphor type, he illustrates how discourse markers were also found at the strategic junctures of this metaphor type: (i) introduction of source and target concepts, (ii) source and

target entity association, and (iii) generation of source domain inferences that map onto the target. Therefore, Tay argues that this co-occurrence of discourse markers at the junctures of the category and alignment types in extended metaphors is not coincidental, but that discourse markers together with the metaphors contribute towards the discourse objective at hand. In terms of the prescriptive aim, Tay briefly discusses how psychotherapists should pay attention not only to which metaphors to use, but also how metaphors should be presented to the patients. He also considers other communicative functions of discourse markers such as indirectness, politeness and naturalness which could serve in clinical practice.

In the last chapter, the author provides a synthesised summary of the main contributions of his analyses both for the descriptive and prescriptive aims of his study. In addition, he picks up a number of themes that have emerged from his research: the stable and dynamic nature of metaphors in psychotherapy, their multifunctional nature and the skill required to master metaphor use in therapy. Tay also points to future research directions that can be pursued by metaphor scholars and by psychotherapy researchers and practitioners: quantitative analyses of metaphors in psychotherapy, a multimodal approach to metaphors, the role played by culture in construction and interpretation of metaphors and the negative outcomes that may derive from the use of metaphor in clinical practice.

Dennis Tay's "Metaphor in Psychotherapy" provides an insightful contextualised analysis of metaphors in a discipline which has concerned itself with their utility in clinical practice. Throughout the book, the author is at pains to point out that there is as yet no concrete evidence of a causal relationship between the use of a specific metaphor and patient improvement or clinical success, but highlights the potential of a more conscious and informed management of metaphors. Also worthy of mention is the didactic tone that the author adopts in the book, as well as the usefulness of the numerous charts and figures that serve as a summary of the authors' major points. Furthermore, the reconciliatory nature of Tay's approach is also a strength. This is particularly noticeable in Chapter 3, where he shows that the actual ideational resources of metaphor can better be explored by a combination of the insights offered by different approaches, and in Chapter 4, where he carefully recasts metaphor processing models as discourse strategies. In the final chapter, Tay further argues that it would be desirable to abandon the conceptual/discourse metaphor theory dichotomy and to approach the study of metaphor from a functional perspective. A major shortcoming of the book is the lack of quantitative data to support some of the author's observations, although Tay's introduction warns readers about the solely qualitative nature of his study and the author suggests quantitative analysis as a future direction that could be further pursued in the last chapter. The author analysed a total of 253 transcripts of sessions from 20 therapist-patient pairs. The duration of the sessions ranged from

5 to 20 hours. In view of the considerable size of the data it would have been useful if he could have provided some kind of quantification to demonstrate that the patterns described are not marginal to the genre examined but that they present some degree of systematicity. This weakness aside, the book as a whole will be of interest to metaphor scholars and most probably to psychotherapists.

References

- Cameron L., & Deignan, A. (2003). Combining large and small corpora to investigate tuning devices around metaphor in spoken discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(3), 149–160. DOI: 10.1207/S15327868MS1803_02
- Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis. Theory and method* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Goatly, A. (1997). *The language of metaphors*. London: Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9780203210000
- Kopp, R. R., & Craw, M. J. (1998). Metaphoric language, metaphoric cognition and cognitive therapy. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 35(3), 306–311. DOI: 10.1037/h0087795
- Sims, P. A., & Whynot, C. A. (1997). Hearing metaphor: An approach to working with family-generated metaphor. *Family Process*, 36, 341–355. DOI: 10.1111/j.1545-5300.1997.00341.x
- Star, S., & Griesemer, J. (1989). Institutional ecology, ‘translations’ and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley’s Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39. *Social Studies of Science*, 19(3), 387–420. DOI: 10.1177/030631289019003001
- Wee, L. (2005). Class-inclusion and correspondence models as discourse types: A framework for approaching metaphor in discourse. *Language in Society*, 34(2), 219–238. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404505050098

Reviewer’s address

Julia T. Williams Camus
Pompeu Fabra University
Traducció i Ciències del Llenguatge
Fresnedo de la calzada nº4 3º centro
Santander, Cantabria 39005
Spain
jtwilliams.camus@gmail.com

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Nacey, S. (2013). *Metaphors in Learner English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 279 pp. ISBN 978 90 272 0206 2 (HB); 978 90 272 7156 3 (Eb)

Reviewed by June Eyckmans (Department of Translation, Interpreting and Communication, Ghent University, Belgium)

As the title indicates, “Metaphors in Learner English” by Susan Nacey deals with the author’s quest to perform an in-depth study of the metaphors produced by Norwegian EFL students. She sets out to answer three questions with her investigation: (1) how is the metaphor production in written English different for Norwegian L2 learners than for native speaker novice writers of English? (2) How creatively do Norwegian L2 English learners employ metaphors? and (3) How can metaphors and metaphorical creativity in texts be identified? In order to address these questions, Susan Nacey systematically checked all linguistic metaphors in 40,000 words from two sets of texts. Half of these texts were written by Norwegian learners of English and belong to the Norwegian component of the International Corpus of Learner English (NICLE). The other half were produced by British A-level students and form part of the Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays (LOCNESS). By means of a comparative analysis, in which the texts of the British native speakers serve as a baseline, the students’ use of metaphor is scrutinized. She used an adapted version of the MIPVU protocol (MIP stands for Metaphor Identification Procedure and the VU refers to the Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam where the protocol was conceived) in order to free the metaphor identification from intuitive or introspective biases.

This ambitious and immensely readable book is divided into three parts that cover the research questions outlined above. It consists of eight chapters that gradually build up to a conclusion that encompasses responses to questions about L1 and L2 students’ metaphor production in argumentative texts, the phenomenon of metaphorical creativity and the theoretical and methodological issue of metaphor identification in texts.

After initiating the reader into the theoretical framework of metaphor research in a first chapter, the author takes on the role that metaphoric competence has been given in the Common European Framework of Reference (Chapter 2). This reference document that informs language learning, language teaching and language assessment in Europe has a far reaching influence when it comes to language teaching practices in secondary schools, as well as colleges and universities.

Metaphor and the Social World 5:2 (2015), 289–293. DOI 10.1075/msw.5.2.07eyc
ISSN 2210-4070 / E-ISSN 2210-4097 © John Benjamins Publishing Company

Her critique of the CEFR is nuanced but very pertinent and her well-voiced stance about how the CEFR authorities render the document impervious to criticism by inviting the users to “critically apply” the suggested taxonomies should not fall on deaf ears. She eloquently reveals how the CEFR’s self-declared refusal to equate language mastery with native speaker competence is inconsistent with the idealized native speaker competence that is used as a benchmark in the competence description throughout the CEFR document. I believe that the author has a strong argument when she points to the ramifications of the presence or absence of CEFR recommendations concerning the inclusion of metaphorical competence for foreign language practice in classrooms.

As it turns out, there is a marked lack of importance given to metaphor in the CEFR. The phenomenon is only mentioned with reference to phrasal idioms and — contrary to corpus-evidence — these are reported to be frequently used. The CEFR thus overlooks the prevalence of metaphor in everyday discourse and consequently condemns the knowledge of metaphor to the periphery of language learning. By means of several examples in the English as well as the Norwegian versions of the CEFR document, Susan Nacey illustrates the inadequate conceptualization of metaphor and the ensuing underestimation of the importance of metaphor in (foreign) language use. In defence of the CEFR, one could argue that the level of abstraction that is required in order to be able to identify metaphor might have relegated it to the domain of advanced language learners, but in such a view proficiency level would be too easily equated with level of abstraction. To sum up, in this chapter the author has uncovered the misalignment between the CEFR and contemporary cognitive linguistic findings. Future CEFR guardians or developers would do well to bear the important role of metaphoric competence for language learning in mind and adjust the document accordingly.

In the next three chapters great pains are taken to chronicle the history and methodology for identifying metaphor and the incarnations that the Pragglejazz procedure, the MIP protocol and the MIPVU protocol have undergone. Throughout the years, several attempts have been made to take individual variation out of metaphor identification and develop a reliable method for finding metaphor in natural discourse. In fact, a substantial part of the book is devoted to the identification of metaphor in texts and to a study into the use of the Metaphor Identification Procedure. Only a select group of dedicated metaphor researchers will fully appreciate all the ins and outs of the MIP(VU) protocol. Still, thanks to the author’s keen sense of humour, evidenced in the wisecracks with which she regularly spices her text, the reader finds himself drawn into the wondrous world of “pragglejazzing” (i.e. the term used to refer to the troubleshooting meetings in which challenging metaphor identifications were discussed). These chapters also lay the foundation for the quantitative and qualitative exploration of the

metaphors identified in the large corpus of learner text. Given the indicated time frame of the data analysis, I presume that this large-scale study was the research project that led to the author's doctoral dissertation. Because the identification of metaphors for her dissertation ran parallel to the development of the MIPVU protocol, she distinguishes her own protocol from Gerard Steen's MIPVU by putting the VU between brackets. By her own admission MIP(VU) is a complicated process to follow and it takes a seasoned metaphor researcher to digest the many examples and discussions in Chapter 4. I for one will not enter into a debate about the linguistic foundation for the identification of the metaphors in the listed examples, but I appreciate the effort the author has taken to render this identification process more transparent and univocal.

That same concern for reliability and objectivity is also reflected in Chapter 5 in which the need for the replicability and the stability of metaphor identification are emphasized. The author proposes inter-rater statistical analysis (i.e. verifying the consensus between different raters in applying the metaphor identification protocol) as well as intra-rater statistical analysis (i.e. verifying the consistency of your own identification by repeating the identification process at a later time) in order to verify the consistency of the protocol. On the basis of her own analyses, she was able to conclude that MIP(VU) offers a sound alternative to ad hoc, intuitive metaphor identification, and that it has the added bonus of making the identification process both transparent and repeatable. Her application of the protocol on a large collection of learner texts is also innovative, since her study is one of the first to try out the identification procedure on learner language. The focus on learner language lends the book relevance for metaphor researchers, as well as applied linguists, who wish to study and improve EFL learners' language development.

The quantitative overview of findings from the systematic identification of all linguistic metaphors in 40,000 words of argumentative essays (half of them by Norwegian speakers of English, half of them by British A-level students) give the reader an idea of the number of metaphors in argumentative essays. The data show that the use of metaphor is ubiquitous in the written English of both the Norwegian L2 learners of English and the British A-level students, with one of every six words being metaphorical in use. In addition to that, the study provides the reader with valuable information on how the production of native-speaker novice writers compares with the production of metaphor by language learners. The degree of similarity between both sets of texts appears to be striking. On the basis of the higher production of metaphors in the texts of English learners, Susan Nacey is able to establish that metaphor is an important linguistic feature in the writing of all language users — not only native speakers — with 'preposition' being the most metaphorical word class. This finding leads to a copious chapter on prepositions,

in which the author is able to demonstrate that three out of four prepositions in the corpus are metaphor-related. This bodes for a language teaching pedagogy in which prepositional choice is explained through metaphorical mappings. Instead of having learners study lists of prepositions, teachers would do well to raise their learners' consciousness of metaphorical extensions, thereby stimulating deeper cognitive processing, which will lead to better retention and more accurate use of prepositions.

The book also comprises a compelling investigation into the creativity of metaphor use and the distinction between 'difference' (i.e. legitimate creativity) and 'deviation' (i.e. error) in learner language. To Nacey, metaphorical creativity needs to involve an awareness of the act of creation on the part of the language user. In other words: using a metaphor creatively presupposes deliberateness. Her investigation of both phenomena in the texts of Norwegian L2 writers of English revealed that the link between creativity and novelty is non-existent.

With this book, Susan Nacey has added to the wealth of literature that offers empirical findings on the ubiquity of metaphor in discourse. The study of metaphor is of course multifaceted and innumerable theories have arisen. Susan Nacey's study clearly falls within the cognitive approach: she investigates metaphor as a matter of mind, language and communication. Although she refers to findings and insights from applied cognitive linguistics with its attention to language learning and the role metaphor may play in this regard, I would have welcomed a more extensive summary of the research evidence concerning the added value of metaphor awareness in foreign language learning. This would have reinforced the applied cognitive linguistic stance the author takes when she discusses the relevance of metaphoric competence for foreign language learners. Nevertheless, the book is firmly grounded in the cognitive linguistic tradition of metaphor research, especially the chapter on prepositions, in which she illustrates the cognitive linguistic stance that metaphorical senses are related to the core senses of prepositions in a principled way (making them more amenable to learning). The book may not be aimed at language teachers specifically, but it contains important pedagogical recommendations that tie contemporary metaphor theory to language learning theory. The findings that are presented point to the ubiquity of metaphor in argumentative essays and illustrate how metaphor can be beneficial for the interpretation, acquisition and retention of lexis. It also points to the similarities and differences between L1 and L2 learner production and it sheds light on metaphorical creativity in language learners.

The author's in-depth elucidations of metaphor theory and her conscientious and systematic study of metaphor in native speakers' and learners' texts will no doubt contribute to the validity and reliability of current and future metaphorical analyses. In applying MIP(VU) Susan Nacey has shown that the presumed

fuzziness of metaphor identification can be constrained through the use of a protocol (that has at its core that metaphorical meaning arises from a contrast between contextual and more basic meaning that may be explained on the grounds of cross-domain mapping). Nacey's verdict on the use of the MIP(VU) comes as no surprise to the attentive reader: although the procedure enhances the number of consistent and replicable decisions, it is extremely time-consuming because of its heavy reliance on the manual extraction of linguistic metaphors and the required in-depth understanding of the identification of lexical units and the treatment of tropes such as simile and metonymy.

The central goal of this and other studies is that the incidence of metaphor in language becomes countable and verifiable as to ensure reliable metaphor identification across investigations so that the same phenomenon can be measured in several studies, targeting several text genres. Future research will show whether this MIP(VU) protocol is useful in other text genres or registers and whether it lends itself well to cross-linguistic analysis.

Apart from being an excellent introduction to the world of metaphor research and metaphor identification, the book has a truly entertaining quality. Certain parts demand a great level of abstraction from the reader, but the book is a must-read for anyone who is into metaphor (and if I have understood the metaphor identification procedures correctly, this use of the preposition *into* is metaphorical!). In fact, I would recommend this book to every novice metaphor researcher who needs to be able to identify and classify metaphor in language, but discourse analysts and applied linguists will also find it a fascinating read.

Reviewer's address

Prof. Dr. June Eyckmans
Ghent University
Groot-Brittanniëlaan 45
Ghent, 9000
Belgium
June.Eyckmans@telenet.be

UNCORRECTED PROOFS
© JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY