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Preface

So many times have I been asked the question why I am interested in studying metaphor in relation to language learning and teaching. The answer is not at all straightforward, especially when the question is asked by someone who is a complete stranger to the field. If asked by an expert in linguistics, applied linguistics, education, or simply a language teacher, a more detailed and elaborate answer is likely to be provided.

It is not my intent, at least in this section, to seek a theoretical or philosophical answer to such question. Rather, I would like to take you on a short journey that begins with some of the very first burning questions and motivations that sparked my interest in metaphor, and ends with what you are about to read, my Ph.D. dissertation.

The journey started when I was an undergraduate student at a Second Language Teacher Education programme in Chile. Being close to completing my five-year Bachelor degree, I was awarded a British Council scholarship to spend a year in the UK, in Northern Ireland to be precise, as an exchange student. While in Northern Ireland, I undertook an introductory course to Applied Linguistics at Queen’s University, Belfast. As well, I was employed as a Spanish Language teacher at Banbridge Academy, the largest Grammar School in County Down.

Once I had officially started my regular lessons at Banbridge Academy and had met all other Modern Language teachers, German, French and Spanish, I was frequently approached by one of the teachers of Spanish, Ashley (pseudonym), Irish born, who always had questions about slang words, idioms and proverbs in Spanish. A close work relationship developed out of regular and rather casual encounters about the use, meaning and pervasiveness of such expressions in the Spanish language. Some of the questions, which always initiated our discussions were: ‘Leonardo, how would you say this metaphor in Spanish? Does this expression in English have an equivalent in Spanish? How would this English proverb be translated into Spanish?.

Intrigued by her constant figurative-language related questions, I asked her one day why she was so passionate about figurative language in Spanish. She said “I love Spanish poetry and the metaphor I find in it”. This short answer was more than enough to understand Ashley’s inquisitiveness about wanting to
dive deeper into the meanings of all those numerous figurative expressions she referred to me over a period of one year.

Is metaphor just about poetry? I asked myself. This question took me back to those days when I studied Spanish literature and Spanish poetry in my primary and secondary school years. I remembered, then, receiving explicit instruction on different figures of speech typically found in poetry such as personification or simile. Ashley was right. Making sense of poetry does require some understanding of not only metaphor but also various different forms of figures of speech.

Having completed my exchange period in Northern Ireland and already back in Chile, I graduated from university and received my Bachelor’s degree in language teaching and education. Partly motivated by my teaching experience overseas and a great desire to pursue further studies, I decided to undertake a Master’s degree. To a large extent, this motivation to embark on this undertaking was also generated by the numerous casual conversations with Ashley about figurative meanings of Spanish expressions.

I was clear about what I wanted to investigate. Ashley had awakened a profound interest in wanting to explore this issue of figurative language further. Just as Ashley always showed great enthusiasm about the nature of figurative meanings in a language other than her L1, Spanish, I began to think of what it would be like looking into this phenomenon in a language other than my L1. Some of the questions I started to raise and consider for later scrutiny were in relation to the possible benefits of lexical metaphors for second language learners’ vocabulary improvement. What I ended up investigating, in particular, was the effect of a multimodal principle, the Redundancy principle to be precise, on second language learners’ development of metaphorically-related lexicon.

A few years later while beginning my Ph.D. journey, I began to explore different avenues of investigation. Although I was quite clear about the overall theme I wanted to look into, I was unsure of how I wanted to approach it. After exploring different kinds of territory, some being familiar and others new, I arrived at a relatively safe place where the real journey into what you are about to read would start.

Unlike my M.A. investigation, this Ph.D. thesis grew out of my curiosity, research interest and enthusiasm about wanting to examine metaphor beyond the lexical. The present work looks at how metaphor and metaphor awareness could potentially help English language learners deepen their understanding of texts with metaphors embedded.
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Abstract

The present study examines the role of metaphor awareness in enhancing English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) learners’ understanding of texts with metaphors embedded. A group of 25 students participated in this research. The study reported herein supports the assumption that an enhanced awareness of conceptual metaphors on the part of ESOL learners can help them deepen their text understanding. The Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) was turned into a teaching tool to raise participants’ metaphor awareness and assist them in identifying metaphors in texts. Participants were explicitly taught different steps of the MIP, which enabled them to both identify metaphors in texts and gain understanding of target and source domain relationships in a metaphor. Three sets of data were elicited so as to tap into participants’ awareness of metaphor and understanding of text. The first set comprised a reading test containing metaphors. The second, which tapped into learners’ awareness of metaphor, involved audio recording learners’ collaborative discussions across three different instances. These discussions focused upon the completion of metaphor-related tasks. Once this data was coded and transcribed, two linguistic features were analysed. The first was the length and number of turns in conversation, and the second was the metalanguage of metaphor as indicated by different metaphorical lexemes tracked in the learners’ language. The last data set comprised three journal entries which were given to learners on three different occasions throughout teaching sessions. Journal entries were used to engage learners reflectively in the process of raising awareness of metaphor over time. Analysis of the reading test revealed that participants moved to deeper levels of text understanding. Evidence was also found for learners’ growth of metaphor awareness through the analysis of the number and length of turns, the metalanguage of metaphor and the journal entries. Overall, the findings indicate that the growth of awareness of metaphor appears to have assisted learners in shifting away from shallow levels of text understanding to deeper levels of comprehension.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Context to the research question

The rapid and far-reaching effects of globalisation along with the widespread use of English over the last decades have become manifest in all spheres of life. Mufwene (2010) attributes the massive effect of English and spread into a global language to “the prescription of English as a second or foreign language” in education (p. 57). This, he contends, has had a tremendous impact on most countries, especially those which fit into Kachru’s (1985) Outer and Expanding concentric circles. One of the areas within which such an impact has become clearly manifest, as Brumfit (2004) and Mufwene (2010) point out, is in the English medium utilised to deliver instruction in higher education. English, as Mufwene (2010) claims, has become “the vehicle through which instruction in higher education institutions is imparted” (p. 58).

Reflecting on the dominance of English and its wide use as medium of instruction in higher education, Coleman (2006) observes that its wide adoption is intrinsically related to the widespread phenomenon of globalisation. Within a globalised context, one of the immediate implications of this for education is, in Crystal’s (2008) view, that English in education “…is the medium of a greater deal of the world’s knowledge, especially in such areas as science and technology” (p. 36). This is further stressed by Kruseman (2003) who points out that:

“English is the language of science; it is the language to be used if the ultimate goal of education is to prepare students for an international career in a globalizing world” (p.7)

English has indeed gone beyond the boundaries of science and technology. Not only is English the language through which scientific research is conducted and disseminated, but the language of most domains of knowledge. In this way, Kruseman (2003) puts forward the idea that English is, or should be, the vehicle through which instruction is imparted, irrespective of the subject matter and content area, if our overarching goal is to provide our students with the tools to face the increasingly-widespread phenomenon of globalisation. What this appears to suggest, in Kruseman’s view, is that English has not only become predominantly used in the fields of science and technology; rather, it has permeated through all facets of academic life. In this regard, Van der Walt (2010) stated that:
“Internationally, the academic context is directed toward and by English: the most academic publications appear in English and student textbooks are also increasingly published in English” (p. 256)

Van der Walt’s (2010) position on the role of English in the academic world clearly reflects the direction that English in tertiary education is taking. The role of English as the vehicle of communication and instruction along with its wide use in most academic publications give us an indication that tertiary education is clearly heading towards, what Phillipson (2006) calls, ‘Englishization’.

This profound impact of the widespread use of English along with the dissemination of academic knowledge in education, especially in tertiary education, has created key demands to which students, especially ESOL students, have to respond. On the one hand, ESOL students intending to make their way to English-medium universities must demonstrate that they are in possession of sufficient English skills to succeed in their studies. Students are, therefore, required to provide evidence that they have acquired a given level of proficiency in English –usually measured by the International English language Testing System (IELTS) or the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TEOFL) –prior to the commencement in the academic programme. Terraschke and Wahid (2011) conclude that the reason for requesting proof of English proficiency is obvious; “proficiency in the language used for teaching and learning is crucial to the success of their studies” (p. 173). On the other hand, students are expected to have developed and acquired the necessary academic literacy skills to deal successfully with the wide range of complex academic texts at tertiary level. Students who do not meet the minimum language requirement, and therefore have not yet developed academic literacy skills, set by the tertiary institution usually receive an offer to undertake studies via a different pathway provided that a pre-sessional English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course is completed.

The EAP course is fundamental in providing ESOL students with the necessary skills for academic life. EAP courses, according to Dooey (2010), are geared towards preparing students for their tertiary studies. Some of the aims of EAP courses, according to Terraschke and Wahid (2011), are to enhance students’ academic language proficiency and to provide them with the relevant tools needed to develop their study skills. Although developing study skills is necessary for success in students’ studies, what becomes more central is the development of literacy skills in a second language due to the complex nature of academic texts students begin to face when entering tertiary education. For instance, Shih (1992) states
that “the central goal of academic purposes ESL programs is to help students develop reading and thinking strategies needed to read academic texts” (p. 289).

Nonetheless, developing those skills presents students with some hurdles. In Miller’s (2011) view, some of the problems and challenges which learners usually face are associated with the lexical knowledge students have to develop (as cited in Nation, 2006), what Grabe (2009) calls the complex syntax, and the variety of registers and genres students are exposed to (Hyland, 2007). Each of these areas is, nonetheless, usually well addressed by language practitioners, especially EAP teachers, who very often develop quite effective tools and strategies which assist their learners in developing a sound knowledge of syntax as well as knowledge and familiarity with a large variety of registers and genres.

There is, however, another significant barrier which learners have to overcome, that which relates to the large amount of metaphorically-used words and expressions embedded in discourse or in Semino’s (2008) words in “naturally occurring language use” (p.1). Although metaphor is pervasive in all kinds of discourse and varied texts, namely science, education, politics, literature, religion, and trade (see Boers & Littlemore, 2000; Knowles & Moon, 2006; Littlemore, 2009; Tyler, 2012), and therefore should not necessarily be regarded as complex, it appears that language learners get somewhat trapped in the process of making sense of metaphors embedded in texts. This is, for instance, clearly evidenced when language teachers are faced with their learners’ concerns about the multiplicity of meanings of given words, the metaphorical meaning of prepositions, the meaning of phrasal verbs and idioms, or the overall meaning of texts which contain chains of words which are used metaphorically. What lies behind the complexity associated with metaphors? Why do language learners appear to grapple with them? Where does the difficulty lie? Is it related to the processing of metaphorical language? Or, is it perhaps the result of inappropriate or ineffective teaching approaches to the teaching of metaphorical language?

In regard to the processing of metaphorical language, it has traditionally thought to be more complex than the processing of literal language. Nevertheless, research has indicated that metaphorical language is processed as quickly and simultaneously as literal language (Glucksberg, 2003; McGlone, 194; Pynte, 1996). Thus, processing of metaphorical language doesn’t appear to be the area where the problem lies, though further research needs to be conducted, especially in L2 contexts. One aspect which appears to be central, in Glucksberg’s (2003) view, to people’s access to metaphorical meanings is familiarity with the metaphorically-used expression. Would this be the problematic area, then, to language learners? Would their being more familiar with and aware of metaphor assist them in moving into deeper
understanding? It may well be that the complexity of metaphor to language learners resides in the lack of familiarity with this form of language. Nevertheless, on considering the pervasiveness of metaphor one could assume that learners encounter metaphor in all kinds of texts in their L1, so metaphor, from this perspective, shouldn’t really be an issue in L2. Perhaps, part of the problem has to do with the fact that learners have not developed a capacity to extend the semantic features and properties of words from a literal (concrete) domain to a metaphorical (abstract) domain. It may be the case that developing learners’ familiarity with and awareness of metaphor may assist them in not only spotting metaphor more easily, but also in developing a better understanding of how concrete and abstract domains relate to each other, which could in turn assist learners in getting deeper text meaning.

In attempting to further identify possible problematic issues relating to the apparent complex nature of metaphor to language learners, one could also speculate about the absence or perhaps the inappropriate use of pedagogic tools and methodological orientations that tap into the systematicity of metaphor in language and thought. It is unfortunate that traditional teaching and pedagogical practices have failed to develop and introduce careful observations of the systematicity of how language, in particular metaphorical language, reflect the ways in which individuals experience and interact with the world. This situation is, for example, clearly reflected in how most English textbooks, and therefore ESOL curricula, have failed to incorporate an approach to metaphor that demonstrates how pervasive it is in language and how it reflects patterns of thought which are by and large shaped by our bodily interactions with the world. This lack of consideration and inclusion of a useful experiential approach to metaphor within the ESOL curriculum has resulted in a growing number of language teachers feeling rather hesitant about what approaches could be used effectively in order to teach and promote a metaphor-in-discourse based curriculum. Teachers’ overall unfamiliarity with systematic ways of introducing learners to metaphor in discourse and of leading learners to unravel the deep meanings intertwined in text has immensely and quite negatively impacted on learners’ inability to dive deeper into text meaning and, therefore, to move away from literal understandings. Devising and implementing a methodological tool that assists both teachers and, most importantly, learners in developing, what Glucksberg (2003) calls, familiarity with or awareness of metaphorically-used language could possibly be a route to developing what Shih (1992) labels as reading and thinking strategies needed to read academic texts.

ESOL learners, especially English for Academic Purposes (EAP) ones, intending to make their way into higher education institutions need to be fully equipped with the right tools and skills in order to
overcome lexical, syntactical and more importantly metaphorical obstacles which they may encounter while dealing with challenging academic texts. Equipping learners with the literacy skills and tools to successfully exploit the unique and versatile uses of metaphorical meanings in text requires that teachers not only familiarise themselves with the powerfully pervasive nature of metaphor in language and thought, but also that they are able to implement a curriculum that is oriented towards helping learners visualise those sometimes obscure metaphors embedded in texts.

On the basis of the above context and in an attempt to potentially help ESOL, in particular EAP, learners deal with challenging academic texts with embedded metaphor and assist language teachers in implementing a metaphor-awareness based curriculum the researcher in this study has set out to investigate metaphor, as an everyday phenomenon through which we talk and think, in discourse and what it offers to learners. In particular, the specific area to be examined concerns itself with awareness of metaphor and the extent to which it could potentially assist learners in deepening their understanding of text. The research question under investigation is as follow:

Can ESOL learners’ understanding of text be enhanced through metaphor awareness raising?

What is to be investigated comprises two central components: awareness of metaphor and text understanding. The theories upon which this research question draws are discussed in depth in Chapters 2 & 3. In regard to one of the core areas of the research question, that of metaphor and metaphor awareness, it is worth stating that the linguistics theory which shapes and informs our focus on metaphor and awareness of metaphor derives from the broad theoretical framework of Cognitive Linguistics (CL, henceforth). One of the main reasons for using CL is the need for reconsidering the role of metaphor in text as a phenomenon which does not only serve to beautify language but also serves as a conduit through which a great deal of meaning is conveyed.

The theories which have been utilised to inform the area range from bottom-up models, whose central premise is that text understanding occurs by looking at the most basic units of the text and that meaning is therefore embedded in the text, to socioculturally-informed orientations to literacy which, unlike bottom-up approaches, argue that text understanding is a meaning-construction process through which readers engage in dialogic discussions with other readers (Frawley, 1987; Roebuck, 1998). Not only have these theories contributed to the manner in which text understanding has been viewed, but also to how it has been measured. Thus, the measurement of understanding of text is characterised by measures which
look at the act of reading from traditional and quantifiable perspectives to others which view it as a meaning-making process.

To sum up, it has been pointed out that the widespread use of English as a medium of instruction in higher education requires that learners be equipped with the necessary tools to make sense of complex academic texts and, therefore, access deeper text meaning. A possible route to assisting learners in moving from superficial to deeper levels of text understanding is by drawing their attention to that type of language which carries ‘hidden’ meanings, channelled through metaphors embedded in written texts, which are not always visible and accessible to learners.

**Aims of the study**

In this section I attempt to outline the main objectives which the present study attempts to accomplish through the operationalization of the research question. Before examining the aims of the study, it is pertinent to recall part of the context within which this study arises.

As stated in the previous section, language learners intending to pursue tertiary studies are very often faced with a number of obstacles which they need to overcome in any event in order to make their way into tertiary institutions. One of the major and recurrent hurdles with which students are faced is the complexity of texts to be dealt with throughout their studies. Such complexity usually lies in, as pointed out earlier, the lexical knowledge learners have to develop, the complex syntax, the varied genres, and also the great deal of metaphorically-used language embedded in written texts. The latter, which has not traditionally been the centre of attention in language teaching and learning, is the focus of this investigation. Some of the reasons that compel us to look into metaphor in text include, on the one hand, the pressing need to help learners deal with challenging texts containing metaphor in order to get more text meaning and, on the other, the lack of attention and partial consideration devoted to metaphor in the domains of language teaching and learning. The necessity for equipping learners with the right tools to deal with complex readings in their tertiary studies has led us to research into possible effective ways which would potentially assist learners in developing deeper levels of text understanding. A possible route to helping learners better access text meaning might be the learners’ own conscious understanding of how metaphors are exploited in written texts and of the text meaning they carry. If learners were able to understand the underlying meanings of a embedded metaphor in a text or the meanings of those metaphors which shape the overall text meaning, it would probably be likely that learners’ access to text meaning were also deeper,
thus enabling learners to move away from literal and superficial levels of text understanding. The core question worth asking thus far is how this could possibly be achieved? How could learners’ familiarity with and awareness of metaphor be developed? If the central problem, as discussed above, of metaphor being complex to language learners mainly lies in the inadequate use, or perhaps absence, of pedagogic and methodological tools that present learners with metaphor as a systematic and ubiquitous phenomenon in language and thought, what should these tools be aimed at?

These questions become fundamental in delineating what will be done in a research study and how it will be achieved. In order to have an overall understanding of both ‘what’ and ‘how’, here are some of the overarching goals of the present study. ‘What’ the present study intends to achieve is largely reflected in some of the overall objectives stated below:

(i) to scrutinise the extent to which an enhanced awareness of metaphor could potentially assist ESOL learners in deepening their understanding of texts with metaphors embedded
(ii) to investigate the usefulness of the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP, henceforth) as a tool to not only identify metaphors in discourse but also to raise learners’ awareness of metaphor
(iii) to explore the benefits of the enhancement of metaphor awareness as a tool for improving language learning
(iv) to determine potential implications of the MIP for language teaching and learning, thus assist EAP language teachers in implementing a metaphor-based curriculum

Having listed the overall objectives which this research intends to accomplish, reference to how these are to be achieved should be made. Although this section is not intended to provide a description of the whole methodology used in the present study (see Chapter 4 for details), it is important to briefly discuss how learners’ awareness of metaphor will be raised in order to later investigate its potential impact on understanding of text.

The question of how awareness, metaphor awareness, is raised can be approached from different angles. If we, as teachers, wanted to raise our learners’ awareness of a given grammatical pattern in discourse, what would we do? Would we provide a clear definition of the pattern? Would we tell our students all the possible discourse contexts where the pattern is used and those where it isn’t used? Perhaps, some would say that a well-informed definition would assist learners in being more aware of the pattern. Others would probably support exemplification; giving as many examples of the pattern as
possible. A combination of both may be well supported by other teachers as well; a well-articulated definition together with clear examples may possibly serve the purpose of enhancing learners’ awareness of the pattern.

As far as awareness of metaphor is concerned, would those practices help enhance learners’ metaphor awareness? Recognising the value of informed definitions along with sufficient examples, the development of awareness of metaphor, however, needs to go beyond these levels. Informing learners of how metaphor has been traditionally defined may not assist them well in becoming more aware of it, especially when embedded in texts. As well, providing learners with multiple examples of metaphor may help them better understand their use and perhaps clarify their meaning. Nonetheless, frequent and constant exposure to examples of metaphor may not be the best route to facilitating learners’ access to metaphors in text.

One possible way to go may be developing learners’ understanding of the underlying relationships between domains in a metaphor. In other words, what are they based on? what do these relations represent? what is their composition? Ultimately, what is really metaphorical? Understanding some of the fundamental issues underpinning a metaphor, such as the existence of concrete and abstract domains, may help learners not only identify metaphors in discourse with more ease but also assist them in becoming more aware of them. Such a potential growth of awareness, familiarity and understanding of metaphor may put learners in a better position to deal with texts with metaphors embedded.

The tool utilised in the present study to develop learners’ awareness of metaphor, and therefore help them identify metaphors in text with more ease, is a model called ‘The Metaphor Identification Procedure’. The MIP, which emerges from the theory of CL, is a central instrument which enabled the researcher to implement the metaphor-awareness curriculum during the four-week intervention period. Thus, the implementation of this tool is fundamental in developing students’ consciousness of the existence, ubiquity, and role of metaphors in written texts. Such developed awareness of metaphor is what could potentially help learners unpack those meanings channelled through metaphors and eventually gain a deeper understanding of the text. This is precisely the ultimate aim which this investigation attempts to accomplish through the operationalization of the research question.

The discussion of the rationale along with other significant aspects of the present study is discussed in the upcoming section. Let us turn our attention to the motives which drive the investigation of the research question outlined earlier on.
Significance of the study

First and foremost, as far as text understanding is concerned various dominant approaches to it are well documented (e.g. Carrell, 1988; Grabe, 1991; Urquhart & Weir, 1998). Two of the main dominant approaches to second language reading are those which view reading as product and process (e.g. Carell, 1988; Grabe, 1991), or what has traditionally been called ‘the bottom-up and top-down’ approach. The major criticism and complication associated with these approaches, irrespective of the latter being more comprehensive and focused on the contribution of the reader to the text, is, however, that reading has been largely viewed as a solitary activity where the reader engages alone with the text. This means that L2 reading is thought to involve primarily either a decoding process of the codes printed on paper or a reconstruction of the intended meaning of the writer through the activation of schemata (Carrell, Devine, & Eskey, 1988). These are quite prominent views which are still palpable and clearly evident when examining traditional reading tests in our current English language context. This situation is not totally incorrect. Reading does involve decoding and the activation of networks of knowledge through a process of interaction between the reader and the text; nevertheless, reading also involves an active process of meaning construction (Roebuck, 1998), process which is not accounted for by the traditional product and process perspective.

In this research, it it important to note that reading has been viewed and measured not only from a product-process perspective but also from the perspective that learners collaboratively engage in the joint co-construction of meaning (Swain, 1997; Wells & Chang-Wells, 1992; Wells & Mejia, 2006). Conceptualising and measuring reading from a traditional product-process perspective provides us with a measurable and quantifiable indication of learners’ understanding of text (Grabe, 1991). Examining reading as meaning-making process, on the other hand, gives us useful insights into how learners actively engage with the text through the co-construction of knowledge. Introducing and adopting a perspective of seemingly distinct approaches, process-product and meaning making, to understanding of text is regarded in this study not as exclusive but as complementary. These perspectives from which understanding of text is viewed and measured could potentially provide us with a much broader and clearer understanding of what learners comprehend from a text and how they engage with it.

Secondly, it is also important to highlight the linguistic theory which informs the examination of metaphor and metaphor awareness. The major theory which provides the rationale in this study as to why metaphor and awareness of metaphor are central to our understanding of reality derives from CL. Before
the spread of CL in the late 1970s and early 1980s, metaphor was treated as a purely ornamental device of language. From that perspective, metaphor wasn’t thought of as an everyday phenomenon which reflected patterns of both language and thought. Rather, it was merely constrained to decorative realisations in poetry and literature. In this study, the examination of metaphor is informed by insights from CL. In other words, metaphor is deemed as a phenomenon which is not only realised in language but also reflects the ways in which individuals conceptualise the world. What this clearly suggests is, in the first place, that metaphor does not only function as a superficial decorative linguistic device utilised to simply say things, and ultimately convey meaning, in a nicer way; but it is primarily a powerful conduit through which a great deal of speaker’s and writer’s meaning is conveyed. This is central to how the question under investigation is addressed. The research question in this study deals with metaphors embedded in written texts and the extent to which potential growth of awareness of metaphor could help learners deepen their understanding of text.

Thirdly, of great significance is also the tool which is utilised to raise learners’ awareness of metaphor. The MIP is a procedure proposed and developed by a team of metaphor scholars known as Pragglejaz Group. This procedure is intended to provide metaphor scholars with a tool for metaphor identification in discourse. In this study, the teacher-researcher utilised and adapted the MIP in such a way that it served as a teaching tool to raise students’ awareness of metaphor. The MIP was adapted and slightly modified (see Chapter 4) so as to turn it into a manageable tool to raise learners’ awareness of conceptual metaphor. It is expected that once the MIP is taught over the four-week intervention period students will appropriate it in such a way that they use it independently on later occasions in order to identify metaphors in text. This would potentially enable learners to drift away from literal understanding to deeper levels of comprehension. The inclusion and implementation of a procedure like this may resolve theoretical and practical questions on how metaphor can be made more accessible to learners, especially to those who deal with complex academic texts.

Fourthly, another significant aspect of this research concerns itself with the two research areas which inform the methodological orientation of this study – Applied Linguistics and Education. Although these two disciplinary areas have most of the time relied upon relatively the same methodological traditions, in that both have utilised quantitative and qualitative methods in their examination of phenomena, they have traditionally addressed and answered different questions. Applied linguistics research has predominantly focused on the study of language and language use through the analysis of linguistic
features (Lazarton, 2000). Education has been primarily concerned with teaching and learning (Anderson & Arsenault, 1998) and literacy in its multifaceted forms (Freebody, 2007). The integration and contribution of these two disciplinary areas to the present study has become manifest in how the two core areas of the research question, awareness of metaphor and understanding of text, have been examined. Given that one of the areas of this study deals with understanding of text, which is broadly speaking a major research preoccupation for educational researchers, research methods from education have assisted in examining reading understanding from different perspectives, namely from product and meaning-making standpoints. In regard to the examination of awareness of metaphor, research methods from applied linguistics have enabled me to look at what features in learners’ language may provide an indication of awareness of metaphor. As well, awareness of metaphor was also examined from a process perspective by utilizing journal entry responses, a tool which has been largely used within education research and is becoming widely used within applied linguistics.

As well, drawing upon some studies that have provided insights into the benefits of metaphor awareness for retention (e.g. Gao & Meng, 2010), vocabulary teaching and learning (e.g. Kalyuga & Kalyuga, 2008) and prose comprehension (e.g. Picken, 2005) this investigation seeks to extend further the implications of awareness of metaphor to levels beyond the lexical one. If metaphor has come to be widely recognised as pervasive in language and thought, why would not it prove beneficial for the development of larger stretches of language such as text understanding or, broadly speaking, literacy skills? This question is what actually lays the foundation for the assumption that conceptual metaphor awareness could potentially lead to deeper levels of text understanding.

Finally, of great significance is the dual role adopted by the researcher in the present study. Positioning myself as both teacher and researcher enabled me to develop a better understanding of the value and nature of the problem I was investigating. Through active participation in the teaching process and my constant and on-going engagement in the data collection process, I would be able to develop what Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009) call an inquiry stance. Secondly, given that part of the data collection process involved the implementation of a pedagogic device, the Metaphor Identification Procedure, with which I was closely familiar, being teacher-researcher would enable me to identify certain problematic areas of either the implementation of the metaphor-awareness curriculum or any other general aspects with which students may grapple while using it in the process of identification of metaphor in text.
To sum up, this section has discussed the various significant aspects of this investigation. In particular, it was discussed how the two core areas of the research question, metaphor awareness and text understanding, are theoretically and methodologically dealt with in this study. In the first place, the linguistics theory which has helped us examine metaphor and metaphor awareness was discussed, theory which derives from the theoretical framework of CL. Secondly, it was highlighted that the theories and models adopted to approach text understanding in the present study range from product-oriented to meaning-making perspectives to understanding of text, where the latter is particularly shaped by sociocultural theories of language learning. With regard to the research areas which have contributed to the operationalization of the research question, two central ones were discussed: applied linguistics and education.

It is pertinent now to turn our attention to the theories which inform our examination of awareness of metaphor and text understanding. The next two chapters (Chapter 2-3) are intended to provide a theoretical base for our understanding of text comprehension and awareness of metaphor. In an attempt to have a well-informed and clearly articulated definition of metaphor, Chapter 2 situates the notion of metaphor within different theoretical standpoints, ranging from philosophy and poetry to the so-called dominant multidisciplinary theory of CL. The chapter then moves on to discussing possible ways of making metaphor more accessible to learners, and the process of metaphor identification.

In Chapter 3 the notion of text understanding is situated within and approached from the perspective of different theories. In particular, attention is devoted to product and process-oriented approaches to text understanding as well as others that view reading as a collaborative activity. Chapter 4 discusses the disciplinary areas that have informed the methodological approach adopted in the present study. As well, it discusses the methods utilised for gathering the data sets and the ways in which these were analysed. Chapters 5 and 6 report on what was learnt from the data analysis. Chapter 5 discusses the findings relating to awareness of metaphor. Chapter 6 discusses what was learnt about understanding of text. In Chapter 7 the findings from awareness of metaphor and understanding of text are brought together and critically discussed attempting to answer the research question. The final chapter discusses conclusions drawn from the study and implications for language teaching and learning as well as curriculum implementation.
Chapter 2: Metaphor and awareness of metaphor

Introduction

The present chapter is devoted to the revision and discussion of those linguistics theories and approaches which pertain to the notion of conceptual metaphor and metaphor awareness, most of which fall within the theoretical framework of CL. As well, a discussion on the teaching and learning implications of metaphor and metaphor awareness is presented in this chapter. The following chapter (Chapter 3) discusses the theories and models of text understanding, some of which range from bottom-up perspectives to meaning-making approaches to reading understanding. Dealing with the two central parts of the research question separately allows for tackling the breadth and depth of understanding of each of the areas involved in the study in a smoothly manner.

Before a discussion of CL and the major linguistics theory which informs the examination of metaphor in this study, it is important to both situate the notion of metaphor within a much broader context and attempt to provide a definition thereof from different standpoints. The following sections briefly position the examination of metaphor within the realm of philosophy, literature and poetry. An account of how metaphor has been traditionally looked at and defined from these perspectives is of importance as what we currently know about metaphor as a result of the CL revolution is to a certain extent informed by what was known in philosophy, semantics, literary studies and poetry.

The nature of meaning from a semantics perspective

Prior to any examination of the concept of metaphor, Evans and Green (2006) suggest that it is always worth looking at what is known about the nature of meaning. They point out that the question ‘what is metaphor?’ is, to a certain degree, a question about meaning.

While several approaches to meaning can be found in the literature (e.g. the etymological, the rhetorical and historical-philosophical), one well-known approach in semantics is the so-called ‘truth-conditional theory’. Reference to this approach needs to be made in metaphor theory as cognitive semantics, the framework within which the study of metaphor from a cognitive perspective is situated, developed out of strong reactions against what Evans and Green (2006) call “the objectivist world-view assumed by truth-conditional semantics” (p. 156).
The basic assumption underpinning this theory is that meaning attached to sentences derives directly from the language-world relations and from the necessary conditions in the world for a sentence to be true (Carston, 2011). This approach to meaning, which reduces the meaning of propositions to ‘true’ conditions in the world, suggests that in order to be able to know the semantic meaning of a sentence, one has to distinguish the conditions and the situation where it is true from one in which the sentence is false. This means that the meaning of a sentence, to a large degree, derives from how it relates a particular way things are in the real world. For example, let us consider the sentence ‘oranges are fruit’. In order to figure out the meaning of the sentence, one would have to match the ‘truth’ conditions in the world with the situation to which the sentence is referring. Given that the sentence describes a fact that is true, actually a unique possible world, the sentence is deemed to have a semantically true meaning. Looking at the meaning of sentences as being logic and truthful with respect to the properties and conditions of the world leads us to consider not only those sentences whose meaning is reduced to their truth conditions in the world, but also those ones where their meaning is found to be false. If we take, for instance, sentences such as ‘monkeys are animals’, ‘Australia is a country’, ‘Bangkok is a city’, ‘oranges are fruit’, one can observe that they are literally true propositions as each of them represents and matches a truth condition in the world. Conversely, such sentences as ‘a country is an orchestra’ or ‘the lawyer is a vampire’ can be clearly shown to be false as they contradict a real-world truth. However, it would be completely inappropriate to say that all those utterances that are not literally true, like ‘the lawyer is a vampire’, can be shown to be false. These sentences, which clearly convey non-literal meanings, are found to be false from the perspective of truth conditional semantics. This would suggest that metaphorical sentences are likely to be viewed as false given that they do not match or correspond with truth conditions in the world.

From the perspective of truth-conditional semantics, a metaphor, or any non-literally intended sentence, is a violation and deviation of literally true sentences. This view of metaphorical meaning is quite limited in assuming language to be essentially literal. This suggests that a truth-conditional semantics approach to meaning is not sufficient enough to the examination of non-literal meanings. In response to this narrow view of meaning, researchers within the framework of cognitive semantics developed an approach to meaning that, unlike truth-conditional semantics, did not “eliminate cognitive organization from linguistic structure” (Evans & Green, 2006, p. 156). The approach postulates that linguistic meaning is a manifestation of our conceptual structure which is largely embodied. Meaning therefore arises from the
ways in which individuals’ bodily experiences and interactions with the world shape their conceptual structure and conceptual organization.

The following sections will look at some approaches that view, and have viewed, language as not being essentially literal, but predominantly metaphorical.

**What is metaphor?**

2.3.1 Introduction

Needless to say, an attempt to seek answers to such a complex and profound question can be a formidable task. A number of theories from various fields of inquiry, namely philosophy, literature, linguistics and poetry, have made good efforts in coming to grips with the question of metaphor and have provided us with different, yet in some cases interrelated, accounts and definitions. Nevertheless, a great deal of tension, and sometimes contention, is usually sensed when a single workable definition has to be provided. To a large extent, the difficulty in arriving at a reasonably sensible answer to the question of what is metaphor is by and large due to the fuzzy boundaries of what counts as metaphor.

2.3.2 An overview of metaphor from the perspective of philosophy

In making reference to early philosophical accounts of metaphor, it is needs to be pointed out that Aristotle was probably one of the first to make mention of the concept of metaphor. In line with his philosophical orientation towards metaphor, Ortony (1993) pointed out that “any serious study of metaphor is almost obliged to start with the works of Aristotle” (p. 3).

The traditional and classic Aristotelian view of metaphor derive mainly from two sources, that of *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* (Veronika Koller, 2003). Curiously enough, most relevant and influential work on metaphor prior to Lakoff and Johnson has mainly focused upon criticisms of the partly incomplete treatment of metaphor in the *Poetics*, albeit Aristotle’s account of metaphor is more elaborate in his *Rhetoric* (Veronika Koller, 2003). Koller points out that from Aristotle’s perspective a metaphor is defined as the application of an unknown name through transference. She suggests that this transfer can be either from general to specific concepts or from specific to general ones as it can also be between two specific ones (Veronika Koller, 2003). Although Aristotle’s definition of metaphor is much more complex than the compressed description given above, what is interesting about it is, in my opinion, that it suggests the idea of comparison and involvement of two different domains. The idea that metaphor involves ‘the application of an unknown name’ through transference suggests that the nature of metaphor comprises the interplay
between a known domain and an unknown one whereby one transfers certain features to the other. In a simplistic manner, this definition appears to be in line with that of CL in that one domain—usually more concrete—is used to understand another which tends to fall within a more abstract domain.

Reference to the role of metaphor in philosophy is not only traced back to Aristotle, but also to other philosophers who have recognized its use engraved in many of their writings. By way of illustration, in his review Ronald Bruzina (1973) points out that Martin Heidegger’s writings “deliberately introduce and exploit shifts of meanings and unexpected associations” (p. 305). Metaphor for Heidegger, as Bruzina explains, has a paradoxical place in philosophic account of discourse. The paradox is this:

Philosophy’s account of discourse is to be an account of the discourse of philosophy itself, that is, the elucidation and validation of philosophic discourse itself. The metaphor, however, is at one and the same time both defined against philosophic discourse and inescapably used with it; the metaphor is both assigned an accessory status, if admitted at all, and is the very type of expression within which meaningful characterization for fundamental elements first arises (Bruzina, 1973, p. 306).

What the above quote suggests is that a serious consideration of the discourse of philosophy can’t disregard the contributions of metaphor through which a great deal of philosophical meanings are conveyed. What needs to be highlighted, though, is that philosophy has primarily focused on the significance of metaphor in language, philosophical discourse rather, and has therefore failed to look into metaphor beyond the boundaries of text.

Other areas that have had similar orientations to metaphor are poetry and literature. Just as philosophy, these two have predominantly treated metaphor as a purely linguistic phenomenon and, therefore, have not shed light on how metaphor relates to other domains of life. Nevertheless, reference to these areas is important as they help better understand how metaphor has been typically viewed. Moreover, having an understanding of how metaphor is conceived of within the realms of poetry and literature will pave the way for an overview of how metaphor has come to be understood nowadays from the lens of CL.

2.3.3 Metaphor in poetry and literature

Aside from philosophy, another area which has devoted a great deal of attention to metaphor, perhaps in a more exhaustive manner, is poetry and literature. In literary and poetic works, two figures of speech have traditionally been identified as central to how creative writers enrich and adorn their writings:
metaphor and metonymy. Differentiation between the two is not the major focus of this section and attention is primarily given to metaphor.

A close look at metaphor from the perspective of poetry and literature does not only require an examination of how it has, and still is, utilised in creative writing, but also of how it has been traditionally defined within these domains. Not only is this particularly important because of the recurrent uses of metaphor in poetry and literary works, but also because poetic and literary metaphors appear to be different from linguistic and conceptual metaphors (Rozik, 1978). A basic, and rather vague, definition of metaphor from a poetic standpoint points to the comparison and contrast of two nouns (Bushell, 1996). Another definition which tells us a little more about its use and significance to poetry and literary works is one that highlights the notions of ‘decoration’ and ‘resemblance’ (Steinberg, 1999). Steinberg goes on to say that metaphor in poetry serves various functions, some of which are to beautify linguistic expressions and convey meanings through the comparison of objects or entities that we know with others we don’t know. Looking at metaphor from the perspective of ‘a device used to adorn language’ gives us an indication that poetry doesn’t appear to go beyond the purely linguistic functions of metaphor. By no means, this suggests that poetry along with literature should focus on the functions and relationships between metaphor and other domains of human life. After all, pushing the boundaries beyond the decorative use of metaphor in language is not the ultimate goal of poetry. On the contrary, the ultimate goal of poetry is to illuminate aspects of language so as to make them distinct and unique from ordinary language (Steinberg, 1999)

Such decorative use of metaphor in language is clearly observed in how creative writers use language. Upon reading pieces of poetic or literary writings, one can notice that creative writers seem to use language quite differently from how ordinary people do. Language in poetry and literature is, in Knowles and Moon’s (2006) view, “made strange in some way or foregrounded so that it is different from other everyday usages” (p. 121). This ‘strange’ or distinct usage of language is what probably most people have experienced when reading literature and poetry for the first time. It reads anomalous, distinct, and probably absurd to the eye of the novice reader. Part of the complexity, or distinctiveness, of the literary or poetic text lies in the recurrent use of creative language, very often in the form of figurative language, and in how writers exploit symbolism and imagery along with devices such as irony and personification. The creative use of such devices is what usually interweaves the different ideas, giving rise to a text which is largely metaphorical. In Lodge’s (1977) opinion, the literary text is always metaphorical in the sense that when the reader interprets its content, unpacks its unity, the text is made into a total metaphor.
2.3.3.1 Making sense of metaphor in poetry and literary texts: reference to L2 learners

Making sense of literary and poetic texts requires readers to be in possession of some understanding of what is literal and what is not in order to arrive at the right interpretations. This interpreting task seems uncomplicated to first language users. They are generally equipped with lexical, grammatical, syntactical and metaphoric competence required to make sense of the creative use of language in literature and poetry. This assumption is supported by research into literal and metaphorical language processing. Glucksberg (2003) points out that although literal language processing seems automatic while metaphorical one does not, research suggests that metaphors are understood directly and as quickly and automatically as literal language is. This direct and automatic understanding of both literal and metaphorical language appears to be representative of the type of processing in which first language users engage.

The scenario for second language learners and users is somewhat different. Knowles and Moon (2006) contradict the argument put forward by Glucksberg (2003) by saying that second language learners usually struggle to make sense of metaphors and often arrive at wrong interpretations. This is partly due to the learners’ lack of familiarity with metaphors, lexical gaps, not enough sociocultural knowledge of the target metaphor, amongst others (Knowles & Moon, 2006). These factors may well interfere in second language learners’ understanding of creative metaphors embedded in literary and poetic texts or, more broadly, in discourse.

The difficulty to second language learners, however, does not only lie in the shortage of vocabulary, lack of familiarity with metaphors or lack of sociocultural knowledge, but also and quite importantly, in how the teaching and learning of metaphor has traditionally been constrained to the domains of poetry and literature L1 contexts. Steinberg (1999) points out that people’s acquaintance with metaphor typically comes through the first encounters with poetry and literature at school. From anecdotal experience, my first encounters with metaphor and with other figures of speech only occurred while studying Spanish Literature and poetry in my first language while at school. Unfortunate was the fact that I was never faced with the same situation while studying foreign languages, English and French. The rare occasions when I did encounter a word or expression that was, in my opinion at the time, obscure in meaning, our language teacher would just tell us that “many words in English have different meanings”. Although those simple explanations given by the teacher never clarified anything about the nature of literal or metaphorical meanings, they at least indicated that a word had the potential to be interpreted in different
ways due to the multiple meanings associated with it. Yet, I was very often left in the dark when it came to accessing those meanings which were certainly beyond the literal.

An important question that arises here concerns itself with whether metaphor should be introduced to language learners through poetry and literature just as it is typically presented to students in L1 settings. If that did occur, it may probably assist language learners with the reading, interpretation, and understanding of poems and literary work. Nonetheless, that would not clearly reflect what is currently known about the pervasive nature of metaphor in not only language but also thought.

What is currently known about metaphor has, however, made enormous strides in advancing a notion of metaphor that has so far been constrained to the study of poetry, literature and philosophy. Current approaches to metaphor have also afforded second language learners with a broader view of how metaphor is not only pervasive in poetry, literature and philosophy, but how it relates to other domains of life.

2.3.4 What we currently know about metaphor

As already discussed above, most definitions of metaphor from the perspectives of poetry, literary studies and philosophy acknowledged its pervasive realisation in discourse and recognised that a metaphor involves comparison between two entities. As well, they all admitted that metaphor is a vehicle through which a great deal of meaning is conveyed. However, none of these definitions has made explicit or implicit mention of how metaphor is not only about language but also about thought. What is required, and the upcoming sections tap into this question, is an informed approach that links metaphor and cognition. If metaphor is a linguistic manifestation that enhances the capacity of language to convey an image, the question we are left with is: what is metaphor a realisation of? What does it reflect? Although these questions appear straightforward to address, they haven’t been fully considered at least within the areas of philosophy, poetry and literature.

In giving a current definition of metaphor, perhaps by far the most simple and workable definition of metaphor is the one given by Knowles and Moon (2006). They hold that metaphor refers to language used particularly to make reference to something else different from what it was initially, and originally applied in order to make some type of connection between the two things. Although in this definition there is no explicit mention of the pervasive nature of metaphor in language and thought, it suggests a distinction and perhaps a dichotomy between what is literal and what is not. Secondly, it also conveys the idea and
involvement of two things from apparently unrelated domains of knowledge, principle that is central to a
definition of metaphor from a CL perspective.

CL is a central theory to what is currently known about metaphor. From a CL perspective, metaphor is much more than an ornamental device utilised to enrich creative pieces of writings. Rather, metaphor is regarded as a pervasive phenomenon that permeates individuals’ everyday life (for a detailed account of metaphor from CL, see the following sections). It reflects the way we reason about the world and is realised in language (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). One fundamental assumption underlying the notion of metaphor from a CL approach is the experiential basis of language. This view develops the idea that our bodily and sensorimotor experiences play a fundamental role in how we think of and talk about reality (Johnson, 1980; Knowles & Moon, 2006). This experiential view of metaphor has changed our traditional understanding thereof and has had important implications in different areas, especially for second language learning. First of all, language is now understood to be essentially metaphorical, view which clearly opposes that which was promoted by logic and truth-conditional semantics. Secondly, although metaphor is still considered as a feature of language, we now understand that it reflects the way in which individuals conceptualise the world. Thus, examination of metaphorical language does not only reveal how language is elaborated by the trope but also, and perhaps most importantly, how a great deal of meaning is conveyed through underlying relationships between different domains. Thirdly, due to the ubiquitous nature of metaphorical language, it has come to be understood that metaphor does not only deserve attention in first language settings but also, and equally important, in contexts where English is taught as a second or additional language. If English is to be taught as a second or additional language, considerable attention should be drawn to how language carries meaning in ways which are not always visible and fully accessible to language learners. Fourthly, this has generated a great deal of interest amongst researchers and applied linguists in seeking pedagogical and methodological applications to facilitate the language learning process. In their article, De Rycker and De Knop (2009) point out that there has been a growing concern amongst researchers and applied linguists to turn the theoretical emerging body of CL into a practical methodological agenda for language teachers. Lastly, this broader and much more comprehensive view of metaphor has enabled us to consider it as central to all kinds of discourse, whether it be spoken or written, hence the need for exploring metaphor in discourse in ways which go beyond superficial analysis of linguistic realisations in text. What is needed, then, is that metaphor in text be looked at as visible manifestations that serve as channels through which underlying meanings are conveyed.
The above-mentioned implications of the current view of metaphor for language and language learning are particularly central to the research question in the present study which seeks to examine the extent to which English language learners’ understanding of text could potentially benefit from a growth of awareness of metaphors in texts.

In conclusion, without disregarding the contributions of philosophy, poetry and literature in trying to give us a reasonable definition of metaphor, CL has helped us have a better and broader understanding of what metaphor is in that it links the linguistic realisations of metaphor to the way individuals reason about the world, something which the above-mentioned theories failed to do. Metaphor has changed from a narrowly defined trope used to elaborate linguistic expression to something more fundamental. Hence it is more important for second language learners.

Given the influential position of CL within what we currently know about metaphor along with its impact on and relevance to the present study, it is pertinent to have an examination of the origins of the theory as well as its major tenets. This will enable us to have a clearer picture of how CL conceives of a metaphor.

**Cognitive linguistics**

**Introduction**

Cognitive linguistics theory is central to how the research question, which is about awareness of metaphor and text understanding, is addressed. The centrality is, first of all, tied to how metaphor is viewed and approached in this study. As well, it is central to how learners’ awareness of metaphor was enhanced in this study. The theory or model utilised to enhance learners’ level of awareness of metaphor derives from CL, hence the relevance of it in this investigation.

Various important issues are addressed in the upcoming sections. First, an account of the origins of the field of CL is provided coupled with some of the major tenets of the theory. This is followed by an overview of other related theories which have contributed to our understanding of metaphor as being experientially grounded, including the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT). Also, CL is one of the multiple theories that has influenced our understanding of second language acquisition, emphasizing the bodily and experiential nature of language learning. Thus, a discussion is provided on how a CL view of metaphor fits into the study of second language acquisition (SLA, henceforth) and how it may shed positive light on the
pedagogical, teaching and learning, arena. Right at the end, some literature is reviewed on the role of metaphor awareness and its potential benefits for language teaching and learning.

**Genesis of cognitive linguistics**

An understanding of this relatively new approach to language and language learning requires a glance over the context from which this approach arose. The emergence of CL dates back to the early 1970s when Chomsky’s framework of generative grammar (1957, 1959) was still particularly prominent amongst researchers and instructors. Some of the revolutionary ideas developed by Chomsky at that time were that (i) there is an innate faculty located in the brain which enables language acquisition, (ii) and the assumption that the mind is composed by distinct ‘modules’ or ‘compartments’ which are responsible for different linguistic functions – phonology, syntax, etc. These ideas were strongly criticized by cognitive linguists who argued that such autonomous language acquisition device responsible for language acquisition and language processing did not exist, and that those cognitive processes involved in language learning also operated in other kinds of knowledge and learning (Littlemore, 2009), thus rejecting the modularity view. Another crucial idea which, according to cognitive linguists, Chomsky failed to acknowledge was the primacy of meaning. CL in reaction to such disregard brought meaning to the fore. The centrality of meaning, according to Littlemore (2009), is one of the fundamental ideas of CL. Although by the time CL emerged, various cognitive approaches had already emphasised the importance of meaning, viz. Systemic Functional Linguistics and other typological approaches to language, what has been distinctive about CL is the way in which it deals with meaning and how it looks at it as a linguistics theory. Meaning, from a CL perspective, is not a purely objective reflection of the external world but a way of shaping that world (Geeraerts, 2006).

Overall, the notion of language acquisition device (LDA), the modularity view and the disregard for meaning were some of the notions, which particularly derived from Chomsky’s theory, against which Cognitive Linguists strongly reacted. In an attempt to develop a more comprehensive theory of language and language learning, researchers – who were very probably trained under Chomsky’s paradigm, focused upon not only the cognitive side of individuals but also upon their social nature, thus giving rise to what is now called ‘Cognitive Linguistics’.

From anecdotal experience and personal observation, I have realised that the term ‘cognitive’ may be rather misleading. Undergraduate, and sometimes, postgraduate students tend to constrain the term ‘cognitive’ to Chomsky’s innatist approach. However, its use and application is certainly much broader than
that. In this respect, Hart and Lukes (2007) suggest that it is necessary to make a distinction between “small c” cognitive linguistics and “capital C” Cognitive Linguistics. Cognitive linguistics (in lower case) refers to any linguistics tradition which is generally cognitive in its orientation. Thus, this broad sense of the term can also encompass the Chomskyan approach to language and various Information Processing models which are largely cognitively oriented. Nevertheless, its capitalised variant – Cognitive Linguistics – refers to a particular branch traditionally associated with the work of George Lakoff, Ronald Langacker, Charles Fillmore and Gilles Fauconnier, all of whom made their contributions popular in the late 1980s. The capital label for CL entails that it is not a single unified theory; rather, it is an interdisciplinary approach to language which subsumes a number of distinct theories with the purpose of explaining the relationship between language and other cognitive faculties and how these are mediated by our experiences in the world (Hart & Lukes, 2007).

CL, with capital ‘C’, is a relatively new movement in the field of linguistics which has introduced various notions and approaches as to how language is represented in the mind through experiences in and interactions with the world. According to Evans and Green (2006), CL is a modern school of linguistic thought whose main purpose is to study the mind and socio-physical experience of human beings. This statement is striking as it positions CL in line with sociocultural theories and literacy as a social practice in the sense that CL does not only account for the mind and cognitive faculties but also for how these interact with the world. In other words, language certainly takes place in the mind but in a way that our physical and social experiences in the world mediate both our language and our conceptual structures, that is, the way we think.

Evans and Green further state that CL is an area which was born out of the work of a number of researchers such as Fillmore (1975), Lakoff and Johnson (1980b), as a reaction against formal approaches to language which were dominant at the time.

CL, for Ungerer and Schmid (1996), is an approach to understanding language on the basis of our acquaintance, exposure and experience of the world and, most importantly, how we perceive and make mental representations of it. In addition, understanding the way human beings conceptualise the world and view things around them is an important endeavour of CL as well. To put it another way, if we ask language users to describe what is happening in their minds in terms of concepts, mental representations and images when asked to describe a chair, for instance, people will not only state that chairs can be made of wood and metal; that they may be in different colours, red, white, brown or they may have different
purposes and functions, some for the kitchen, others for the office or the house. More likely than not, it will also be mentioned that chairs are comfortable and very useful. Some people will even be able to connect the concept of chair with a comfortable old chair they have at home which was given away by somebody special to their lives.

All the above-mentioned characteristics and features of a chair clearly represent the way people—those who have described the chair—have experienced the world in their lives and how they have been able to create concepts, mental images and representations which allow them to view the world from a particular perspective that may be different from that of another person.

To conclude, researchers in the field of CL firmly believe that our common and shared experiences of the world are reflected in our everyday language and can thus be seen in the creative way we use our language and express our ideas. It is also believed that these common experiences of the world, which are predominantly grounded in the nature of our bodies, become manifest through the use of metaphorical language.

CL, as a multidisciplinary approach, is premised on a number of principles. A description and discussion of some of the central premises is fundamental to our understanding of theory. As well, it is useful to consider the main themes of CL as they lead us to understand the area of language learning that the research question addresses.

**Major tenets of cognitive linguistics**

Due to the complex nature of the theory of CL and the number of approaches which inform it, it would be a laborious task to make mention of the large number of principles and tenets which govern this linguistics approach. This section intends to discuss some of the central corollaries which contribute to a better understanding of language learning.

A close examination of the CL literature reveals that there are three major guiding principles of this framework, two of which (i & iii) are touched upon in this section. These three major tenets which CL offers us are thus (V. Evans & M. Green, 2006):

(i) Language is not an autonomous cognitive faculty

(ii) Grammar is conceptualization
(iii) knowledge of language emerges from language use

What is important to mention, first of all, is that these three major tenets represent to a large extent a response by the pioneering figures of CL to the dominant approaches to syntax and semantics at the time, namely Generative Grammar. In other words, various of the guiding principles of CL appear to have emerged as a clear reaction to the theories developed and enthusiastically supported by Noam Chomsky.

The first principle is opposed to the well-known hypothesis, that of the modularity view developed by Chomsky, that language is an autonomous cognitive faculty or module which is separated from non-linguistic abilities. This view has immensely impacted on how traditional linguistics has studied language. The study of language has traditionally been separated into distinct areas or modules such as morphology, phonetics, semantics, and so forth, each of which is thought to have different structuring principles operating over different kinds of primitives (Evans & Green, 2006). Consequently, this modular view of mind has justified the idea of separating the study of language into different disciplines. In relation to these different areas or modules, Evans and Green (2006) point out that CL acknowledges that “it may be useful, for practical purposes, to treat areas such as syntax, semantics and phonology as being notionally distinct” (p. 35). Nevertheless, CL clashes with the idea that modules or subsystems of language are organised in different ways and posits that language faculty does not differ from other general cognitive faculties. That is, the organisation and retrieval of linguistic information is not significantly different from the organisation of other knowledge. The cognitive abilities that we apply to speaking and understanding are not significantly different from those applied to other cognitive tasks such as visual perception, reasoning, motor activity.

In order to address the third principle, that knowledge of language emerges from language use, we need to be reminded of the multidisciplinary nature of CL which was discussed earlier. A number of theories and approaches, Tyler (2012) points out, have contributed to the current shape of the theory of CL, one of which is the Communicative Approach. This approach regarded the contextualised functions of use to be a fundamental aspect of knowing a language. Also, it assumed that “knowing a language includes knowing a particular speech community’s conventionalized ways of achieving particular communicative ends” (Tyler, 2012). The communicative approach was an important precursor in delineating the usage-based nature of CL. From this it is understood that linguistic forms always occur in situated contexts and that the choice of form occurs in the service of communication. Thus, in Tyler’s (2012) view, it is not possible to have a full understanding of linguistic form if the discourse context and communicative functions are not considered. Since one of the overarching functions of language is communication (Tyler, 2012), it
needs to be briefly mentioned what communication entails. Considering that most of our talk is usually about entities and events which don’t physically exist but are internally represented in our memory, communication then involves materializing and externalizing those internal conceptualizations. In Tyler’s (2012) view, language, then, is “a set of tools for communicating our conceptualizations of experience and our reflections on that experience” (p. 30). What this clearly suggests is that our knowledge of language, which emerges from usage, reflects the ways in which individuals have interacted with and experienced the world.

To conclude, what has been discussed above has given us an overview of not only the genesis and basic tenets of CL, but also an overview of the experiential basis of language. What we know about language from a CL perspective now is that our common and shared experiences and interactions with the world along with the nature of our bodies play a fundamental role in not only how we talk about the world but also how we think about it. This means that our integrated understanding of language forms and their structures arises from our common experiences of using language. There are some prominent theories within the field of CL that address how our interactions and experiences with the world shape our conceptual structures along with our language use. Some of these are the Prototype theory, the Embodied Mind Thesis and, above all, the Conceptual Metaphor Theory.

**Prototype theory and embodied mind thesis**

The possibility of our shared common experiences of language has led to the development of the prototype theory which gives us an indication of how both the way we reason and the language we use are shaped by how we interact and experience the world.

Individuals are often caught up in situations where they are asked to provide a definition of something, a concept or a category, and do not know how to. From my own experience, I have recently been overwhelmed by one of my older daughter’s questions seeking a definition of rain. Before I attempted to provide a relatively adequate definition for her age of what rain is, she asked whether rain can be cold and warm, just like tap water. From her experience with water and other fluids in different seasons – for instance, drinking cold milk and cold water in summer and warm drinks in winter, she has learnt that water and milk can have different temperatures. As she knows that rain is essentially water she goes on to ask whether it can be cold and warm. It seems that the ways in which she has experienced the world has led her to assume that because water and milk can be cold and warm, rain can also possess the same
temperature-related features. This clearly demonstrates how she is attempting to categorise the concept of rain by taking the cold-warm features of water so as to form an overall understanding of what rain might be.

Another piece of anecdotal evidence, before I move on to more substantial matters, which also demonstrates how people and even young children begin the process of categorization of concepts by taking features of members of a category is that of my younger daughter. When she was about eighteen months she got very attracted to my glasses. She would always take a chance to grab them and drop them to the ground. Such was the familiarity with my glasses and the image of her dad wearing glasses that on several occasions she called other men wearing glasses dad. This, just as the example above, shows how kids categorize concepts, in this case the concept of father, on the basis of the features of salient, familiar or prototypical members of that category – me as her father. This process of categorization, coming to understand the concept of father in this case, is rather pervasive and occurs even at early stages of childhood.

Croft and Cruse (2004) contend that “the act of categorisation is one of the most basic human cognitive activities” (p.74). It seems that when thinking of concrete concepts and even abstract concepts of emotions, some of them come to our minds before others. The reason for such a phenomenon is due to the fact that some members of a category seem to be more salient or representative than others. This assumption – grown out of research on cognitive and developmental psychology – has led people to believe that certain members of a particular category appear to be ‘better’ examples of a concept, either concrete or concepts of emotions.

The pioneering experimental work on prototype theory was carried out by Rosch and her colleagues (Rosch, 1973, 1978). The Prototype Theory is a model of categorisation that, in turn, is an approximation to a way in which we organise our concepts and how meanings are constructed. The prototype theory holds the view that some members of a category are more central than others. For instance, when asking somebody to name a member of the category animal, the most likely, accessible, and frequent member to be named is “dog”. Such a member is then deemed the basic level category or prototype that, in turn, is the best example of the category animal. This is based on the assumption that the concept shares most attributes common to other members of the category, and also because it tends to be the most socially encountered animal in our everyday experiences. The physical and social dimensions appear to be crucial in the construction of prototypes or, in other words, in the way we organise and categorise our concepts.
A criticism of the prototype theory is that it fails to acknowledge and deal with abstract entities. In CL terms, this theory seems to work best with concrete categories rather than abstract concepts; although it does not ignore the existence of abstract entities, it is simply the fact that does not fit well. Nonetheless, Keskses (1997) contends that the notion of prototype can also be extended to some abstract entities, namely concepts relating to emotions. He contends that some concepts of emotions are more prototypical than others. The possible reason underpinning this assumption may be due to the experiential basis of our prototypes in relation to our early experiences with the world. Keskses (1997) points out that abstract concepts of emotions such as ‘love’, ‘happiness’, ‘sadness’ etc. are more prototypical than ‘disappointment’ or ‘frustration’. It is clear that little children’s early experiences and interactions with the world are associated with love, happiness and sadness whereas disappointment and/or frustration occur a little later as the child grows up. Another possible reason we can highlight as to why certain concepts of emotion are more prototypical than others is because emotional events tend to be remembered with greater accuracy and vividness than events less-emotionally driven (Buchanan, 2007).

It becomes clear that the prototype theory does not only provide a theoretical base for looking at the salience of concrete concepts in individuals’ process of categorization and formation of concepts, but it also provides a theoretical orientation for looking at the prototypicality of abstract entities. From the above discussion it becomes clear that there are certain abstract concepts which are more prototypical than others and basically represent the way in which individuals categorise the world. However, what needs to be noted is that prototypical and less prototypical members of a category along with the different source domains which may be utilised to conceptualise a particular abstract entity (e.g. LOVE IS A GAME; LOVE IS A JOURNEY) share something in common: they are all rooted in our bodily experiences and interactions with the outside concrete world. Although understanding love in terms of game or journey might represent two different world views, they both demonstrate the ways in which we conceptualise and interact with the concrete reality.

A continuation and extension of the prototype theory and somewhat similar model that also taps into the nature of bodily and experiential interactions with the world is the Embodied Mind Theory (Thesis). To a large extent, the embodied mind thesis is contesting the traditional Western view which views language faculty as being independent of what we do with our bodies and, therefore, rejecting the idea that our reasoning is largely determined by our interactions with the world.
The embodied mind thesis is a theory which attempts to explicate the reason why we acquire knowledge on the basis of our bodily interactions with the world and how this knowledge is accessed when recognising an object, understanding a concept, or understanding a story. Siakaluk et al. (2008) postulate that the field within cognitive science known as embodied cognition examines how our sensory and motor interactions with the world are fundamental in the acquisition of knowledge and to the development of cognitive processes (p. 434). Followers of the embodied cognition thesis take as their theoretical premise “not a mind working on abstract problems” but “a body that requires a mind to make it function” (Wilson, 2002, p. 625). This striking assertion demonstrates the importance and relevance of the social domain along with our interactions with it. It is evident that such a claim is not a denial of the role played by the mind; rather, it is a recognition that not only do we need a mind to acquire knowledge and a language system but also an engagement with social processes and social interactions. Clark (1999) reasons on the importance of our biological bodies and our biological mind saying that “Biological brains are first and foremost the control systems for biological bodies. Biological bodies move and act in rich real-world surroundings” (p. 506).

Overall, the main underpinning of the embodied mind thesis is that all the reasoning humans do is rooted in our bodily experiences in the world. This notion aligns with that of the prototype theory which maintains that the way in which we categorise and construct our concepts is based upon the early and general experiences human beings have in the physical and, as Evans (2006) states, perceived world. Recognising that human cognition is fundamentally shaped by the ways in which the biological and anatomical architecture structure of our bodies relate to and interact with the world sheds light on how these experiences influence the way humans think about reality. Humans’ conceptualisation of reality is to a large extent structured by our reliance on the concrete and immediate social reality with which we are familiar. Tyler (2012) points out that a ubiquitous aspect of human cognition is thinking about events, activities, feelings, and entities in terms of more concrete concepts. The immediate implication of this is that humans not only conceptualise reality on the basis of their social and physical experiences in the world but also, and quite significantly, they talk about the world relying on their understanding of this physical and concrete domain.

A practical and comprehensive way to exemplify how language reflects humans’ bodily experiences and interactions with the physical world is by looking at the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT).
Conceptual metaphor theory

Aside from the prototype theory and the embodied mind thesis, within the field of CL, one of the most prominent theories which has attracted a great deal of attention amongst linguists, philosophers and psychologists is the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT, henceforth). The theory, which is originally associated with the seminal publication by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) ‘Metaphors We Live By’ is, as stated by Evans and Green (2006), one of the first and most influential theoretical frameworks of cognitive semantics.

To properly understand the origins of the theory along with its contributions, it is of great importance to recall what the context was like within which the theory emerged. Prior to the emergence of the CMT, there was the belief, primarily promoted and supported by the philosophy of language, poetry and literature, that metaphor was a property of, and very often a problem for, language (Katz, Cacciari, Gibbs, & Turner, 1998). In this way, metaphor was commonly referred to as a linguistic device primarily serving ornamental and decorative functions in language, particularly in poetry (Steinberg, 1999). This relatively narrow view clearly showed some of the limitations and constrains of metaphor as being linked solely to language.

Challenged by the proponents of the CMT, such constrained belief was taken a step further. Lakoff and Johnson (1980a) pointed out that metaphor is not just a matter of language; metaphor is pervasive in everyday activities in life and permeates not only language but also thought. In other words, they put forward the idea that metaphor is by no means a device of poetic imagination and rhetorical flourish; that is, it is not a characteristic of language alone. On the contrary, and most importantly, it was pointed out that people can’t get along well without metaphor as it is a pervasive tool that manifests itself in both how people talk and how they think and structure concepts in their minds.

This is precisely the central idea that forms the basis of the CMT. As put forward by Lakoff and Johnson (1980a, 1980b, 1999) and Evans and Green (2006), the central tenet of the CMT can be summarized as a theory in contemporary cognitive science which regard metaphor as a significant constituent of human cognition. What’s interesting to highlight about this view, though, is that metaphor, from a CMT perspective, does not simply reside in the individual’s mind. In other words, it is not a phenomenon that originates in the mind and finishes in the individual’s speech. On the contrary, metaphor arises from our early physical, bodily and sensorimotor experiences with the outside world (V. Evans & M. Green, 2006). This is precisely
what forms the basis of the CMT; that metaphor is not simply a stylistic or ornamental device of language, as put forward in 2.2.1 and 2.2.2; rather, it is something that permeates the ways in which individuals reason and conceptualise the world. What this suggests is that all the reasoning we do and language we express, which are rooted in our minds, have emerged from our early experiences in the world, particularly from our sensorimotor and bodily interactions with the concrete reality.

The idea that metaphor is not purely an ornamental device used in literature and poetry, but an everyday phenomenon of language which reflects patterns of metaphorical thinking, arises from three fundamental findings of cognitive science which are embedded in a larger framework of philosophical claims made by Lakoff and Johnson (1999, p.3). These three premises can be summarised thus:

(i) Thought is largely unconscious

(ii) Abstract concepts are fundamentally metaphorical

(iii) The mind is embodied

The first claim addresses the idea that we cannot help thinking the way we do. While reason has traditionally been taken for more than two millennia as the essential and defining characteristics of human beings, we are not consciously aware of the way we reason. The second statement is based upon the idea that most of our nonphysical and abstract reality, namely ideas, thoughts and concepts, is conceptualised through physical reality. In more simple terms, abstract domains happen to be understood in terms of concrete domains. Lastly, the third principle conveys the idea that concepts derive their meanings either directly or indirectly from sensorimotor experiences. This is an idea which has its roots in philosophical principles of embodied realism (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). Embodied realism, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1999), is a philosophical principle that promotes the idea that the mind and body are not separate metaphysical entities. That is, the mind along with concepts and overall conceptual structure “are not just reflections of an external reality, but that they are crucially shaped by our bodies, especially by our sensorimotor system (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, p. 22). They also state that it is a principle that naturally opposes the disembodied view of the mind which states that “the contents of mind, the actual concepts, are not crucially shaped or given any significant inferential content by the body” (Lakoff & Johnson, p. 37). Consequently, advocates of this view argue against the belief that the body is fundamental for what concepts are. What is interesting to highlight about the mind-is-embodied thesis is there exists a clear
interplay between the mind and the structure of our bodies in how people structure concepts, conceptualise the world and talk about reality.

These three theoretical principles on which the notion of conceptual metaphor rests provide us with an overall understanding of how the biological structure of our bodies and how they interact with the world have an important role in how our conceptual system is structured. Such an influence of our bodies, and more precisely of our bodily experiences, on how we reason is primarily what leads us to assume that the metaphors we use in our language are not just a linguistic accident, but a phenomenon that originates in thought; that is, at the conceptual level.

If metaphor, then, is a phenomenon that occurs primarily at the conceptual level, we are left with the question of how this relatively abstract level can be accessed. In an attempt to answer this question, Lakoff and Johnson (1980a, 1980b) and Turner (1993) suggested that “although metaphor is a conceptual phenomenon, we have access to the metaphors that structure our way of thinking through the language we use” (as cited in Ungerer & Schmid, 1996, p. 119). This suggests that by examining the linguistic realisations of metaphor we can look into the overall cognitive and conceptual structures from which those language expressions have emerged.

Looking at how the conceptual level becomes manifest in language forms leads to consider a distinction between a conceptual metaphor and a linguistic metaphor. Bailey (2003) points out that the CMT, as a theory of cognition and language, provides for two levels of metaphor: conceptual metaphor and linguistic metaphor. Conceptual metaphor, in his view, is a superordinate, epistemic, semantic mapping between two domains, source and target. These mappings usually occur in the form of ‘target domain is source domain’ or what others call (e.g. Evans & Green, 2006) A is B. Linguistic metaphor, on the other hand, which is always motivated by a conceptual metaphor, refers to all those linguistic realisations that appear in everyday written and spoken language.

Examples of the conceptual and linguistic level can be seen in how Lakoff and Johnson (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980a, 1980b) draw our attention to how conceptual metaphors are exploited in language. For instance, they point out that the conceptual metaphor ‘TIME IS MONEY’ (realised in the form ‘A is B’ or ‘target domain is source domain’) is not just an arbitrary expression widely used in the English-speaking community. It is an expression that becomes realised in a number of different English phrases (linguistic metaphors) which, at the same time, reveal patterns of thought. Lakoff and Johnson go on to state that “we actually think of, or conceptualise” the domain of ‘time’ through the domain of ‘money’. English phrases
such as those below are the ones that give us an indication that people view, think of, conceptualise and talk about these two domains, money and time, as valuable commodities and limited resource.

I don't want to waste my time here.

I'll give you a few minutes to answer the question.

How do you spend your time?

We are certainly running out of time.

What do you do in your spare time?

The above expressions, especially the words in bold, show the extent to which lexemes, typically associated with and used within the domain of money, can be transferred to the domain of time. Once again, this is not a pure phenomenon of linguistic transfer where words used in one domain can also be used in a different domain. It is a systematic pattern that reveals the way people view and conceptualise the world and how concepts, especially abstract ones, are understood in terms of others, typically more concrete ones.

This type of linguistic and conceptual transfer is what has been labeled as ‘mapping’. Conceptual mappings take place when one member of a set fits exactly onto a member of a different set domain. In other words, the term mapping, which originates in mathematics, is one that refers to the act of fitting one element of one domain with a different member from a another domain (Katz et al., 1998). This type of correspondence between and across domains is one of the fundamental features, as stated by Ungerer and Schmid (1996), that underpins the essence of metaphor. Metaphor, in their view, is “a mapping of the structure of a source model onto a target model” (1996, p. 120). The notions of source and target models or domains in this definition refer to the conceptual structures that account for the organization of human experience. From the perspective of metaphor scholars, the interplay between the two is such that one is typically and most often used in order to understand the other one. The source domain is the conceptual domain from which metaphorical expressions are drawn. That is, it is the domain from which features, properties and characteristics are taken and mapped onto the target domain (Evans & Green, 2006). The target domain is the one being understood in terms of the other. To put it more simply, as exemplified by Lakoff and Johnson (1980b), the expressions ‘look how far we’ve come’, ‘we’ll have to go our separate ways’ and ‘we’re stuck’ demonstrate the way experiences of relationships like ‘marriage’ are understood in terms of a conceptual domain of ‘journeys’. To apply the definition provided earlier on, in this example the
source domain is that of 'journeys', the one from which properties and features are taken to be mapped onto the target domain which, on the basis of the examples above, may refer to a marriage relationship. What these conceptual mappings or correspondences between source and target domains suggest is that individuals very often draw on their familiarity with the concrete world in order to understand and interpret abstract domains of experience.

In relation to the interplay between source and target, there are a couple of important points that need to be made. First of all, Evans and Green (2006) have pointed out that a central feature of conceptual metaphors is their unidirectionality or non-reversibility. This, in Forceville’s view is one of the central principles of the cognitive Lakoffian theory of metaphor. In linguistic and cognitive studies of metaphor, it has been widely accepted that in each metaphor a target and source domain can be distinguished, with the mappings moving from source to target rather than the other way around. In this sense, metaphors are asymmetrical, and mappings unidirectional (Forceville, 2002). From this perspective, a metaphor where ‘marriage relationship’ is conventionally conceptualised in terms of ‘business’ could not be understood by reversing the mapping of the domains; that is; by understanding ‘business’ in terms of a ‘marriage relationship’. This unidirectional view of metaphor is, however, challenged by other researchers (e.g. Koller, 2002; Goatly, 1997; Forceville, 2002). Although Koller (2002) recognizes that reversibility may be possible in some conceptual metaphors such as ‘eyes’ understood in terms of ‘cameras’ or ‘cameras’ understood in terms of ‘eyes’, Forceville (2002) argues that such reverse movement across domains is much more common in pictorial metaphors than verbal ones. Although bi-directional movements across source and target domains in some metaphors exist, the present study will examine conceptual metaphor on the basis of the traditional principle underpinning the cognitive view of metaphor, that of movement from source to target in the form of ‘A is B’.

Secondly, another observation worth making relates to which features and aspects of the source domain are mapped onto the target domain. In addressing this issue, Evans and Green (2006) refer to what they call ‘highlighting’ and ‘hiding’. These, in their view, are two central features of the mapping process between source and target domains and, therefore, represent a central aspect of conceptual metaphors. Highlighting refers to those features of a domain which stand out in the mapping process across domains. Hiding, on the other hand, refers to those features which are not highly prominent and, therefore, do not usually become evident in the mapping process. By way of exemplification, in understanding the metaphor ‘argument is war’ there are some clear war-related properties that are mapped onto the argument domain.
Expressions such as ‘he attacked every point in my argument’, ‘he won the argument’, etc. provide some clear evidence of how aspects of the domain of war are highlighted in understanding the domain of argument. There are other aspects, however, which are hidden. In other words, some features which do not become salient and are, therefore, not mapped onto the domain of argument. For instance, we do not regard people involved in an argument as ‘soldiers’, ‘civilians’, ‘chiefs’, ‘commandos’, etc. These features of war are clearly not highlighted in the mapping domain process between ‘argument’ and ‘war’. What this may indicate is that only certain prototypical features of the source domain become more salient and therefore highlighted in the mapping process. This, to a certain extent, relates to what was discussed in 2.4 where we discussed the prototypical nature of concepts and how these are experientially driven. It may be that what becomes highlighted and/or hidden in the mapping of source and target domains is closely connected with the degree of prototypicality of features of the source domain.

So far various central ideas about conceptual metaphor have been put forward. First of all, it has been noted that the notion of metaphor from a CL perspective differ a great deal from those views of traditional philosophy, literature and poetry. From a philosophical perspective, metaphor is a property of language. The CL view of metaphor, on the other hand, holds that metaphor is a property of concepts, and not of words alone (Kövecses, 2010). As well, it was pointed out that the notion of conceptual metaphor is rooted in the assumption that our bodily experiences and interactions with the concrete world are crucial in shaping our conceptual system. This conceptual level of metaphor manifests itself in everyday linguistic expressions in written and spoken language.

Despite the great contributions of the CMT to the field of language and cognition and in particular to the broad study of metaphor, there appear to be some problems associated with it. The CMT, as any theory, has not been exempt from criticism and critical evaluations thereof.

Some problems associated with the CMT

Upon examining research into metaphor, especially within the field of CL and conceptual metaphor theory, one can clearly see that researchers coming from different backgrounds remarkably come to the same conclusion as far as the nature of metaphor is concerned: metaphor is not just a matter of language but also, and quite importantly, of thought. Despite this widespread agreement on the nature of metaphor, there have been some problems associated with how metaphor can be identified in language.
Being able to identify a metaphor in language and/or discourse is a task that apparently goes beyond the capacity to describe it or define it. Put it differently, being able to describe a metaphor or provide a definition thereof does not necessarily mean being able to identify between what is and what is not a metaphor. Anyone with an interest in language, poetry or philosophy could read a book on metaphor and easily recite a workable definition of it. However, reciting a definition of metaphor from a certain book does not imply having the capacity to identify them in language. This process of identification of metaphor is precisely what has caused some problems for metaphor scholars; problems which have primarily situated around the question of whether any explicit criteria can be utilised to identify metaphor in language, whether it be written or spoken.

This question, however, requires us to make another consideration. It appears that thinking of what constitutes a metaphor in language, and how they can be identified, automatically leads us to consider what is not a metaphor. In other words, being faced with the task, and potentially the problem, of identifying a metaphor in language requires that judgements and evaluations be made about not only what is metaphorical but also about what is literal. When and in which contexts are these judgements and evaluations made? Two broad contexts can be identified. The first relates to the use and understanding of metaphor. The second concerns itself with metaphor research. In regard to the former, language users constantly have to make sense of language, whether it be spoken or written, and make appropriate judgements and decisions as to whether what is being said or heard is metaphorical or not (Knowles & Moon, 2006). This is an area which has attracted the attention of many researchers wanting to investigate whether access to metaphorical meanings occurs directly or indirectly. As for the latter, metaphor scholars, when investigating metaphor in discourse, are faced with the challenging task of deciding what constitutes a metaphor in language; therefore, key judgements and decisions have to be made in order to draw a clear line between what is literal and what is metaphorical.

In order to do this, researchers have to have clear criteria which enable them to identify metaphor in language. The question that arises here is whether it is really necessary for researchers to have clear and explicit criteria to carry out a process of metaphor identification. Wouldn’t just intuition be enough? To a certain extent, this question is addressed by Low (1999) in his chapter on validating metaphor research projects where he discusses the extent to which researchers themselves could decide unilaterally what is metaphorical and what is not. It may seem reasonable to allow the researcher to utilise their knowledge and intuition to determine what counts as a metaphor. Their knowledge of the language and metaphorical
intuitions are, in Knowles and Moon’s (2006) view, what primarily drive researchers’ decisions about what constitutes a metaphor. Low (1999) goes on to state that “the idea that the researcher examines the text and unilaterally decides what is and is not metaphorical is perhaps the commonest approach to identification” (p. 49). For instance, in a study (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999), whose primary goal was to examine the metaphors used by students and teachers when referring to teaching, learning and language, the researchers relied upon their own intuition and knowledge of metaphor and language when identifying metaphors in one of the data sets. In Deignan’s (1999) view such reliance and unilateral power on the part of the researcher to decide what is metaphorical is what has come to be labelled as ‘informed intuition’.

Using the researcher’s own intuition to identify metaphor in language has certain advantages. First and foremost, it is the least time-consuming procedure that can be utilised in the process of metaphor identification (Low, 1999). Instead of following different criteria and applying them to the sample that is intended to be analysed for metaphor, researchers may easily and directly access their knowledge of language and metaphor along with their intuition in order to make relatively quick decisions about what is metaphorical and what is not. As well, by deciding unilaterally on what is metaphor, researchers can come up with their own identification criteria and, therefore, exert a greater deal of control over them, which in turn allows them to make the necessary adjustments to suit the specific needs of the research project. Lastly, drawing on their knowledge and experience in different fields and disciplines, it is possible that researchers be more responsive to the material or linguistic samples being analysed.

Although using the researcher’s own intuition to identify metaphor in language has certain advantages, there may be some serious dangers. The first disadvantage of relying solely on the researcher’s intuition is that great measures of subjectivity and randomness are always likely to prevail, especially in cases where expressions are not clearly demarcated by the speaker or writer as metaphoric (Low, 1999). Having unclear demarcations of whether an expression is metaphoric or not may lead the researcher to get biased in the identification process. This problem may be further complicated by the “vagueness and open character of metaphors” as well as the lack of well-established parameters for metaphor identification (Siquiera, Souto de Oliveira, Hubert, Faé de Almeida, & Brangel, 2009). Another important danger of unilateral identification is what Low (1999) calls “the recency effect” (p. 49). As defined by the Oxford Dictionary of Psychology (2009), the recency effect refers to when one is asked to recall items on a list in any given order, those items that appear at the end of the list are much more likely to be recalled than others. This notion is linked to the idea of unilateral metaphor identification in that metaphor
scholars, according to Low, “are likely to have a heightened sensitivity to metaphors they have been working in the recent past” (p. 49). Recent experience with certain metaphors may lead researchers to over-identify certain expressions which have little or no metaphorical content or under-identify others which are clearly demarcated as metaphor.

A possible route to avoiding these problematic issues involved in identifying metaphors unilaterally could be having a clear set of criteria and well-established method that allows us to identify metaphors in language without engaging too personally in the identification process. A method like this would not only provide the researcher with clearer parameters when deciding on what is metaphorical and what is not, it would also provide him/her with a more systematic procedure for identifying metaphor in any kind of discourse, especially in naturally-occurring discourse.

Looking at this problem of identification, a clear set of steps and criteria is already available for use to anyone with the aim and interest in identifying metaphor in discourse in a more systematic, objective and empirical manner. Such operational procedure for metaphor identification has come to be popularly known under the name of Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP, henceforth). One important thing worth highlighting about the MIP is that it was a procedure primarily intended to assist researchers in moving away from the identification of metaphor in laboratory-based and artificially-created language data to naturally-occurring discourse (Pasma, 2012). The ultimate goal was to provide researchers with a more rigorous method of metaphor identification in real language data.

Having a clear set of procedures for metaphor identification has implications for second language learners. Unlike L1 users who typically have a capacity and, as Knowles and Moon (2006) say, ‘intuition’ to recognise certain figurative forms in their L1, L2 learners need to be equipped with tools to recognise the cognitive (or conceptual) domain that lies beneath the linguistic realizations of a metaphor. Due to the apparently unrelated mapping between the different domains of knowledge that underpins a conceptual metaphor, L2 learners, in Boers’ (2004) view, need to develop certain conceptual skills (e.g. association and analogical reasoning) to unpack the metaphorical meaning of a word or expression. The MIP, in particular how it has been used in the present study, is intended to be used in ways that enable learners to identify metaphors and the mappings across domains that underpin their conceptual structure.

Let us now turn our attention to a more detailed description of the MIP.

**Identification of metaphor**
Fully aware that the identification of metaphor in discourse requires the application of an operational procedure that enables researchers to not only identify metaphorical occurrences in a more systematic manner but also one that allows them to identify them more objectively and empirically, the present section is intended to describe and discuss a clear set of steps and criteria for identification under the name of MIP.

In an attempt to move away from the examination of laboratory and artificially constructed examples of metaphor, metaphor scholars began to feel the pressing need to investigate metaphor in naturally occurring discourse (Steen, 2002). In order to do so, metaphor scholars needed a reliable, systematic and relatively objective procedure with clear criteria that helped them identify metaphors in written and spoken discourse. Knowing that the process of metaphor identification cannot be carried out solely on the basis of the researcher’s knowledge of language and intuitions, metaphor scholars, then, created a procedure which would allow them to identify metaphors in discourse in a more rigorous and repeatable manner. The procedure created by metaphor scholars became known under the name of MIP.

The procedure is realised in four different steps where the third is sub-divided into three. The steps are as follows (Semino, 2008, p. 23):

1. Read the entire text-discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text-discourse.
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.
   (b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. Basic meanings tend to be:
       - More concrete; what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste.
       - Related to bodily action.
       - More precise (as opposed to vague).
       - Historically older

Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.
(c) If the lexical unit has a more basic-contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.

4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical.

Following each of the above steps would allow metaphor analysts to identify linguistic realisations of metaphors in discourse. Central to the identification process is the final decision that has to be made about whether a lexical unit is metaphorical or not. This is, after all, the overall objective of the MIP – that of identifying and determining whether a lexical unit conveys a metaphorical meaning or not. If a lexical unit is found to be non-metaphorical, it does not necessarily mean that it is being used literally (Pragglejaz, 2007). The lexical item may well express other forms of figurative meanings such as metonymy, simile, hyperbole, and so forth.

In order to understand the application of the MIP and what it really attempts to identify in discourse, it is important to understand the distinction between conceptual metaphor and a linguistic metaphor. A conceptual metaphor, as discussed in 2.5, is a mapping between two conceptual domains of knowledge where one tends to be more concrete than the other. In Kövecses’ (2010) view, conceptual metaphors “are sets of mappings between a more concrete or physical source domain and a more abstract target domain (p. 77).” Correspondences across these two domains provide an indication of how people understand and conceptualise abstract concepts in terms of other more concrete ones. That is, these correspondences tell us something about people’s underlying metaphorical patterns of thought. A linguistic metaphor, on the other hand, is an instantiation or manifestation of the conceptual metaphor in discourse. This implies that at the level of language, entities which belong to the target domain, i.e. the one which is more abstract, are lexicalized by using words and expressions from the source domain, i.e. the more concrete one. These lexicalized realisations are what we know as linguistic metaphor or metaphorical expressions.

How does this relate to the MIP? Having a clear distinction between the conceptual and linguistic levels of a metaphor is pivotal to understanding the use and application of the MIP in language data. When applied to language data, in particular to naturally-occurring discourse, the MIP is utilised to identify the linguistic realisations of metaphor, and not the underlying conceptual patterns of thought. Hence, several researchers (Deignan, 1999) have gone on to suggest that the application of the MIP in discourse should be labelled as linguistic metaphor identification. This, however, does not necessarily imply that metaphorical patterns of thought cannot be determined through the identification of linguistic realisations of metaphor. On
the contrary, the use and application of the MIP advocates a bottom-up approach to metaphor analysis in which the analyst proceeds from the identification of linguistic forms to determining conceptual structures and inferring patterns of cognitive processing. This suggests, then, that the MIP is not just a tool for identifying linguistic realisations of metaphor but also a means through which people’s underlying metaphorical patterns of thought can be determined and inferred through the examination of such realisations.

In the present study the MIP has served different purposes. First of all, the MIP has been turned into a teaching tool utilised predominantly to potentially enhance language learners’ awareness of metaphor. Aside from being a metaphor-awareness raising tool, the MIP was also used for metaphor identification throughout the teaching-intervention period. As a metaphor identification tool, the MIP was used by the students and not by the researcher as has traditionally been the case. Upcoming sections provide a clear account of the use and application of the MIP in the present study.

Given the centrality of the notion of metaphor awareness in the present study, being one of the core areas of the research question, of great significance is to situate such notion within a much broader context. Fully aware that metaphor is realised, for the most part, in language, it is pertinent to position the concept of metaphor awareness within the context of language awareness (LA, henceforth).

**Language awareness**

Before a close look at awareness of metaphor, it is important to explore the language awareness territory in order to examine the ways in which metaphor awareness can be accommodated within the LA broader context. This is pivotal as having an understanding of the underpinnings of language awareness may help pave the way to the exploration of what lies behind the concept of metaphor awareness.

One of the first clear moves towards changing this scenario was made by Hawkins, the founder of the Language Awareness movement in the U.K., in his book *Awareness of language: An introduction* (Svalberg, 2007). One of the central ideas put forward in his publication concerned itself with shifting the perspective from which language teaching and learning were looked at. Hawkins stated that the focus from the teacher needed to be shifted to ‘the child’s eye’. That is, learners should begin to be stimulated and consistently encouraged to ask questions, which are typically taken for granted, about language, the function and role it plays in the lives of individuals. By gradually drifting pupils’ explicit attention to and reflection on these aspects of language, Hawkins (Hawkins, 1984) believed that children’s difficulties that
emerged in the school education context could be overcome, especially in the transition process from primary to secondary school. What was further postulated was that explicit reflection on language, both native and foreign, should form an integral part of the school curriculum. This idea is reflected in what Hawkins calls ‘language across the curriculum’. By this he meant an opportunity where teachers across disciplines, language areas and schools could discuss the potential of greater awareness as a way of interrogating, questioning and improving teaching and learning methodologies, especially those which tended to represent parochial viewpoints of language learning (Ellis, 2012).

In practice, the actual school curriculum proposal of Hawkins consisted of an interplay between mother tongue studies, foreign language studies and language awareness work. Ellis (2012) points out that learners, under this model, “would be assisted to develop skills such as noticing and the articulating of linguistic intuitions, and to apply them both to their mother tongue and the language(s) they learn” (p. 3). Ellis’ observation appears to resonate with the ideas put forward by Hawkins in his 1984 publication, as mentioned earlier, where he stated that language difficulties can be overcome by drawing learner’s explicit attention to different aspects of language. By developing noticing skills and linguistic intuitions, as Ellis points out, language learners would be afforded with particular skills that might enable them to have a better understanding of language and to be better language users.

Having broadly looked at the context within which the Language Awareness movement emerged, we are now left with the question of how it can be defined. Before a definition is provided, it is pertinent to highlight that the scope of language awareness has been particularly broad across different areas within education and applied linguistics such as language policy (Svalberg, 2007), curriculum (e.g. Candelier, 1992), the teaching of culture (e.g. Balboni, 1993), along with language teaching and learning. Language awareness, Svalberg (2007) observes, “straddles a cognitive to sociocultural spectrum and involves such apparently distinct areas of research and practice as cognitive linguistics (attention and awareness in language learning), language teaching, language use and intercultural communication” (p. 287). The broad scope of the term along with its multiple applications and uses in different domains has, therefore, given rise to several definitions which, after all, all contribute to a broader and better understanding of the term.

One of the most workable definitions of language awareness is provided by the Association for Language Awareness (e.g. Schwerdtfeger, 1993) which has defined it as “explicit knowledge about language, and conscious perception and sensitivity in language learning, language teaching and language use” (para. 1). Of interest is to see that embedded in this definition of language awareness one can find
explicit reference to not only the formal properties of language but also to how language is used. This is to some extent in line with the definition provided by James (2014) and James and Garrett (1999) where language awareness is defined as an individual’s sensitivity to and conscious awareness of not only the nature of language but also of its role in human life. This definition reaffirms the idea that being aware of language also comprises understanding the ways language functions in social life; that is, how language is used in different social contexts and how it serves different purposes. This in turn suggests that an examination of language awareness requires not only a consideration of explicit knowledge of the formal constituents of language but also of the social dimension of language and language use.

Such consideration of the social dimension becomes clearly manifest in how language awareness is typically categorised. In Leets and Howard’s (1991) view the operationalization of language awareness has fallen within five different interrelated dimensions: (i) the affective dimension, (ii) social dimension, (iii) power, (iv) cognitive and (v) performance levels. The social dimension of language awareness, they observe, is crucial as it helps speakers improve their intercultural relations with speakers from other ethnic backgrounds. They go on to state that “language awareness is a vehicle to raise consciousness and improve the relations between different ethnic groups and diverse cultures” (1993). What this, interestingly, appears to suggest is that a heightened awareness of language would not only assist speakers in better understanding the formal mechanisms of language but it would also enable them to have better sense of the nature of language itself and how it functions in social contexts.

Acknowledging the social dimension of language awareness assumes recognition of the dynamic nature of language. In order to examine language awareness as conscious knowledge of language being socially situated, a methodological framework is required for such scrutiny. The following section discusses the notion of language awareness as methodology (Leets & Giles, 1993, p. 159). Relevant to the present study is Borg’s language awareness methodology which provides a critical view of how language and language awareness could be methodologically approached. It also sheds some light into how language learning and teaching can benefit from language awareness as methodology. Next is a discussion of Borg’s methodological view of how language and language awareness should be addressed.

**Language awareness as methodology**

The previous section provided a brief account of what language awareness entails. It was pointed out that the notion of language awareness comprises, amongst other things, the idea of conscious knowledge of properties of language along with that of language use. From this it became clear that being
linguistically aware involves both knowing the formal properties and mechanisms of language and knowing how language is used in a variety of social contexts. In order to be able to investigate language awareness from these two perspectives, it is important to have a methodological framework that enables us to look at language awareness from these two viewpoints.

An approximation to this is Simon Borg’s (1994) proposal of language awareness as methodology. Although his observations were primarily oriented towards developing teachers’ awareness of language along with the processes involved in teaching and learning, his suggestions on how language and language awareness should be explored may very well be applied to developing awareness of language learners, hence its relevance to the present study. Along with discussing each of the features of Borg’s language awareness methodology, I shall attempt to comment on their applicability to the present study.

It is important to observe that the idea of looking at language awareness as methodology, Borg states, “denotes a process/product view of language learning not just on the outcomes of learning (i.e. knowledge about language) but also on the means through which these outcomes can be reached” (Borg, 1994). This dual perspective suggests, as will be shown in the features of the methodology, that an exploration of language and language awareness should not only entail observations of an individual’s awareness of language at a given point in time (i.e. product) but also of the on-going dynamic processes of how the individual has come to be aware (i.e. process).

The first feature Borg discusses is that language awareness methodology must entail a constant and ongoing investigation of language as an active and dynamic phenomenon. In this respect, Svalberg (2007) pointed out that by analysing language as a dynamic phenomenon, knowledge is then assumed to be constructed rather than discovered. Indeed, taking on the view of language as being constructed rather than discovered has implications for how language awareness should be investigated. If language is to be examined as an active and dynamic phenomenon, it would suggest that, instead of viewing language awareness as static, it should be viewed as a constant process of construction and transformation. It seems that Svalberg’s claim is in line with the constructivist theory of learning which, in its broadest sense, view learning and knowledge as being socially constructed. The constructivist theory of knowledge and learning, in Pritchard and Woolland’s (2010) view, “draws a picture of knowledge and understanding as being slowly constructed” (p. 5). This active and dynamic view of language and language awareness has a great deal of correspondence and resonance with how awareness in the present study was investigated. In line with this view, it was decided to examine learners’ awareness (of metaphor) as something that is
constructed, and possibly transformed, over time. Taking on this perspective in the analysis and examination of learners' awareness entailed close scrutiny into what occurred throughout the process of becoming more aware (of metaphor). Central to this was the analysis of students' talk as a way of exploring the process through which students' awareness was potentially developed.

In line with this way of analysing learners' language and language awareness is Borg's (1994) second methodological feature. His second feature of LA as methodology points to the importance of encouraging learners to not only think about language but also, and most importantly, to talk about language with other peers. In his view, it is important that "learners are actively encouraged to discuss the language analytically" (1994, p. 62). In order for learners to develop a reflexive and analytical capacity to talk about language with others, it is pivotal, as Borg (1994) suggests, to develop learners' metalanguage for doing so. This would therefore suggest that being linguistically aware would eventually involve having the metalanguage to talk about it in a reflexive and analytical manner. This methodological feature of Borg's proposal is also well aligned with how learners' awareness (of metaphor) was approached in the present study. In order to find a way of keeping track of learners' potential growth of awareness, it was decided to examine their metalanguage (of metaphor) as evidence of their being aware.

Another language awareness methodological feature, which also applies to this investigation, worth highlighting is to do with the reason behind enhancing language awareness. What is the purpose of developing learners', and/or teachers', language awareness? Borg (1994) outlines that the main goal of developing awareness is twofold: to develop the learner's knowledge and understanding of language, and enhance their language learning skills. These two, in his view, will in turn enable the learner to become more independent. In relation to the present study, it needs to be pointed out that the overarching goal of this investigation is to examine the extent to which an enhanced awareness (of metaphor) could potentially deepen learners' understanding of texts with metaphors embedded. Developing learner's awareness (of metaphor), then, would not only deepen their knowledge and understanding of language, as Borg suggests in this methodological feature, but also their overall language learning skills.

The last methodological feature worth mentioning is linked to the learner's level of engagement and interaction in the talk exchange. Borg (1994) points out that involvement and engagement are fundamental in the process of discovery. In line with this idea is what Kowal & Swain (Borg, 1994, p. 62) point out in regard to the development of awareness: it is by means of talk in collaborative tasks that consciousness is raised. In their view, collaboration, or involvement and engagement in Borg's words, appears to be pivotal
in the process of becoming aware. This shows that being involved in a talk exchange is not only an opportunity for learners to share ideas, it is an instance through which consciousness is created and raised. In relation to the present study, these ideas are particularly relevant in that learners’ talk exchanges were central to the examination of their potential growth of awareness.

From the methodological features discussed above it can be clearly observed that an appropriate examination of language and language awareness should entail, as Borg (1994) suggests, a product and process perspective; that is, an examination of not only the outcomes of language awareness (i.e. the product) but also the processes through which those outcomes are achieved (i.e. process). Relevant to the present study is this dual approximation of awareness. Borg’s features of language awareness are central to the methodological approach utilised in the examination and measurement of learners’ awareness of metaphor in the present study.

Having looked at an overall definition of language awareness along with a methodological framework for how it could be approached, we are now in a position to turn our attention to what forms the core of the present study: metaphor awareness.

**Metaphor awareness**

To begin with, it is important to state that the notion of metaphor awareness in nowhere to be found in the literature on language awareness. Upon examining research into language awareness, one finds that different types of awareness are typically identified such as phonemic awareness (Vygotsky, 1979), pragmatic awareness (Rastall, 1996), cultural awareness (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005), amongst others. Metaphor awareness, however, is a type that is not at all documented in the vast literature on language awareness. To a large extent, the reason for the absence of metaphor awareness within the domain of language awareness is due to the different disciplinary traditions from which they have emerged. Language awareness, as discussed in 2.8, was a movement that primarily grew out of the concerns of educators for the teaching and learning of first and foreign languages back in the 1980s. Unlike the educational orientation of the origins of language awareness, metaphor awareness is a notion that sits within a linguistics approach to language, that of CL. Although research into metaphor awareness sheds light on the teaching and learning of languages, its origin is predominantly motivated by an interest in the metaphorical essence of language and thought. Having originated from CL, which only emerged in the 1980s, the notion of metaphor awareness appears to have been explored only in the 1990s. Despite being a notion that primarily situates itself with a broad linguistics approach, it is a term that has been increasingly used within
the disciplinary areas of applied linguistics, education and, in particular, second language acquisition, thus offering insights into language teaching and learning. These disciplinary areas have also helped us have some understanding of what is really meant by metaphor awareness. Even though the traditions from which language awareness and metaphor awareness have emerged may be quite distinct, their definitions cannot be detached from one another.

It was mentioned in 2.8 that language awareness refers to an individual’s conscious understanding of the linguistic form and social function of language. Transferring this definition into the metaphor awareness domain, one could state that it is an individual’s conscious understanding of the linguistic form and social function of metaphorical language. This approximation to metaphor awareness is probably not far from how it may be defined. Nevertheless, attempting to find a clear-cut definition of metaphor awareness is paradoxically difficult. Although the field of CL, the broad area where the notion of metaphor awareness rests upon, has become increasingly popular, no clear accounts of what is meant by metaphor awareness has been provided. Despite this, reference to certain approximations is worth highlighting. In Boers’ (2003) view, being aware of metaphor entails awareness of the pervasiveness of metaphor in everyday language and awareness of cultural differences embedded and embodied in metaphorical themes, amongst others. Gao and Meng (2003) pointed out that a language learner who is aware of metaphor is one who can “identify metaphor in various forms...” (p. 113). Although these are not definitions of metaphor awareness per se, they provide us with an indication of what may be involved in being aware of metaphor.

To a certain extent, it may be that the paucity of clear-cut definitions and accounts of what is meant by metaphor awareness may be due to the relatively recent interest in the area leading to literature on metaphor awareness being not immensely extensive. Yet, several studies are well documented. These studies have provided insights into the effectiveness and facilitative role of metaphor awareness in language learning and understanding. Generally speaking, metaphor awareness studies have been typically conducted within the realms of lexical learning and understanding of specialised texts.

In regard to vocabulary learning, Kalyuga and Kalyuga (2008) discuss the role of metaphor awareness in the process of vocabulary acquisition. Their discussion focuses on how efficient vocabulary learning can be facilitated by means of grouping words in metaphorical chunks according to a shared metaphorical theme. Although their analysis is focused on demonstrating how the grouping of Russian words and idiomatic expressions on the basis of a shared metaphorical theme may facilitate cognitively
efficient learning, the authors point out that this is an approach that proves useful and applicable to the teaching of second languages in general. In relation to awareness of metaphor, the authors do not explicitly advocate a particular procedure that could be utilised as a metaphor-awareness raising tool. However, throughout their analysis they make reference to developing understanding of common metaphorical extensions in vocabulary, which may resemble other etymologically-related words. It appears, then, that in their view becoming aware of metaphor would involve understanding the lexical and etymological relations of words that have a shared metaphorical theme.

As well, in the domain of metaphor awareness and lexical learning Gao and Meng (2010) investigated the extent to which an enhanced awareness of metaphor could help EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners acquire and retain vocabulary. Unlike Kalyuga and Kalyuga’s analysis, Gao and Meng’s (2010) investigation is a traditional experimental study in which a control and an experimental group were utilised throughout the course of the experiment. Each of the groups received a different kind of teaching intervention. The control group went through, what the authors have labelled, ‘The Traditional Teaching Model of Metaphorical Expressions’ while the experimental group went through ‘The Teaching Model Focusing on the Enhancement of Metaphor Awareness’. The former involved the grouping and presentation of metaphorical words according to their pragmatic and functional usages. The latter involved the grouping and presentation of metaphorical words according to a shared metaphorical theme which was “to enhance the learners’ metaphor awareness” (2010). This is a similar methodological procedure to the one suggested by Kalyuga and Kalyuga, in which chunking and presenting words on the basis of common metaphorical themes seems to be facilitative of and conducive to the development of metaphor awareness, or in their words ‘learners’ conscious capacity’, to learn metaphorical language.

In a similar line of inquiry, it is worth discussing a study which attempted to investigate learners’ awareness of figurative language in relation to their capacity to distinguish literal from non-literal language (Gao & Meng, 2010, p. 115). The study measured the responses of twenty-eight EFL learners to 40 sentences, of which some were metaphorical and others metonymic. Participants were given the sentences and asked to rate and judge them to be literal, metaphorical or metonymic. The findings of the study revealed that learners were more capable of identifying and recognizing metaphorically-oriented sentences in fixed expressions than metonymic ones. In the authors’ view, this appears to indicate that learners’ view of metaphor is constrained to such fixed expressions as phrasal verbs and idioms. By way of conclusion and suggestion, the authors point to the need for explaining “the definition of figurative language to
students clearly and carefully, showing them that figurative language is more than a fixed phrase used only in poetic work”. Drawing learners’ attention the nature of figurative language may not only enhance their awareness but also facilitate the process of learning figurative language.

On the same domain of lexical learning and metaphor awareness, Guo (2007) conducted a study which looked at the effect of learners’ metaphor awareness on idiom comprehension. Similar to the methodology utilised in Gao and Meng’s (2010) study, a control and experimental group were used throughout the teaching intervention period. In order to test the potential effect of awareness on the comprehension of idioms, the experimental group received some special instruction through which language learners’ metaphor awareness was sought to be raised. As part of the metaphor awareness-raising methodology, learners’ awareness was raised by means of explicit explanations and elaboration on the nature of idioms, their systematicity and underlying metaphorical patterns. In addition to this, when learners came across an idiom in class they were asked to hypothesise the metaphorical mappings embedded in it with the purpose of enhancing their awareness of metaphor and facilitating comprehension of idioms. Participants in the control group were not exposed to any metaphor-awareness-raising procedure; rather, they were taught idioms on a traditional basis. In order to measure the potential effect of metaphor awareness on idiom comprehension, learners from both the control and experimental group were given a test at the end of the intervention. Results from the test showed significant differences between the control and experimental group, thus pointing to a positive effect of awareness on idiom comprehension. In order to track the process which the learners took during the intervention, it was decided to interview the students in order to get a better sense of what happened along the process. It was reported that “along with their metaphor awareness increased, the students’ anxiety of learning idioms was reduced and their motivation was increased” (Guo, 2007, p. 159). It seems that an enhanced awareness of metaphor not only contributed to a deeper comprehension of idioms but also enabled learners to face the task differently, and therefore adopt a different attitude towards the learning of idiomatic expressions.

The studies discussed thus far provide an indication of an apparently intricate relationship between metaphor awareness and vocabulary learning. Kalyuga and Kalyuga (2007) and Gao and Meng (2008) showed that presenting learners with chunks of vocabulary grouped on the basis of shared metaphorical themes may improve their awareness and facilitate vocabulary learning. Chen and Lai (2012) investigated learners’ conscious capacity to distinguish metaphoric sentences from metonymic sentences. Although learners demonstrated being more aware of metaphoric sentences than metonymic ones, their conscious
understanding of metaphoric expressions was constrained to the identification of fixed phrases. The authors, then, stressed on the importance of drawing learners’ explicit attention to the pervasiveness of metaphor in language and not only in fixed expressions. Such explicit and conscious attention to metaphor, potentially leading to a growth of awareness, may not only help learners distinguish metaphoric and metonymic sentences but also understand them and learn them (2010). Guo (2007) sought to investigate the role metaphor awareness in the understanding of idioms. It was found that those learners who went through a metaphor-awareness raising intervention period performed better in an idiom comprehension test.

Although all these studies have been clear in what they seek to achieve and provide insights into the potential and facilitative role of metaphor awareness in vocabulary learning, some of these suffer from some important drawbacks that deserve some attention. One of the first drawbacks is that neither Kalyuga and Kalyuga’s (2008) study nor Gao and Meng’s (2010) makes explicit and clear mention of how awareness of metaphor was raised. Although Kalyuga and Kalyuga point out that by learning words in chunks on the basis of shared metaphorical themes, learners’ conscious capacity to establish mental relationships amongst words with metaphorical extensions may be enhanced, nothing is discussed in relation to the actual procedure which may be utilised to raise learners’ awareness of metaphor. Similarly, Gao and Meng’s (2010) experimental study also makes reference to the potential effect of grouping words according to common metaphorical themes on enhancing learners’ awareness of metaphor. However, it does not provide clear-cut theoretical or methodological orientations as to how metaphor awareness can be developed. Unfortunate is the fact that no discussion, or at least description, is provided on the methods and/or step-by-step methodology utilised to raise learners’ awareness of metaphor. Nor is it discussed whether learners’ awareness of metaphor was actually enhanced and how it was measured. An exploration of these issues may have provided greater insights into the relationship between teaching and learning chunks of vocabulary metaphorically and thematically related and the growth of awareness of metaphor on the part of the learners.

Guo’s (2007) study, on the other hand, presents a clear methodological procedure which was utilised in the intervention period as a metaphor-awareness raising tool. Definitions of metaphor, elaborations on underlying metaphorical patterns, and descriptions of the systematicity of metaphorical expressions were some of the tools used to enhance learners’ awareness of metaphor. In order to better
capture the process of becoming aware, the researcher decided to interview the participants in order to have a broader picture of the learners’ experiences and of the overall process of becoming aware.

All in all, the studies discussed thus far do not only shed light on the role of conscious cognitive processes involved in the learning, understanding and interpretation of metaphor but also, and most importantly, on the implications of metaphor awareness for the teaching and learning of vocabulary.

Besides looking at the role of metaphor awareness in vocabulary learning, there are other studies (Y. Chen & Lai, 2012) that have attempted to go beyond the lexical levels. In particular, these studies have sought to tap into the interplay between awareness of metaphor and the understanding of texts. Boer’s (e.g. Boers, 2000; Picken, 2005) study, for instance, tested the hypothesis that raising students’ metaphor awareness could assist them in deepening their understanding of specialised texts. For instance, Boers stressed that it is quite common to find that different metaphors are typically utilised to describe a particular economic scenario. Boers hypothesized that drawing students’ attention to the source domain of the metaphor, or in other words to the literal sense of figurative expressions, would assist language learners in better understanding specialised texts. The results suggested that learners in the experimental group were more capable of interpreting the figurative meaning of an expression even though the literal meaning had only been taught. Thus, learners demonstrated to be able to extend the literal meaning to the figurative meaning of the expression. As well, it was found that learners were more able to reproduce at least one of the targeted metaphorical expressions; that is, metaphor awareness seemed to have influenced learners’ retention. All in all, the development of the learners’ explicit attention, i.e. their awareness of metaphor, to the source domain of the metaphor was precisely what enabled them to dive deeper into the text meaning and to retain the lexis.

In a similar vein, Picken (2005) reports on three studies which examined the extent to which awareness of conceptual metaphors could potentially assist language learners in understanding literary texts. In particular, the study focused on helping learners make sense of what he calls ‘invisible metaphors’. Picken (2005) defines an invisible metaphor as “linguistic metaphors that are comparatively difficult to identify in context” (p. 147). His findings, which are, to a large extent, in line with Boers’ (2000b), revealed that awareness of metaphor did have an influence on understanding of literary texts. In other words, the studies provide some evidence that metaphor-awareness raising enhances the possibility that metaphorical readings of invisible metaphors will be more accessible to language learners. Of interest is to highlight that Picken stresses that implementing an awareness-raising methodology may have short and long-term
implications for language learning and teaching. In regard to the short-term effects, he points out that an enhanced awareness of metaphor is likely to stimulate and facilitate readings of invisible metaphors in literary texts. In the long term, a growth of awareness of metaphor may help learners develop their interpretative skills, thus enabling them to become more autonomous in the processing of interpreting and understanding metaphors in literary texts.

These studies along with the others discussed earlier on vocabulary learning suggest that there seems to be some agreement with regard to the potential of metaphor awareness in assisting learners enhancing certain language and even cognitive skills, namely retention, vocabulary understanding, and text understanding. Generally speaking, the findings from the above studies are quite revealing in that they all shed light on the significant effects of an enhanced awareness of metaphor on language learning, including vocabulary learning and understanding of (literary) texts. However, returning to the drawbacks of some of the studies discussed earlier, it needs to be pointed out that findings from these studies may have provided greater insights into the interplay between metaphor awareness and language learning if certain methodological and theoretical constrains had been addressed. Without intending to be repetitive, some of these drawbacks relate to the absence of clear-cut methodological procedures on how metaphor awareness is raised, how it becomes manifest and it is measured. These are fundamental questions which need to be addressed, particularly when the core of a research question relates to awareness of metaphor.

Partly, in order to address some of these methodological and theoretical constrains the following section is intended to provide a discussion on how metaphor awareness may become manifest. Considering that ‘being aware’ is primarily a phenomenon at the cognitive level, we wish to explore ways in which such cognitive activity may be realised in something more manageable and, perhaps, more observable.

**How does metaphor awareness become manifest?**

Before attempting to discuss possible ways in which awareness of metaphor may become manifest, reference to earlier definitions of the concept may be worth recalling. As pointed out earlier, metaphor awareness is intricately connected with the broad notion of language awareness. It was mentioned in 2.7 that awareness or being conscious of something is primarily a cognitive activity. As traditionally defined, awareness alludes to a state or ability to perceive or to be able to be conscious of events or objects in the perceived reality. Awareness, in Stainton’s (1992) words, refers to a cognitive
process in which an individual becomes conscious of some input. As far as language awareness is concerned, it was discussed earlier on (see 2.8) that it refers to the explicit knowledge about language (2005, p. 142). As well, James and Garrett (Stainton, 1992) defined it as an individual’s sensitivity to and conscious awareness of not only the nature of language but also of its role in human life; definition which, in a way, touches upon the social dimension of language.

In regard to metaphor awareness, an observation was made in relation to the difficulty in providing a clear-cut and well-articulated definition of metaphor awareness. However, by way of extending the definition of language awareness to the domain of metaphor awareness, it was pointed out that being aware of metaphor is likely to refer to an individual’s sensitivity to be conscious of the metaphorical forms of the language along with its metaphorical social function. In general, what appears to be common across these definitions is that they all point to the cognitive dimension of awareness. Indeed, it is something that by no means can be neglected. As Stainton (1992) points out, awareness is “an activity that at least involves consciousness and perception, both of which pertain to the mind” (p. 112).

This predominantly cognitive nature of awareness leads us to consider some questions. Considering that central to the present research question is the concept of metaphor awareness, we are left with the question of whether, and potentially how, such apparently abstract mental activity, i.e. awareness, can be accessed. In light of this question, of great significance is to note that awareness, in Al-Hejin’s (1991) view, is likely to cause a change in an individual’s behaviour or cognitive state which very often results in a person being able to report that they have become aware and what they have become aware of. This is quite revealing in that it provides an indication of a possible route through which metaphor awareness may be explored and how it may become manifest. If being aware, according to AL-Hejin (2004), results in the individual having the capacity to report what they have become aware of, it could be suggested that a possible way to access learners’ awareness may be through an exploration and analysis of what they can report; that is, their language. Looking at learners’ language may then provide an indication of whether they are aware of something and what they are aware of.

An important question that arises here is to do with what aspect of the learners’ language should be looked at. In this regard, Berry (2004) points out that what needs to be analysed is the learners’ metalanguage; that is, the language that learners use to talk about language (2005). To a certain extent, this capacity to talk about language by means of language itself is what some researchers (McArthur, 1996) have referred to as ‘language reflexivity’. This is a term that alludes to the capacity of language to describe
and talk about itself. Language cannot only be used to talk about other languages but also, in quite complex ways, to describe its own essence and nature. It appears that this faculty of language to talk about itself is aligned with the distinction made by Preston (cited in Berry, 2005, p. 6) between, what he calls, Metalanguage 1 and Metalanguage 2. This distinction is particularly made based upon the level or degree of consciousness involved, being metalanguage 1 the one that involves a higher degree of consciousness. In Preston’s view, “metalanguage 1 talks about language qua language” while metalanguage 2 does not necessarily draw the speaker’s or listener’s attention on the properties of linguistic form (cited in Berry, 2005, p.8).

In relation to the present study, the above observations about metalanguage and its relation to awareness are particularly relevant and central to the examination of the research question in the present investigation. Understanding that learners’ metalanguage is what needs to be analysed in order to be able to access learners’ consciousness, as Berry (2005) suggests, it could be pointed out, then, that an apparently feasible route to exploring learners’ awareness of metaphor would be by examining their capacity to talk about language; speaking more precisely, their capacity to talk about metaphorical language. Analysing learners’ metalanguage of metaphor, in Berry’s (2005) view, would potentially serve as a window into the individual’s mind, thus allowing access to their awareness of metaphor.

To conclude, this section has discussed an apparently interwoven relationship between awareness and metalanguage. It has been pointed out that a possible way through which learners’ awareness can be explored is by analysing their metalanguage; that is, the language utilised to talk about language itself. In line with the present research question, this proves highly useful in that it provides both a theoretical base for the study of metaphor awareness and a methodological approach to the underlying question of how learners’ awareness of metaphor may become manifest.

**The position of the present study**

It was pointed out earlier (see 1.1) that being able to understand a variety of texts, especially academic ones, is a major requirement for academic success. Developing the necessary skills for delving deep into texts can be a challenging task to most university students. Such challenge can be even greater when faced by learners whose first language is not English. Throughout the process of developing learners’ required skills for academic success, a number of different obstacles are most likely to be encountered. Lack of lexical knowledge, poor understanding of grammar and syntax along with the lack of linguistic and
sociocultural resources needed to make sense of a large number of metaphorically-used expressions found in discourse (e.g. Lyons, 1995) are just some of the great barriers which language learners often have to overcome. In regard to the latter, it is important to recall that metaphor as a pervasive phenomenon in language and thought becomes ubiquitously manifest in all forms of discourse, text and genres (Knowles & Moon, 2006). Due to such ubiquity of metaphor in discourse learners have to be assisted in the process of comprehending those metaphors embedded in texts so as to be able to fully understand text meaning. Learners’ inability to make sense of those metaphors in texts may result in partial or lack of understanding of the core text meaning. Hence, the pressing need for helping learners make sense of metaphors embedded in texts as a channel through which more text meaning can be obtained. It has been stated that a possible route to assisting learners in getting more text meaning from texts with metaphors embedded is by raising their awareness of metaphor. Developing learners’ awareness of not only the pervasive presence of metaphors in texts but also of the underlying conceptual patterns may result in a greater capacity to identify metaphors in texts. Such potential enhanced awareness of metaphor and greater capacity to identify metaphorically-used expressions in texts is precisely what could potentially help learners dive deeper in the process of understanding a text with metaphors embedded.

In light of this context within which the research question is situated different theories and approaches have been discussed in the present chapter. In an attempt to theoretically address one of the core areas of the research question, that of metaphor awareness, this chapter began by defining the notion of metaphor as typically understood within the realms of philosophy, poetry and literature (see 2.2.1 & 2.2.2). Without diminishing the importance of the contributions of philosophy, literature and poetry to our understanding of metaphor, the discussion moved on to what is currently known about metaphor. Such discussion was situated within the disciplinary area of CL that has provided new insights into what is understood by metaphor nowadays (see 2.3). A prominent theory of metaphor within this linguistics area is the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT). The core assumption underpinning this theory, as explained earlier, is that metaphor is not just a poetic or literary device used to decorate language but, most importantly, a pervasive phenomenon that cuts across different forms of language and discourse. Besides the great contributions of the CMT to what is now known about metaphor, it was pointed out that there are some problems associated with the theory (see 2.5.1). It was stressed that one of the major problems of the theory is related to the apparent lack of explicit and clear criteria for metaphor identification in discourse. In light of this context, the discussion then moved on to a description and examination of the
Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP); a procedure which would eventually help metaphor scholars, researchers and anyone with an interest in metaphor clearly identify metaphorically-used expressions in discourse on the basis of explicit and clear-cut set of steps.

Due to the centrality of the notion of metaphor awareness in the present research question, section 2.8 situated such concept within the context of language awareness. Aside from providing the historical context within which the notion emerged along with a definition of the term, that section was intended to provide a theoretical base for the discussion on metaphor awareness. Prior to such discussion was an examination of the concept of language awareness as methodology (see 2.7.1) as pointed out by Borg (1994). This section provided not only a theoretical insight into how awareness can be studied but also a methodological basis for how awareness (of metaphor) would be examined in the present study. The last two sections of the present chapter provided an account of different studies on metaphor awareness (see 2.7.2), thus giving some insights into how it has been typically examined and what the theoretical and methodological foci of these studies have usually been on. Followed by an account of metaphor awareness studies was the last section which attempted to discuss possible ways in which metaphor awareness, viewed mostly as a mental phenomenon, may become manifest in something more ‘accessible’. This section (2.7.2.1) shed light on the interplay between awareness and metalanguage, thus suggesting that a possible way through which awareness may be accessed is by examining the language that language learners use to talk about language itself; that is, their metalanguage.

Having summarised the main theories and approaches within which metaphor awareness, one of the central areas of the present research question, is situated, we are now in a position to turn our attention to the other core area of the research question, that of text understanding.
Chapter 3: Understanding of text

Introduction

A discussion of different approaches to reading on which the present study draws is provided in this chapter. It begins with a brief overview of approaches to reading in the first language (L1), and then moves on to discuss reading in a second language (L2). The chapter discusses several approaches which view not only the act of reading but also the role of the reader from different angles. The discussion begins with an overview of what has been traditionally labelled as the ‘product’ view of reading. It, then, moves on to discuss a ‘process’ approach which views reading and the reader as dynamic and interactive. In an attempt to extend the process view of reading, the chapter also discusses, within the social constructivist view of learning, reading and understanding of text as a meaning-making process. This entails considering the active role of readers in their engagement with the text and with other readers, and how the reader responds to it. In this way, the chapter also examines the process of meaning construction from the perspective of how readers respond to a text and how they collaboratively participate in dialogues with others in the process of understanding text meaning. Understanding of text, in the present study, is, then, approached from the perspective of how reading moves from decoding, to interaction, to collaborative interaction.

The chapter finalizes with a discussion of traditional measures of understanding of text along with other measures that attempt to move away from traditional models of reading assessment.

What counts as reading?

Before discussing different approaches to reading, it is important to attempt to provide a definition of what counts as reading. As Grabe and Stoller (2011) point out “a common way to begin a discussion of reading is to provide a definition of the concept” (p. 3). Defining reading is probably as difficult as attempting to define language. The primary reason behind the complexity of providing a definition lies in the multiplicity of, and sometimes conflicting, approaches which have contributed to our understanding of reading.

A short, but rather simplistic, definition of reading is given by Grabe and Stoller (2011). Reading is defined as “...the ability to draw meaning from the printed page and interpret this information appropriately”
(Grabe & Stoller, 2011, p. 3). Although some would probably provide a great deal of support to this definition, Grabe and Stoller (2011) point out that such definition is quite insufficient; it does not account for the complexity involved in reading. They highlight five different areas of weaknesses underlying the definition and stress the need for expanding and, perhaps, reconceptualising what is understood by reading. Some of the major drawbacks of this definition, the authors state, pertain to the idea that it does not clearly show the different ways in which a reader can engage in reading. As well, it does not show what are the different skills, processes and knowledge bases that determine and define the nature of fluent reading; quite importantly, Grabe and Stoller (2011) also point out that neither the social context in which reading takes place nor the different ways in which readers arrive at text interpretations is clearly addressed in such narrow definition.

Providing a more comprehensive definition of reading would require to not only take into consideration the above-mentioned weaknesses but also to consider how reading is viewed from the perspective of different models and approaches.

Within the wide array of reading approaches, one finds a continuum along which some of the major views of reading can be identified. At one end of the continuum are purely cognitive-informed approaches within which text-meaning-extracted models can be found. At the other end, one finds those socially-informed approaches which tend to view reading as not only a process of meaning construction but also as a situated practice within a particular context at a particular time. Without diminishing the importance of the contributions of one or another, each of these approaches provides us with different ideas, which may be deemed complementary rather than conflicting, about what is understood by reading and understanding of text.

An important consideration that needs to be made in relation to the diversity of approaches to reading is that what is understood by reading and how it is viewed depends upon whether it is looked at from the perspective of the L1 context or the L2 context. Grabe and Stoller (2011) point out that the differences that exist between L1 and L2 reading cannot be overlooked. In their view, an examination of L1 and L2 reading is relevant to the understanding of the reading process and the reader.

In order to background the discussion of L2 reading, which relates to the present study, an overview of reading in L1 is provided in the following sections.
Reading in L1

Understanding what it means to read in L1 provides a basis for an examination of reading in L2. One of the reasons, as Grabe and Stoller (2011) state, is that “far more research has been carried out on reading in L1 contexts than in L2 contexts” (p. 4). This has allowed the field of L1 reading research to develop solid models and theories that have served as foundation to the development of several approaches to the study of reading in the L2.

Bottom-up approaches to L1 reading

Early research into L1 reading fell under the so-called ‘bottom-up’ approaches to reading. Their emergence in the 1940s and 1950s was traditionally associated with behaviourist approaches to reading, in particular with phonics approaches to the teaching of reading which argued that before children could read the words, recognition of letters would need to take place. Bottom-up approaches are serial processing perspectives to reading which, therefore, entail the sequential occurrence of individual processes in a fixed order. From this, the reading process is assumed to be the act of attending to individual items at a time. That is, the reader’s first task is to begin with the printed grapheme where the graphic stimuli are recognised by the reader. This is followed by a decoding process to sound and then to meaning. Each of these processes, according to Alderson (2000), occurs independently of each other. In this traditional view, reading is therefore a sequential process which by and large consists of decoding graphic, phonemic and syntactic systems. Consequently, the reader is assumed to be merely a decoder of such systems. Once the sequence of systems and sub-systems has been decoded by the reader, text meaning is obtained. From the perspective of bottom-up approaches, text meaning was self-contained in the printed material. This suggested that coming to understanding a text was an automatic process that simply resulted from deciphering the printed codes on a piece of paper; that is, understanding of text was just an end product of decoding.

This basic belief about reading and understanding of text became the basis of most literacy practices during the 1960s and 1970s. It was an approach that dominated all reading-related areas, how reading texts were designed, how it was taught and learnt, and how it was assessed. In regard to the latter, as teachers continued to place greater emphasis on decoding skills, they realised that there were many students who were not able to understand texts; understanding of text did not appear to be an automatic process. What was thought to be the primary reason behind this was the way in which reading was being
assessed. Teachers and educators believed that the problem of students’ not understanding texts was rooted in the types of questions that teachers were asking when assessing understanding. This was primarily “because teachers asked predominantly literal questions, and students were not being challenged to use their inferential and critical reading and thinking skills” (Fries, 1963, p. 45).

It was within this scenario that researchers began to look in other directions to find answers to questions about what reading really was and how it could be best assessed. Researchers’ concerns about finding a more comprehensive view of reading and better measures to assess it were moving towards a paradigm shift (Cooper, 1986, p. 3). What was traditionally conceived of as reading during the 1960s and 1970s was now being challenged by researchers’ increasing interest in how the reader achieves understanding and the extent to which accumulated experiences of readers contribute to their understanding of text.

**Top-down approaches to reading**

Attempting to find answers to their concerns about reading and reading assessment, researchers began to theorise about how a reader really comes to comprehend a text. Questions about whether decoding was the only process involved in comprehension began to be raised and systematically investigated by several researchers (e.g. Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Smith, 1978). Researchers’ beliefs about reading were now pointing to not just the process of deciphering codes printed on a page, but also to what experiences and prior knowledge the reader brings to the text. Anderson and Pearson (Coles & Jenkins, 1998) and Smith (1984), amongst other researchers, postulated that the understanding at which the reader arrives emerges from the experiences of the reader, which are activated as the reader engages in the process of decoding words, sentences, paragraphs and overall ideas. As the reader’s experiences are brought up to the reading activity, the reader engages in an interaction with the text itself. As pointed out by Cooper (1978) “the interaction between the reader and the text is the foundation of comprehension” (p.3). In the process of understanding, the reader’s information stored in their mind is related to the information presented by the writer in the text. This, according to the schema-theoretic models (e.g. Carrell, 1983: Anderson & Pearson, 1984), is what has traditionally been labelled as ‘the activation of schemata’. Schemata, in Carrell's (1986) and Anderson and Pearson’s (1983) view, is a term used to refer to “networks of information stored in the brain which act as filters for incoming information” (1984). Schemata theory explains that a reader develops such networks of information through experiences. As far as understanding of reading is concerned, if a reader has had few or no experiences whatsoever with a given
topic; the reader is likely to have little or no schemata to recall. Consequently, understanding of text is more difficult or impossible.

If a reader is to read and understand a text about the body’s immune system, it is pivotal that he or she be in possession of immune-system schema in order to comprehend the text about that topic. If no immune-system-related schema is stored in the reader's mind, little or no understanding of the text will occur.

This schematic view of reading and reading understanding supported what was known as top-down approaches to reading. Largely influenced by schemata theory, top-down approaches were based on the premise that reading is primarily a process rather than a product. Unlike text-based and product approaches to reading such as the bottom-up model, process-oriented accounts of reading take, as a point of departure, the reader instead of the text and its features. Top-down approaches to reading put forward the idea that the reader starts off with a set of hypotheses or predictions as to what may be the meaning or meanings of the text he or she is facing, hypotheses which are actively and constantly put to test by the reader.

Research along these lines began to argue for a theory of reading which, at the time, evolved into the so-called “psycholinguistic model of reading” (Grabe, 1991, p. 476). Based primarily on Goodman’s (1982) work, reading was conceived of as a psycholinguistic guessing game. In his view, reading does not result from the pure identification and decoding of single elements printed on the page, but it involves an interaction between thought and language. He went on to state that “efficient reading does not result from precise perception and identification of all elements, but from skill in selecting the fewest, most productive cues necessary to produce guesses which are right the first time” (Goodman, 1982, p. 23). The engagement between what the reader brings to the text, the hypotheses he or she formulates and tests, and the text itself are central to the process of understanding a text.

This interplay between the reader’s mind and the textual material is in line with what information-processing models of reading tell us about reading and understanding of text. Roebuck (1998) reasons that much of the current research and what we know about reading today is rooted in computer-based and information-processing models of cognitive science. The information processing definition of reading and reading understanding as defined by Bernhardt (1984) is that “reading comprehension is the process of relating incoming or new information to information already stored in memory” (p. 323). Under this perspective, reading is an internal process of problem-solving tasks that involve the brain as the central
processor. This view of reading suggests that it is a somewhat intrapersonal process in which the reader arrives at the text meaning through the connections and mappings between the incoming data, information from the text, and what is stored in the mind. Such connections and mappings, according to Roebuck (1998), refer in particular to what the reader brings to the text and how that is linked to in which the reader and what he or she brings to the text is fundamental in text processing.

Unlike the bottom-up approach, which predominantly viewed reading as a process highly dependent on features of the text, the approaches discussed thus far, namely schema theory, top-down models and information-processing models of reading, provide us with a route to understanding the reading activity and what is involved in it. Understanding reading through the lenses of psycholinguistic models has offered us a broader view of those elements involved in the reading process. Not only is deciphering the codes printed on the page central to the reading process, but also, and most importantly, the ways in which the reader cognitively interacts with the text. Such interactional instance with the text is particularly driven and dominated by the reader’s prior knowledge (Grabe, 1998), which results from accumulated experiences and essentially enables him or her to make sense of a text after the formulation and testing of hypotheses.

An important observation to be made is that despite the great advances of top-down models in expanding the narrow view of reading promoted by bottom-up approaches, they seem to suffer from, as Roebuck (1998) states, some serious shortcomings. The major one, as she points out, is related to the increasingly cognitive orientation of these approaches. Although these approaches appear to integrate into their accounts the role of the reader and what the reader brings, they continue to be heavily focused upon the text as the primary source from which meaning is gathered. Roebuck (1998) affirms that such approaches still view “reading as a meaning-extracting process” (p. 4).

An alternative approach to the contained-in-texts meaning approach is that of viewing reading as meaning construction instead of a meaning-extracting process.

**Reading as meaning making**

According to Roebuck (1998), the idea that incoming information from the text is integrated with pre-existing knowledge of the reader is a reasonable approach. However, the approach is challenged by those scholars who believe that meaning is not contained in texts and that reading is a process in which meaning is constructed rather than extracted (1998). Texts, in Roebuck’s (1998) view, are by no means
packages or boxes into which meanings are placed. On the contrary, she argues that reading and writing are activities of meaning construction. Thus, what a text contains is not the overall text meaning but meaning potentials that are actualised by the reader or listener. In this way, understanding of text is, then, understood as a meaning-making activity during which readers are constantly seeking to construct meaning and, thus, produce an interpretation or representation of the text which, in essence, in Roebuck’s view, is a new text. Most importantly, the interpretation or representation of the text produced by the reader is said to be valid for one given reader, at that particular time and for that given purpose. The same person may be a different reader at different times depending upon interests, purposes for reading and what information counts as relevant at the time of reading. Thus, according to Roebuck, understanding a text cannot and should not be equivalent to replicating an identical version of the original text. In the context of a classroom context, Roebuck (1998) states that coming to an understanding of text, especially in a language other than the L1, is most likely to be facilitated by the means through which such understanding is reached. In this respect, she points to the fundamental role of collaboration in the process of reading and understanding a text. She argues that text understanding is a much richer activity when carried out in collaboration with others than when achieved on one’s own. This view of reading and reading understanding acknowledges not only the reader’s individuality as a meaning maker but also, and quite importantly, the dialogical nature of the reading process through which readers appear to come to deeper understanding of text in collaboration with other readers.

**Reading and collaborative dialogues**

Largely influenced by the work of Vygotsky (Frawley, 1987; Hareé & Gillett, 1994), the concept of learning and learning to read began to be scrutinised from a different perspective. Not only was the role of mind central to reading and understanding but also, and most importantly, the ways in which the social context and elements thereof influenced and contributed to the reading activity and to how readers come to understand texts. A growing interest in a socially informed view of reading and understanding led researchers to looking at elements of interaction when readers read in collaboration with other readers.

Scholars such as Rogoff and Lave (Rogoff & Lave, 1984), Wertsch (1984) and Wells (1980, 1991) explored the social elements involved in teaching and learning (to read) as, what they called, a social transaction. Rogoff (1992; 2006), for example, stressed the importance of participation as a central element of any learning activity. Inspired by Vygotsky, she considered learning as a participatory activity in which a novice engages in a jointly-undertaken cultural activity with an expert who provides assistance, guidance
and demonstration to carry out the activity. In Wells’ (1992) view, “it is through participation in interaction in the context of joint problem solving with adults” (p. 32) that children are challenged to construct knowledge, and develop their understandings of their culture in collaboration with others. Reading and understanding of text, from this perspective, can be thought of as an activity involving interaction between readers where text understanding is collaboratively constructed through participation in conversations. In Roebuck’s (1998) words, reading, aside from being a participatory activity, is “a problem-solving activity whereby readers seek solutions to problems through participation with others” (p. 32). These instances of participation and collaboration enable readers to arrive at text meanings through discussions and “achieve deeper levels of understanding than those they would achieved on their own” (Roebuck, 1998, p. 15).

A central element to such interactional instances of collaboration and participation is the role of dialogues. The centrality of dialogues to reading and to how readers come to understand texts lie, generally speaking, in what Wertsch (1980) assumes language to be; language is, in essence, purely dialogic. Language, in his view, develops in dialogic ways and typically occurs in dialogic contexts. When children learn their first language, they listen, talk and share their interests with other members of the family by engaging in joint activities. Before being able to produce the very first words, the child receives an incredibly large amount of input typically from parents and other family members. Although children at these early stages are unable to verbalize their feelings, emotions and thoughts, the language which occurs, for instance, between the mother and the child has a number of features of common dialogues. Once the child has developed language, every type of transaction and activity, from the simplest to the most sophisticated ones, is carried out in a dialogic manner. In the process of carrying out those transactions and activities, ranging from getting dressed to helping out in the house, the child acquires the forms, mechanisms and patterns of the language of their community along with ways of making sense of their experience in different social contexts. What’s interesting is that throughout the process of acquiring such patterns and mechanisms of the language of the community, dialogue is frequently the channel through which these processes occur. As Bakhtin (1986) pointed out, language is never encountered or learnt as an abstract system of decontextualised rules and definitions. On the contrary, language, he emphasizes, always occurs as dialogue.

An interesting study where the significant role of dialogues becomes clearly manifest in how readers come to understand texts through dialogues is one by Flint (2010) who looked at L1 reading in a first grade class. The study, which is based on a Vygotskian approach, looked at the different ways in which
social interaction, particularly reading with another reader, or what the researcher called ‘buddy reading’, enables young readers to employ and exploit texts more effectively. After the analysis of field notes, the researcher found that children, through participation in dialogic interactions with other readers, managed to make books more meaningful to them. As well, the findings revealed that “children can learn as much and likely more while reading with a partner than while reading independently” (Swain, Kinnear, & Steinman, 2011).

From this it can be clearly observed that the reading activity is much more meaningful to the reader when carried out in collaboration with other readers. The process of participating in dialogues with other readers allow for the joint construction of meaning whereby text meaning is sought, discussed, negotiated and critically evaluated (Flint, 2010, p. 296). In regard to the latter, of great significance is to bear in mind that the reading transaction does not terminate when text meaning has been constructed; the reading activity also involves the reader’s capacity to analyse, critique and evaluate the content of the text. This view of reading is particularly interesting as it suggests the idea of a reader who not only decodes information and construct meaning with other readers, but also that of a reader who is capable of engaging in a critical analysis and evaluation of a text; thus, enabling the reader to have authoritative control over the text. In this way, the reader can be thought to adopt several roles in the reading activity. The reader decodes the information, makes meaning, uses the text according to specific social situations and is able to critique it (Roebuck, 1998). These roles were developed and explicated in what is known as ‘the four resources model’ (Iyer, 2007).

The roles for the reader

The concept of role is central to a literacy model that was developed by Luke and Freebody in the 1990s. The model, known as ‘the four resources model’, was aimed at developing a repertoire of practices of effective literacy that allow learners to engage with texts at four different levels. At each of these levels the reader’s role in relation to the text is different. A reader’s role can be that of a code breaker, meaning maker, text user or text critic. These roles, in one way or another, reflect what readers should be in possession of in order to be effective readers in modern societies where literacy practices abound. A reader as a code breaker recognises and uses different features of the text such as graphemes, sounds in words and patterns to make sense of the overall text meaning (Freebody & Luke, 1990). In order to be able to decipher the codes printed on the text, the reader needs to be in possession of what Luke and Freebody (1999) calls ‘coding competence’. It is the view of some scholars (Luke & Freebody, 1999) that
being able decode, or break the codes, is an important but not sufficient tool to become an efficient reader. The next role as discussed by Luke and Freebody is that of a meaning maker. On adopting this role the reader “participates in understanding and composing meaningful written, visual, and spoken texts, taking into account each text’s interior meaning systems…” (Luke & Freebody, 1999, p. 36). Throughout this process of understanding and composing, the reader’s available knowledge along with his/her experiences of other cultural discourses, texts, and meaning systems become a central element to the overall process of meaning making. At this level, the reader, drawing on sociocultural background and prior knowledge, constructs meaning from texts. By comparing and associating the reader’s own interests, knowledge and sociocultural experiences with those in the text, the reader arrives at an interpretation of the text. Luke and Freebody (1999) call this ability to construct meanings from texts ‘semantic competence’. This type of competence is quite significant as the reader’s own stance and personal engagement with the text is taken into account in the process of meaning construction. In order to engage in effective literacy practices, Luke and Freebody (1999) point out that there are other roles, or repertoires of capability as they suggest, other than being a meaning maker that can be adopted and constructed by readers in order to engage effectively and successfully with texts. Another of these roles is that of readers as text users. A text user has a developed understanding of genre and utilises this knowledge to approach a text. According to Luke and Freebody (1999), a reader who has developed and constructed a text-user capability is able to understand the diverse social and cultural contexts and purposes that shape the ways in which texts are structured and constructed. Ludwing (Luke & Freebody, 1999, p. 5) summarises this role as “understanding the purposes of different written, spoken, visual and multimodal texts and using texts in different ways for different social and cultural functions” (p. 2). Aside from understanding the social purposes of texts, readers can also move to a deeper level and engage with the text more critically. At this level, the text critic level, the reader is capable of evaluating the social and cultural purposes of the text that has been put forward by the author. As well, readers are able to recognise opinions, bias, points of view, gaps, silences and dominant readings in a text (2003). As well, readers feel empowered to raise questions about the circumstances, contexts, factors and forces shaping the overall text meaning. In this way, Ludwig (2003) asserts that it is through a process of evaluation, critiquing and questioning that readers construct alternative positions to the one taken by a text.

Readers’ alternative views and positions to those adopted in a text are very likely to be in the form of responses to the text. When a reader is engaged in a literacy task where a written response to a text has
to be given, there tends to be greater space for reflection, evaluation and critique which, consequently, allow the reader to approach the text at a deeper level. Responding to a text does not only enable readers to engage with the text more openly and critically but also enables them to raise meaningful questions, comments and interpretations of the text (Ludwig, 2003). This, in McIntosh's (Christenbury, 2000) view, shows the reader's depth and breadth of understanding of text. This, in one way or another, suggests that Luke and Freebody's (1999) last role for the reader, the reader as critic, would seem to indicate a level at which readers engage with texts where opportunities for reflection, evaluation and critic are more likely to arise.

One important observation to make is that although Luke and Freebody's four resources model is not a hierarchical model, as they insist (2003), where code-breaking stands for a superficial literacy level and text critiquing for a deeper level of engagement with the text. On the contrary, the authors indicate that all levels, or repertories of capabilities, are important and necessary for successful and effective pedagogy and literacy practices. This is primarily because the four resources model is not to be viewed as a set of cognitive skills that should be developed in order to help readers move from decoding to critiquing. Rather, it is a model that emphasises the need for participating in a wide range of literacy practices and social institutions that allow readers to construct such repertoire of capabilities in order to effectively function as a reader who is able to unpack the meaning systems and voices that arise in the reader's engagement with the text.

**Reading and reader response**

In line with the four resources model, in particular with the reader's role as a text critic, reader response theory has been another way of looking at reading and understanding of text in L1 contexts from a critical stance. Just as the reader-as-critic role emphasizes the reader's capability to evaluate, analyse and question the ways in which texts and meaning systems are structured, reader response theory stresses on the reader's own stance and capacity to respond to texts critically as a vehicle for improving student ability to learn from texts (Chase & Hynd, 1987).

Reader response theory, originally intended as a tool to capture readers' responses to literary texts, has become a useful way to examine the reader's involvement with the text. This is central, as McRae's (e.g., Freebody & Luke, 2003) points out, because meaning is not solely in the text but also amongst readers who, through an interactive engagement with the text, construct individual meanings when responding to a text.
In the L1 context there have been several studies (1986) which have utilised a reader response approach to analyse readers’ engagement with reading texts as a way of capturing their personal understanding and interpretations. One of the central ideas put forward in these studies in that text meaning is not contained in the text; rather, text meaning is derived from an individual and unique interaction between the reader’s voice and the writer’s voice. Due to the individuality and uniqueness of every reader, comprehension is likely to be different for every reader (Chase & Hynd, 1987). This is, in fact, an idea that “usually threatens teachers as literacy instructional practices tend to be focused upon objective understandings of text” (Chase & Hynd, 1987, p. 534). Having several readers’ responses and interpretations of a text may sound pedagogically complicated as far as assessment is concerned (Chase & Hynd, 1987). In order to ease this pedagogical complication, some reader response scholars (e.g. McIntosh, 2003; McRae, 1986) have developed some taxonomies to assess readers’ responses to texts. Hancock’s study categorised the responses by creating a categorization scheme. This consisted of parsing the responses into response statements. All response statements were organised into a nine-point categorization scheme. These nine categories were grouped into three broad labels. The three broad categories were:

**Immersion:** Understanding – character introspection – predicting events – questioning

**Self-involvement:** Character identification - character assessment – story involvement

**Detachment:** Evaluation – reader/writer digressions

Sebesta et al. (1995) created a four-category reader response assessment taxonomy based upon Rosenblatt’s (e.g. Hancock, 1993; Sebesta, Monson, & Senn, 1995) theory. The four categories include: Evocation, alternatives, reflective thinking and evaluation. These four stages, as the authors suggest, are to be viewed as evolving categories where the last stage, that of evaluation, reflects a deeper and more critical engagement with the text than the other three stages.

One of the major advantages of using reader response, as pointed out by Chase and Hynd (1987), is that students become actively involved in reading when they understand that they have a role in determining meaning.

To conclude, the reading approaches discussed above have shown a changed view of reading and understanding of text within L1 contexts. These approaches not only show a development of L1 reading research but also, and quite significantly, provide an indication of different levels of understanding. As Gray
(1988) pointed out, bottom-up, top-down and meaning-making approaches largely represent the ways in which readers read ‘the lines’, ‘between the lines’ and ‘beyond the lines’ respectively.

The above-mentioned models and approaches to reading have provided the theoretical basis for the examination of reading approaches in L2. As Grabe (1960) states “any account of the L2 reading process must begin with an overview of what happens in L1 reading contexts” (p. 4). The following sections discuss some of the major theories of reading within the L2 context.

Reading in L2

Introduction

The approaches to L1 reading discussed above, to a certain degree, assume the L1 reader to have developed the capacity to decode, interact with the text and with others by the time the begin the process of reading in another language. If a second language learner already knows how to decode, interact with the text and collaborate with others when reading a text in the L1, why is it L2 learners are sometimes found to be unsuccessful in reading and understanding a text in L2? Grabe and Stoller (2011), who believe that L2 learners already possess extensive knowledge of what it means to read in L1, usually struggle, and sometimes fail, to understand texts because the codes of the L2 are not familiar to them. This directs the following discussion to the examination of L2 reading as decoding. This is followed by a view of reading as an interaction between the reader and the text, an interaction between the reader and other readers, and, finally, as a critical engagement between the reader and the text.

An overview of theories of reading in L2

L2 reading research, in Carrell’s (1998) view, has followed a similar line of evolution and development to L1 reading research. Early work in second language reading promoted a bottom-up view of reading where a decoding process of reconstructing the author’s intended meaning was central to the overall reading activity. Reading in a second language was assumed to be a process of building up a meaning for a text from the smallest textual units at the bottom, namely graphemes and lexemes, to larger units at the top (phrases, clauses and intersentential connectors). Problems and deficiencies in second language reading and understanding of text were viewed as being essentially problems of decoding (Carrell, 1983, 1988).
In the 1970s, the view of reading in L2 was predominantly influenced by psycholinguistic models of reading which had earlier had a significant impact on L1 reading research. Largely influenced by the work of Kenneth Goodman (e.g. Rivers, 1964, 1968), these psycholinguistic approaches emphasised the reader’s capacity to make predictions and hypotheses and confirm them without necessarily having to use all the textual cues. Although Goodman did not link his theory to L2 reading research, several articles relating Goodman’s theory to L2 readers began to appear in the literature (e.g. Goodman, 1967). These researchers argued that decoding models were inadequate because there was an underestimation of what and how the reader could contribute to the reading process.

By the 1980s, the idea of reader contribution to the reading process was taken further to suggest that although the reader’s capacity to make predictions and hypotheses about the text are crucial to the reading process, they are not enough. Roebuck (1998) says that it was by the mid to late 1980s that reading began to be recognised as a sociocultural practice. Especially influenced by the work of Vygotsky, reading in a second language was beginning to be viewed not only as interactive practice between the reader and the text but also, and most importantly, as an activity that occurs through participation and collaboration in dialogues. This was quite a dominant view that was theoretically supported by the work of several researchers (e.g. Vygotsky, 1979; Wertsch, 1980) who stressed the significance of the role of participation in joint conversation and dialogues with other readers.

As discussed earlier (see 3.2.1.4.1 & 3.2.1.4.2), some of the reading models in L1 which also emphasised the importance of the reader as an active agent in the process of meaning construction are the four resources model and the reader response theory. These two models of reading have also found a prominent place within the L2 reading context. As far as the four resources model, for example, it has permeated through a number of different curriculum documents in Australia where great emphasis has been placed on the idea that texts are not socioculturally neutral. Rather, texts always represent particular social and cultural positions and meaning systems that have to be unpacked by critical readers.

Readers’ critical engagement with texts is also heavily emphasised by those L2 reading researchers who have carefully examined the benefits of affording readers with opportunities to respond to texts. Studies in L2 contexts (e.g. Roebuck, 1998; Wertsch, 1991) have recognised the value of giving readers the opportunity to engage critically with texts. Probst (1994) argues that allowing readers to react to texts, in the form of a written response, is a valuable opportunity that not only leads readers to the construction of critical individual interpretations of the text but also to deeper stages of language learning.
In brief, it can be observed, as Carrell (1998) has observed, that reading research in L2 has developed in pretty much the same way as reading research in L1. Perhaps, as mentioned in the introduction to this section, a possible reason as to why L1 and L2 reading is pointing to similar ideas is

In Grabe and Stoller's (2011) view, this is the primary reason for examining the context within which reading in L1 has developed. The L1 and L2 reading models discussed above inform the theoretical and methodological approach adopted in the present study in the examination of the research question.

**Reading and understanding of text in the present study**

The centrality of the different approaches to reading discussed above to the present research question is probably clearly manifested in the methodological approach adopted in the present study to look at reading and understanding of text. The ways in which reading was measured in this research largely reflect the different levels at which readers engage with texts. Not only has reading been conceived of as a cognitive skill that can be measured by having readers answer literal questions, but also as socially constructed where readers’ own individuality and uniqueness is central to their understandings and interpretation of the text. These apparently distinct approaches to reading are, however, as Grabe and Stoller (2011) point out, not to be viewed as conflicting; rather, they should be viewed as complementary where what is not looked at by one approach is looked at by the other. This complementarity, in their view, is central to a broader and more informed understanding of reading since looking at reading from the perspective of one single approach alone does not provide a full picture of what is involved in the complex process of reading and understanding a text.

This is a significant reason for adopting different perspectives when looking at learners’ understanding of text in this study. As discussed in the following chapter, learners’ understanding of texts with embedded metaphor is more likely to be better informed by the use of not only bottom-up and top-down measures of understanding but also by other models that view the reader’s individual engagement with the text as central to the overall process of understanding.

**How reading is traditionally assessed**

A central question which pervades discussions, debates and critiques on reading and reading understanding concerns itself with how it has been traditionally assessed (Grabe & Stoller, 2011). Discussions around reading assessment in L1 and L2 have typically focused upon finding, designing and utilising effective methods or instruments in the process of measurement. Within this context, as Paris
(2007) states, heated discussions about what constitutes a good instrument for measuring reading understanding have been increasingly common within education and applied linguistics. Alderson encourages us to understand that no one method can be deemed ‘best method’ for assessing understanding of text in L1 or L2. In order to assess reading understanding, Alderson suggests, a variety of methods need to be employed in order to be able to obtain better results. The problem is, however, that reading assessment has been predominantly characterised by the use of a limited and traditional set of measures within the areas of both L1 and L2 reading.

As far as methodological orientations are concerned, it is important to note that traditional sets of measures of reading understanding have been largely driven by a purely quantitative tradition. By way of illustration, Harrison, Bailey and Dewar (2000) make reference to a declaration made by Kenneth Clark in 1991, the then Secretary of State for Education in England, who stated quite bluntly that telling whether or not child can read is something that can be done in five minutes. In his view, all is needed is a quick pencil-and-paper test rather than a test that drags on for a long period of time. This is a clear reflection of the conservative and traditional view of reading which has pervaded within education.

In relation to the shape and form of a traditional reading test, one finds different test procedures which respond to such a conservative and easy-to-quantify view of reading assessment. The first test procedure widely used in the assessment of reading understanding is the so-called multiple-choice test item (1998). Although multiple-choice sections have been increasingly used as measures of reading understanding, its wide use in reading assessment does not necessarily imply absolute validity as reading measurement. In this respect, Fletcher (2006) refers to the inaccuracy of multiple-choice tests in measuring reading understanding. Using a multiple-choice section to measure reading understanding may not provide a clear indication of what the reader has really understood. In this way, Fletcher believes that the major criticism of multiple-choice measures is in regard to their inadequacy in that the complexity of the process of the reading activity cannot be measured on the basis of three or four different alternatives. In contrast, Alderson (2000) is of the idea that multiple-choice tests could potentially be quite powerful tools for assessing reading understanding. Its effectiveness in measuring reading could be one of the reasons for its popularity, wide acceptance and use within language teaching and learning. Alderson (2000) goes on to state that multiple-choice questions have the potential to be used effectively as tools to train the readers’ ability to think. He contends that multiple-choice tests can be adequately used if, for instance, distracters are set so closely that close examination and analysis by the reader may be needed. Regardless of
whether distracters are carefully set in a multiple-choice section, what is important to highlight, in Alderson’s (2000) view, is that the possible significance and effectiveness of multiple-choice sections in a reading test may only be applicable to certain types of questions. Alderson asserts that literal questions, i.e. questions which require the reader to look for specific information in the text, are more likely to be suitable to be presented in the form of multiple alternatives. Other types of questions, such as inferential questions, may be well presented in other formats.

Another type of test procedure widely used in the assessment of reading is the traditional cloze test procedure. Alderson (2000) comments that the advocacy of cloze test procedures have come to be popular in both assessing general language proficiency as well as reading. Cloze tests procedures are widely used in international language tests, namely First Certificate in English (FCE), Certificate in Advanced English (CAE); tests which have been widely used in Europe and South America at university level to assess EFL learner’s language proficiency and reading comprehension. Even though cloze tests can be very useful in many ways, for instance in that they are easy to prepare and score, they also pose controversial issues pertaining to their effectiveness in assessing reading comprehension. The major controversy around the use of cloze text procedures as measures of reading understanding concerns itself with the heavy overemphasis on what might be called ‘lexical inferencing’ and ‘word choice’. As a result, measuring readers’ understanding of text through the use of a cloze test item would appear to reduce reading comprehension to the reader’s ability to manipulate individual lexical items.

This increasing focus on lexis can be illustrated by examining the content of traditional ESL text books. For example, looking at an ESL text book, in particular ‘New Headway Intermediate’ (Alderson, 2000; Fletcher, 2006), one finds a large number of reading comprehension activities which are predominantly focused on either lexis or questions which are only targeted at testing learners’ background knowledge. However, few tasks which allow the students to evaluate, judge and create meaning can be identified. Partly, this focus may be rooted in the increasing interest which the lexical approach to second language teaching and learning has received in the last decades. This approach focuses on developing learners’ proficiency with lexis and word combinations – the so-called ‘collocations’ (Soars & Soars, 2003). Whether or not the lexical approach is the reason why most reading comprehension tests focus on lexis, the serious drawback is that the overemphasis on lexis is impeding second language learners from moving to more inferential and deeper levels of understanding of text. This therefore results in learners failing to access text meaning as their understanding of texts continues to be limited to dictionary meaning.
Another possible reason as to why reading comprehension assessment tests have primarily and traditionally focused on lexis and word-by-word decoding may be due to the complexity of the reading process; a process which, in turn, is not thoroughly explored by the ESL practitioner (Moudraia, 2001). Thus, by having learners take tests based on vocabulary knowledge with the help of the dictionary turns out to be less demanding for both the teacher and the student. Or, perhaps, it is possible that we have seen reading comprehension to be more complex than it really is.

In an attempt to base these assumptions on practical and experiential grounds, as an ESL/EAP teacher I personally experienced situations in which reading comprehension was measured by having learners complete fill-in-the-gaps lexical exercises, do cloze tests, identify key vocabulary in the text, or answer literal questions from the text, leaving inferential questions as a measure of deeper levels of understanding. ESL teaching practices in Chile, for instance, have not been not typically characterised by a strong emphasis on participatory and collaborative learning. When it comes to reading and measuring reading comprehension, no opportunity is usually given for the students to elaborate on assumptions they may have, beliefs they may hold, judgements or evaluations which they could put forth towards the writer’s view on a certain topic or issue as a way of constructing meaning. On the contrary, reading understanding, from my experience as an ESL/EAP instructor has been typically measured through the use of, what Kenneth Clarke called, quick pencil-and-paper tests. One of the implications of this view is that learners are not often pushed to engage in meaning-making activities as part of their process of understanding texts and, therefore, of their overall learning process.

Whether or not it relates to the way we have seen reading, it remains clear that there has been a strong emphasis on lexis when assessing text understanding. Similarly, the aims and objectives as set by the Chilean English curriculum documents do not emphasise nor invite language teachers to the implementation of pedagogical practices aimed at promoting other ways of dealing with a text such as evaluating, judging, summarising or responding critically to a text (Paris, 2007). On the contrary, the increasing use of standardised measures of reading comprehension tacitly stresses the use of quick pencil-and-paper tests as indication of attainment in English literacy. This scenario calls for a shift, or at least alternative views, towards how reading comprehension is conceived of so that this change can impact the ways in which literacy practices are enacted in the classroom.

In this way, one is left with the question of how such traditional and conservative view of reading may be complemented with alternative views. In light of what was discussed earlier in 3.2.3.2, an
alternative view of reading and reading understanding can be based upon the opportunities with which learners are afforded to respond to a text. It was discussed earlier (see 3.2.1.4.2) that giving learners the opportunity to react critically to texts through responses enables them to not only write a response but also show the ways in which they have approached and understood the text. From this approach, as shown in earlier sections, letting the reader react and respond to the text from a critical stance has been used as a measurement of readers’ understanding of text (MINEDUC, 2014). Aside from giving an indication of readers’ text understanding, reader response, as a reading measurement, also sheds light on the reader-text interaction and how that interaction has developed and unfolded.

Although measuring readers’ understanding of text as a reader-text interactional activity is central to the overall reading process (e.g. Chase & Hynd, 1987; Sebesta et al., 1995), Pacheco (2010) believes that the interaction between readers is also central and an important contributor to how a readers come to understand texts. Measuring reading understanding in the context of interaction, or collaborative work, would need to be driven by close scrutiny of what actually occurs in the dialogue. For instance, in a study which examined the dialogue occurring during a reading activity in a bilingual classroom, the researcher analysed discourse patterns and participation structures in conversation along with participant observations and narratives produced by the learners. Analysis of their participation and contribution to the reading activity revealed the important ways in which students employed their agency as knowledge producers. As well, analysis of students’ participation and contribution to the collaborative reading activity showed how opportunities for participation and dialogue enable learners to become makers of meaning.

A different study (Lenihan, 2003) examined the potential effect of small-group discussions on learners’ understanding of text. A story was read to learners, and then they were asked to write details of anything they thought were most important. This was followed by asking learners to write their interpretations of the story. Although these parts of the activity were done individually, the students were then put into small groups and asked to discuss in small groups the details they had taken notes of and their interpretations of the story. Analysis of the transcripts revealed that discussions provided learners with opportunities to deepen their understanding of the story. The learners themselves responded quite positively to having an opportunity for discussion; so much so that some of them commented that “our discussion opened my mind up to the more symbolic meanings that the story had. I liked having so many different people share their insights...” (Lenihan, 2003, p. 12). Providing learners with opportunities to engage in dialogues and discussions while reading appears to contribute to their depth of text
understanding. As far as reading assessment is concerned, one can observe from these studies that examining the content, patterns, structure and the very nature of dialogues can show not only the degree to which readers participate in conversation and dialogues but also the ways in which they, in collaboration with other readers, engaged in the process of text meaning construction.

To conclude, such traditional measures of reading comprehension as multiple-choice test items, cloze test procedures and lexical-oriented test sections are not at all wrong and invalid. A word of caution from Alderson (2000) to language teachers is that although traditional and conservative measures of reading understanding may not provide a holistic view of what the reader has understood, they do help us measure certain reading and language skills. In this way, it is important to determine what a particular test item is measuring without equating, for instance, performance on a lexical task with overall text understanding. Within this context, what is clearly required in order to measure learners’ reading understanding in a more holistic manner is different complementary measures that allow for a more comprehensive view of the reading activity.

The following section is intended to describe the methodology of the present study. It situates the research question within the methodological traditions which inform it. It also provides a description of the methods utilised to measure the two central areas of the research question: awareness of metaphor and text understanding. Lastly, a detailed description of participants and the methods utilised in the data collection.
Chapter 4 : Research Methodology

Introduction

The previous chapters identified the focus of this study by examining linguistics theories of metaphor and metaphor awareness (Chapter 2) along with approaches to reading comprehension (Chapter 3). The present chapter is aimed at, first of all, outlining and situating the research question within the research areas which inform it. Secondly, it also intends to explain the methodology on which the research design is based. Lastly, it details the methods that were used for data collection and discusses how the data were analysed.

Methodology

The research question

It is worth highlighting the aim of this investigation by outlining the research question under investigation. This study addresses the question of whether learners' growth of awareness of metaphor could assist them in deepening their understanding of text with metaphors embedded. From this, two core areas of the research question can be observed: text understanding and awareness of metaphor. In the previous chapters (Chapters 2-3), these two were situated within the theoretical framework which informs the research question. One of the aims of this chapter is to discuss the research areas that have provided a methodological base upon which this investigation rests. The research areas which have informed the research design, the methods utilised, how the data were analysed and, of course, the overall operationalization of the research question are Education and Applied Linguistics. Research methodologies derived from these areas have contributed to the methodological examination of understanding of text and awareness of metaphor.

This chapter also details the methods that were utilised for data collection, justifies the adopted model for the analysis of data, and describes how the data were analysed.

Research design

Recalling the research question under investigation is a good starting point to describe the overall research design of the study. Hesse-Biber (2010) points out that research questions are the key element of a study because they provide the foundation on which a study is designed. Similarly, research questions are the basic and necessary ‘cell’ of a study without which investigation would not be possible (Johnson &
In Tashakkori & Teddlie’s (2003) view, how one answers a research question depends, by and large, on the research design the researcher has opted for.

In order to answer the research question described in the previous section, several research designs could have been adopted. Cohen et al. (2007) maintain that the same phenomenon can be examined from different perspectives and by taking different actions. By way of analogy, they say the same principles behind research methodological designs apply to anything that is to be constructed. When constructing a building, they comment, important decisions need to be made on how to build it, what the overall structure will look like, which materials to use, what type of insulation and what colour paint will be used (Cohen et al., 2007). Similar important decisions have to be made when finding a methodological way to answer a research question; what instruments will be used, who the participants will be and how many, how the data will be gathered, analysed and reported. From the vast array of methodological designs (e.g. descriptive, correlational, cross-sectional, longitudinal, experimental and non-experimental), the researcher has to choose a design or, what Creswell (2003) calls, ‘a plan for answering the research question’ (p. 76).

Despite the ‘popularity of experimental research designs in linguistics and applied linguistics’ (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 98), in the present study it was decided not to answer the research question experimentally. There are several reasons for this choice. First of all, as Creswell (2003) points out ‘one of the aims of experimental research is to measure the outcomes of phenomena (p. 115). This suggests that measuring processes – that is, how phenomena reach certain outcomes, is not a goal that experimental research seeks to achieve. Although attention is paid to the outcomes gleaned from the four-week intervention period in the present study, greater attention has been paid to the processes through which such outcomes were achieved. On measuring learners’ understanding of text, different measures were used to track the processes of their understanding. Learners’ responses to the text, their voices in the form of journal entries and their collaborative talk in the classroom, all provided some insights into the ways in which learners may have come to a certain outcome measured by a traditional pre and post-test.

Secondly, unlike experimental research which aims at controlling the conditions under which data collection and measurement are taking place, non-experimental designs do not involve a manipulation of the situation, conditions, circumstances or experience of the participants (Creswell, 2003, p. 112). This is precisely another reason for not choosing an experimental design in the present study. In this research, it was not the researcher’s intent to alter the conditions under which participants would be studied. When the conditions of the study are manipulated, Cohen et al. (2007) comment that the gathering of data is highly
artificial and does not reflect the conditions under which real phenomena occur. In order to gather data that would enable the researcher to examine the development (the process) of awareness of metaphor and the ways in which this impacted understanding of text, a non-experimental design is thought to be more appropriate. This is supported by Cohen et al. (2007) who recommend gathering data under non-experimental (artificial) conditions if the goal is to examine processes, not outcomes (p. 116).

The following sections provide details of the design adopted in this study; the disciplinary areas that inform the methodology underpinning the study, the methodology adopted, the methods used and the participants of the study.

**Research in Applied Linguistics and Education: What questions do they ask?**

First of all, it is important to recognise that in order to answer the research question stated above, various methodological approaches could have been adopted. The examination of the research question along with the collection and analysis of the data could have been informed by, for instance, purely Conversational Analysis (CA) measures, Discourse Analysis (DA) approaches, Sociocultural approaches to learning or Ethnographic methods. Although the inclusion of these approaches would not have been methodologically flawed or inappropriate, in this study it was decided to draw upon research methodologies derived from Education and Applied Linguistics. The rationale behind this methodological choice lies in the nature of the research question which is about language and about learning, questions usually asked in Applied Linguistics and Education.

The present study has greatly benefited from the contributions of these research areas as they have informed the methodological orientation of the research question and have also contributed to the actual examination of the two major domains of the research question: text understanding and awareness of metaphor. In practice, different aspects of the investigation, namely the research design, the methods utilised, the collection of data along with their analysis, have been shaped by the contributions of methodological approaches from Applied Linguistics and Education.

Before the actual examination of how these fields have contributed methodologically to this study, one of the central questions that needs to be answered is what each of these research areas asks and how they usually seek answers to their questions. It is important to mention that although these two areas have had a historical relationship in which ‘linguistics has been seen to contribute to the total education process’
(Canning, 2004, para. 9), resulting in such new fields as educational linguistics, the two areas are distinct in their foci, i.e. each area attempts to answer different theoretical questions.

With regard to the foci and questions asked in each disciplinary area, educational research has predominantly focused upon teaching and learning. Anderson and Arsenault (1998) point out that the focus of research in education is usually upon teaching methods, student learning, teacher training and classroom dynamics, all of which are naturally in constant change. As well, it goes without saying that one of the major preoccupations of education has been literacy. For years, educators have had a particular interest in exploring the interplay between literacy and education, the ways in which learners engage with everyday texts, and how literacy is tied to identity and social practices. Given that one of the two components of the research question in the present study covers understanding of text, which falls within the domain of literacy, the reliance on and incorporation of research methodologies, and probably methods as well, from education may greatly contribute to the examination of understanding of text.

Unlike the focus of educational research that is mostly on teaching, learning and literacy, the focus of applied linguistics research, on the other hand, has traditionally been on language and various aspects of language use. As Lazarton (2000) points out, applied linguistics research has predominantly focused on the study of language and language use through the analysis of linguistic features. Similarly, in her discussion of differences in domains and methods between applied, theoretical and descriptive linguistics, Alcala (2000) points out that “applied linguistics is concerned with various aspects of language use, and attempts to explain the processes of language acquisition and the relationship between language and their users” (p. 145). As well, in an attempt to define the scope and foci of applied linguistics, Langemets (1988) states that the major preoccupation of applied linguistics is to seek answers and solutions to “linguistics problems and aspects such as Multilingualism, lexicography, corpus linguistics, translation, language technology,...” (p. 561). What these definitions and approximations indicate is that the questions usually asked in applied linguistics fall within the areas of language and language use, and less with cognition and meaning making. Given that one of the prominent areas of the research question under investigation deals with metaphorical language, which in turn relates to language and language use, it becomes pivotal to draw on research methods from applied linguistics which could inform the methodological examination of the linguistics side of the present study.

To conclude, although education and applied linguistics have had different foci and have attempted to answer different theoretical questions, where the former is particularly interested in learning, pedagogy
and literacy while the latter in language and language use, it is of interest to highlight that they also share some common ground. The point at which these two research areas intersect is in the methodologies on which they have traditionally drawn to answer their different theoretical questions.

**What methodologies have they employed?**

In regard to the research methodologies utilised in education, it is not uncommon to find a great deal of quantitative research aimed at measuring variables on a quantifiable basis. In their description of the nature of educational research Wiersma and Jurs (2009) point out that “a strong empirical approach characterizes educational research” (p. 3). From the perspective of empiricism, which is an essential aspect of the scientific method, knowledge arises primarily from sensory experiences that in turn emerge from observation and experimentation. Under this paradigm, data, which may come from test scores, responses to questionnaire items, surveys and standardised measures to assess teaching and learning practices, are usually represented in numerical data. All of the above measures from which quantitative data are obtained have been some of the widely-used methods underpinning research methodologies in education. Nonetheless, not only has educational research employed quantitative methodologies but also, and quite prominently, qualitative ones. This methodological inclination, upon which much educational research is currently conducted, enables researchers to approach and examine social phenomena in conjunction with their social, cultural and historical constituents. Ethnographic research, case studies and narrative enquiry have been, for example, some common styles of educational research which have primarily rested on interpretive methods (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). In the realm of teaching and learning, such concern for using interpretive methodologies for investigating social phenomena within their broader and wider context has led some researchers to view teaching and learning as a process, rather than product, shaped by and bound to their social context (Cohen et al., 2007).

Researchers under the qualitative paradigm, according to Lodico, Spaulding and Voegtle (2010), tend to reject the scientific method which reduces social phenomena to the understanding of its individual units, and advocate that the understanding of social reality deserves a broader view which considers its complex composition bound up to socioeconomic, cultural and historical factors. From this methodological orientation, data are usually gathered by using qualitative methods and are very often analysed through interpretive lenses.
The reliance of educational research on both quantitative and qualitative methods provides an indication that educational research, irrespective of their current methodological inclinations towards more interpretive approaches, has traditionally drawn upon both descriptive and interpretive paradigms.

A similar scenario can be observed when looking at the methodological traditions in applied linguistics. Both quantitative and qualitative paradigms have informed theory and practice in applied linguistics. Dörnyei (2010) states that within the field of applied linguistics three main types of gather data are found: quantitative, qualitative and language data. He goes on to state that quantitative, qualitative and a combination of both have shaped the current state of applied linguistic research. It needs to be noted, though, that quantitative research has been perhaps the strongest methodological orientation within the field. In a thorough examination of a large number of renowned journal articles in applied linguistics, Gao, Li and Lu (2007) discovered that quantitative studies appeared to dominate the research tradition in applied linguistics. Although applied linguistics has characterised by its strong quantitative focus, it is important to acknowledge that it also has an increasing interest in integrating qualitative methods to its research into language and language use. Holliday (2001) recognises that there seems to be more applied linguists who have a concern and interest in social issues relating to language and language education. Similarly, Lazarton (2010) pointed out that research in applied linguistics has reached its full success as evidence by the increasing spread of qualitative research. This methodological recognition and integration of qualitative methods into applied linguistics research should not, however, be taken as a radical shift in methodology from quantitative to qualitative within the field. On the contrary, it is a reflection of both the current nature of research in applied linguistics and the acknowledgement of qualitative methods as complementary approaches to the study of language and language use. Dörnyei (2007) supports such assumption by stating that quantitative and qualitative methods should not be seen as exclusive; rather, they should be viewed as complementary resulting in a third research approach, that of mixed methods.

What we learn from the above is that in terms of their methodological orientations, applied linguistics and education have not been complete strange fellows. On the contrary, both methodological traditions, quantitative and qualitative, have clearly informed the nature of each research area resulting in similar methodological underpinnings between educational and applied linguistics research. Both of the methodological approaches which underpin research in Education and Applied Linguistics have been incorporated in the examination of the research question in the present study.
In conclusion, research in Education and Applied Linguistics certainly has some common ground. Even though education and applied linguistics research have clearly marked their inclinations and orientations as far as methodology is concerned, both research areas have traditionally drawn upon both quantitative and qualitative methodologies in their examination of phenomena. These two areas, however, have had different foci: education’s focus of attention has predominantly been on teaching, learning, pedagogy and literacy with a major preoccupation on the individual as situated in a particular socio-cultural context; applied linguistics, on the other hand, has very often concerned itself with language and language use through the description of features evidenced in the language.

The similar methodologies shared by Educational and Applied Linguistics research along with their different foci have provided a platform for addressing the research question in the present investigation. In practice, education has provided a basis for investigating an aspect of literacy – text understanding. Methods from applied linguistics have set a methodological base for investigating awareness of a feature of language – metaphorical language – by looking at language use in activities related to that feature of language.

**Why both methodologies have been incorporated**

**Introduction**

The following sections are intended to justify the use of a mixed-method approach in the present study. There are two important points that need to be made in regard to the justification for using a mixed methodology. The first one, as described later, is to do with the fact that each methodological tradition – quantitative and qualitative – on which this study draws helps us find an answer to our research question. Secondly, the justification for using a mixed methodology in this study is closely akin to the two research areas within which this research falls – Applied Linguistic and Education. It was mentioned earlier that both fields have traditionally rested on quantitative and qualitative methods in their description and examination of reality. A combination of these two was utilised in addressing and answering the research question under investigation.
Quantitative and qualitative methods

As stated earlier, in this study qualitative and quantitative methods were combined in how the research question was answered. Before a description of the mixed methods approach, an overall definition of each method, namely quantitative and qualitative, is first provided.

Quantitative research stems from positivism and is therefore tied to the scientific method whose goal is the finding of causes, relationships, and facts through the collection of numerical data whose analysis is mathematical based (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). In order to collect such data, instruments need to be designed aimed at transforming phenomena which don’t typically occur in a quantitative form into quantitative data. Qualitative research, on the other hand, is focused on understanding social phenomena by looking at a specific situation to generate general conclusions. A common characteristic of quantitative research is that – due to the deductive nature of it – research tends to be theory-based whereas qualitative research is more context-specific. Another distinction between these two paradigms concerns the role of the researcher. With regard to quantitative research, researchers usually focus upon individual variables, behaviours, and settings and seek ways to control and manipulate them. In qualitative research, however, the researcher is interested in looking into a social phenomenon by using inductive and interpretive methods. Qualitative researchers are also attached to the belief that the social environment exerts some influence on human behaviour (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). This is probably why researchers pay a great deal of attention to processes rather than products. That is, more attention is drawn to how things happen and what is involved in them than the outcome itself. As a result, participants’ voices are more easily heard and accounted for when qualitative approaches are used.

It is clear that quantitative and qualitative research methods represent two different foci to viewing and understanding the world. The differences described above between quantitative and qualitative research methods are due to the underlying principles behind how knowledge is constructed, and how the world can be investigated. Although the epistemological principles behind each methodology are quite different, a combination of both has greatly contributed to a better understanding of the research question under investigation. Such a combination of research methods is what gives rise, according to Creswell (2003), to a third method, that of a mixed-methods approach.
Combining methods: Mixed-methods approach

The justification for utilising a combined or mixed methods approach in answering the research question rests upon two fundamental reasons: the first one relates to the methodological merits, as described by Creswell (2003), of integrating two research methods in a single study; the second concerns itself with the research areas, both of which draw on quantitative and qualitative methods, which inform this study

Before describing the instantiation of the mixed-methods approach adopted in the present study, it is important to understand what is meant by mixed methods. First and foremost, the notion of mixed-methods approach can be viewed as a methodology and as a method. As a methodology, it involves methodological and philosophical assumptions that drive the collection and analysis of data, and the incorporation of quantitative and qualitative approaches in different stages of research. Thus, a mixed-methods approach basically entails the combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches in the study of a particular phenomenon. As a method, it comprises the design of quantitative and qualitative instruments, the collection, analysis and mixture of both quantitative and qualitative data in the study of a single phenomenon (2003). Simply put, a mixed-methods approach can be defined as a process whereby quantitative and qualitative data are collected and analysed in a single study. Perhaps, a clearer and more extensive definition of a mixed-methods approach is given by Creswell (Chaudron, 1986). His definition is as follows:

...one in which the researcher tends to base knowledge claims on pragmatic grounds (e.g. consequence-oriented, problem-centered, and pluralistic). It employs strategies of inquiry that involve collecting data either simultaneously or sequentially to best understand research problems. The data collection also involves gathering both numeric information (e.g. on instruments) as well as text information (e.g. on interviews) so that the final database represents both quantitative and qualitative information (p. 20)

From the above definition one can observe that the incorporation of both methodologies into a single research study would appear to provide a better understanding of the nature of the research question. Fully aware that every method has their limitations and their strengths, in highlighting the methodological benefits of employing mixed methodologies it can be observed that they serve: (i) to obtain corroboration of findings, (ii) to reduce the possibility of any plausible alternative explanations from conclusions drawn from the research data, and (iii) to explicate what may sometimes be divergent aspects
of a phenomenon (2003). As well, Blaxter, Hughes and Tight (Johnson & Tuner, 2003), point out that one of the main reasons for intentionally using more than one method in the same research study concerns itself with the depth and breadth of understanding obtained from the mixing of methods. In their view, this provides the researcher with the opportunity to examine the same phenomenon from different perspectives, thereby obtaining much richer data on what is being studied. Another reason for mixing methods posed by Greene, Caracelli and Graham (2001) is that the results obtained from one method can help develop or may well inform the other method. The incorporation of two methods in the process of obtaining data provides the researcher with a better understanding than if each method had been used alone. Although the quantitative and qualitative divide is sometimes seen as conflicting, from the above it can be observed that utilizing different methods in the data collection process is a practice to be seen as complementary.

In the present research study, the integration of quantitative and qualitative methods has become manifest in different phases of the research:

1. The design of instruments (methods) for data collection
2. The data collection process
3. Procedures utilised to analyse the data

In order to examine the research question in, what Chaudron (1989) calls, a more comprehensive manner, it was decided that different methods would be designed and utilised in the collection and analysis of data. As pointed out earlier, the use of mixed methods in a study allows for richness in the data and validity in the findings since the same phenomenon is examined in different ways. The two central parts of the research question under investigation, which comprise metaphor awareness and understanding of text, were examined by means of both qualitative and quantitative methods. Broadly speaking, metaphor awareness data were collected and analysed through the use of methods which required the researcher to use statistical instruments along with interpretive lenses. Similarly, collection and analysis of data pertaining to understanding of text was marked by the use of quantitative and qualitative research methods.

A thorough description of each of the methods utilised in the process of data collection and analysis is provided in 4.9. Upcoming sections also discuss the ways in which text understanding and metaphor awareness were examined in the present study.

Let us turn our attention to the participants of the present investigation.
Description of participants

Who were the participants of the study?

In the present study a total number of 25 participants took part in the research. All the participants were international students at Deakin University, Australia. The composition of the total number of participants was as follows: 12 international students from the Deakin University English Language Institute (DUELI), and 13 international students from the Masters of TESOL programme at Deakin University, Australia.

DUELI is mainly characterised by having a wide range of English language programmes available to suit students’ needs and to prepare them for entry into Deakin’s courses. It is also important to highlight that DUELI offers a wide range of courses to both prospective undergraduate and postgraduate students. The regular duration of, at least, English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses is based on five-week cycles. Participants from DUELI had been doing EAP (English for Academic Purposes) courses for six months so that, upon successful completion of the last EAP level, they could enter postgraduate courses at the University. Most students, except for one, were expecting to complete the last term (five weeks) of EAP classes in order to have direct entry to different Masters courses at Deakin University. The nationalities of the participants from DUELI were mostly Chinese, except for one student who came from Italy.

International students from the MTESOL programme had been studying for one trimester at the University. All these students came from Indonesia on a University exchange scheme. One important commonality between students from DUELI and those from the MTESOL is that English was their second language. This is particularly central to the present study as the research question deals with the extent to which metaphor awareness could potentially assist second language learners in understanding texts with metaphors embedded.

The recruitment of participants

In order to carry out the teaching intervention through which participants would be exposed to metaphor-awareness raising sessions, it was decided that a four-week teaching intervention would be offered to students. The decision to have a four-week cycle was made on the basis of the five-week intake of students run by DUELI. The researcher was advised by DUELI staff that it would be more manageable to conduct a four-week training instead of five because students normally have to sit exams in week five.
Conducting a four-week cycle of intervention sessions would allow for a relatively stable number of participants without putting extra pressure on students at the end of their five weeks of study.

Before the actual recruitment of participants, Ethics approval was sought for the study by submitting an application on a National Ethics Application Form (NEAF). The Ethics application form detailed the major aspects involved in the research study. Some of these included information on the expertise and research supervision experience of the principal and associate supervisors, resources needed to conduct the study, methodologies utilised in the research, profile of participants and process to recruit them. The Ethics application for the study was reviewed by Deakin University Human Research Ethics Committee (DUHREC). Once Ethics approval was obtained, the researcher began to seek permission from the course co-ordinator at the MTESOL programme and the Director of Studies (DoS) at DUELI to officially start inviting prospective participants for the research study.

Permission was granted to invite MTESOL students to participate in the study. Calls for participation were put up on notice boards around the Faculty of Arts and Education. As well, Ethics approval allowed the researcher to visit MTESOL seminars to explain to students that a research study was under way examining the role of awareness of metaphor in ESOL learners’ understanding of text. Upon visiting students in class, a written notice was given to students that briefly explained the main purpose of the study and also contained the researcher’s contact details. Students were informed that if they wanted to express interest in participating in the study, they should contact the researcher by email.

With permission from the then Director of Studies at DUELI, the researcher was given the opportunity to visit all EAP classes in order to invite students to attend free classes on reading comprehension and figurative language in texts. Students were informed that these classes had been organised in order to get participants for a large-scale research study. It was explained to students that these free classes would run two days a week for a period of four weeks (the first four weeks of the study cycle). Lessons would take place after the study hours at DUELI and would run for one hour. That is, students would have two hours of free English classes a week for a period of four consecutive weeks.

On visiting each class, students, who were interested and willing to participate in the study, were given a sign-up sheet (see Appendix 1) to write their names so the researcher could keep track of the numbers of students interested. After visiting the first four classes, the researcher had already over 40 students who had signed up. In view of the big numbers, it was decided to not continue promoting these classes to other classes as the numbers would continue to grow and, realistically speaking, no one knew
how many would really turn up on the day. There was the possibility that either everyone would turn up, no one or just a few.

When the time came for conducting the first session, there was an incredibly large attendance rate. So many students attended that some were requested to attend the following session as the room would not hold any more students. However, this situation began to gradually change in the second session. The number of students who turned up in the second was manageable and more reasonable so the lesson was conducted with no major difficulties. The attrition rate increased during the second week as students began to face increasing demands from their DUELI course.

This posed a great hurdle on the researcher as regular attendance was required in order to be able to conduct the lessons and implement the teaching procedure more smoothly. Furthermore, having irregular attendance would not allow the researcher to keep track of the learners’ progress throughout the teaching intervention period. In view of this situation, it was decided to cancel all upcoming sessions and make another call for participation emphasizing continuity and regularity in attendance. In order to start new sessions, the researcher had to wait until the beginning of the following intake which meant a five-week wait. Unfortunately, the same irregular attendance rate occurred in the first week. This meant that a third call was made to students to participate.

After the following five weeks, the time came again to commence a new cycle. Fortunately, the sessions were conducted quite successfully this time as, despite some drop-outs along the way, the majority of the students were regular in attendance throughout the four-week period. This naturally enabled the researcher to collect data for the present research. Successfully, 12 students attended each lesson regularly throughout the four-week period. Classes for DUELI students and MTESOL students were offered on separate days. DUELI students were invited to attend classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 14:00 to 15:00 for a period of four weeks. MTESOL students were offered classes on Mondays and Wednesdays from 14:00 to 15:00 for the same period of time. All students were exposed to exactly the same type of information and teaching throughout the intervention period. No differences in delivery of instruction were made during the course training.

After participants were gathered and asked for personal information, they were assured that their identity would be kept confidential, and that under no circumstances would their names be revealed. No one but the researcher and supervisor would have access to their details. Students were asked for their names, surnames and nationalities so they could also enjoy a sense of recognition, importance and
ownership. All participants were given a consent form and a plain language statement (PLS). None of these had to be translated into their first language because all students had an IELTS score of at least 5.0. They all had sufficient English language skills to understand the project and the research processes involved in it as described in the PLS. The consent form described the purpose of the research study, asked the students to consent to being audio-recorded throughout the study, provided information on the privacy and confidentiality of the information gathered, and stated clearly that participation was completely voluntary and that participants could withdraw from the study at any time without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way. The PLS detailed the research question under investigation, its aims, methods and research processes involved in it. It also provided participants with information on potential risks and benefits from the study, the dissemination of findings, monitoring and storage of the data along with issues relating to privacy and confidentiality. Contact details of the principal and associate researchers were provided in case the student participants required further information about the project.

Despite a few differences between the two cohorts of students (DUELI and MTESOL), for the purpose of the present study and the actual methodology used herein, they were all treated equally as one overall group of participants. The main reason behind this consideration lies principally in the similarities they share. First, they are all students whose first language is not English, and therefore learnt it as a second or additional language. Second, all students had similar levels of English competency. Students studying at DUELI were only five weeks away from completing their EAP preparation course. Upon successful completion of the course, students' English competency was deemed to be equivalent to an IELTS 6.5 score. In regard to the MTESOL students, given that they were already pursuing a Masters degree in Australia as international students, the IELTS 6.5 score (or equivalent) requirement had already been met. This way, learners from DUELI and those from the MTESOL are considered to have similar levels of English competency. Another important similarity is that all these students have to face the challenge of reading a variety of texts in their study, and therefore have to unravel the complexities of making sense of a text with metaphors embedded.

A central question that needs to be addressed is in relation to what exactly occurred throughout the four-week intervention period. So far the nature and profile of participants have been described but nothing has been said about what kind intervention took place during the course. In an attempt to describe what participating students were exposed to, the following section provides a brief description of what the
intervention was broadly aimed at. Upcoming sections will provide a clearer description and discussion of the procedures utilised during the teaching period.

**Description of the teaching intervention period**

Before a description of what the delivery of instruction consisted of, it may be necessary to recall the research question under investigation. The present study deals with two major areas: understanding of texts and metaphor awareness. It seeks to find out the extent to which a potential growth of metaphor awareness may help language learners deepen their understanding of texts with metaphors embedded.

The four-week teaching intervention course, that is, the free English classes offered to DUELI and MTESOL students, was particularly focused upon the development of learners’ awareness of metaphor in order to track its possible impact on the depth of text understanding. In order to develop learners’ awareness of metaphor, a metaphor-awareness raising procedure was implemented throughout the course. Some of the overarching goals of such implementation were:

1. To expose learners to some written texts containing metaphors
2. To draw learners’ attention to the pervasive presence of metaphorical language in written texts
3. To draw learners’ attention to the underlying patterns of metaphors
4. To provide learners with tools for metaphor identification in texts

While the implementation was taking place, different types of data were being collected in order to gather evidence which could shed light on both the potential growth of learners’ metaphor awareness and its possible impact on their depth of text understanding.

An important observation to be made here is in relation to who delivered the lessons over the four-week period. All the teaching intervention was conducted by the researcher himself. That is, a dual role was taken on by the researcher; that of a teacher and researcher. A closer look at this dual role and a justification for it is discussed in the following section.

**The dual role of teacher-researcher**

Having described the participants of the present study, it is important to discuss the role and position of the teacher-researcher within the present investigation in an attempt to provide a justification for adopting such dual role.
At a glance, the term ‘teacher-researcher’ appears to refer to two distinct, and perhaps opposing, activities conducted by different individuals where teaching is done by the teacher while research is conducted by the researcher. Traditionally, teachers have been regarded as subjective insiders delivering classroom instruction to students, marking papers, evaluating their performance, responding to standards as well as looking at and interpreting curriculum documents (Chaudron, 1986). Educational researchers, on the other hand, have been typically conceptualised as objective outsiders who develop questions and conduct research on those questions to address particular language teaching or learning issues (ibid). These traditional conceptions, nevertheless, dramatically change when teachers embark upon investigating problems related to the learning of their learners as well as the teaching context and attempt to find solutions to them. In this way, not only do teachers become researchers but also, and most importantly, they develop a deeper understanding of teaching and learning along with a greater sense of reflection which enable them to investigate and resolve classroom-related dilemmas (Ellis, 1997).

In the present study, the research question under investigation originally emerged from the researcher’s quest, as a teacher himself, for mechanisms and effective tools which could assist language learners in deepening their understanding of texts. Having faced language teaching and learning dilemmas as a language teacher for over ten years, in particular dealing with learners who constantly struggle with the complex texts they have to face at university, it was decided that such a problem was worth looking into. When such a dilemma was turned into a research question and therefore the present study, I decided I would adopt a dual role, that of teacher and researcher, throughout the process of carrying out my research, in particular during the stages of data collection.

Positioning myself as both teacher and researcher would enable me to develop a better understanding of the value and nature of the problem I was investigating. Through my active participation in the teaching process and my constant and on-going engagement in the data collection process, I would be able to develop what Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009) call an inquiry stance. Secondly, given that part of the data collection process involved the implementation of a pedagogic device, the Metaphor Identification Procedure, with which I was closely familiar, being teacher-researcher would enable me to identify certain problematic areas of either the implementation of the metaphor-awareness curriculum or any other general aspects with which students may grapple while using it in the process of identification of metaphor in text.

Engaging in this process of identifying classroom dilemmas, as Huillet, Alder and Belger (2009) point out, would potentially position the teacher-researcher in an inquiry stance. This, according to
Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009), typically refers to a reflective process in which teachers focus upon a teaching-learning problem and, through inquiry and action, search for solutions and different ways to improve pedagogical practices and student achievement. The creation of such places for inquiry is pivotal to the improvement of our teaching and to the development of positive learning contexts for our language learners.

Throughout the classroom inquiry process the teacher-researcher utilised various tools to collect relevant data in order to address the research question under investigation. The following section provides a description of the methods that were used along the process.

**Methods of data collection**

This section describes the methods utilised for collecting data and provides a rationale for the selection of such methods. At the end of the section is a description of the MIP - tool utilised to raise learners’ awareness of metaphor is provided.

The table below provide an overview of the methods and methodology utilised in the gathering and analysis of the data for the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core areas of research question</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of text</td>
<td>Reading test (measured reading from two perspectives)</td>
<td>Measured reading from traditional (decoding) perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measured reading from a reader-text interaction perspective in the form of a reader-response task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcripts of learners’ collaborative discussions</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of metaphor</td>
<td>Transcripts of learners’ language (discussions)-learners’ language was analysed for two features</td>
<td>Length and number of turns in conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of metalanguage of metaphor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5: Overview of methods and methodology

As can be observed in the table above, a reading test and transcripts of learners’ audio-recorded discussions were used to elicit data relating to learners’ understanding of text. Data relating to awareness of metaphor were collected by means of learners’ audio-recorded discussions, which were analysed for different linguistic features, and journal entries administered to students on different occasions. Each of these data sets was analysed by using different methodological approaches. Below is a detailed description of each the methods used in the study.

Reading test

As discussed earlier, there are two reading approaches that have influenced how the reading test was constructed and what it measured, both of which are closely related. The first one relates to a product view of reading while the other one relates to a constructivist or meaning-making perspective.

4.5.1.1 The nature of the reading test

Before a description of each of the test items, it is important to make reference to the nature of the text that was utilised in the reading test. The reading text is one that has been commonly used by metaphor scholars in their use of metaphor identification procedures in written texts. It is a text that contains a large amount of metaphorical language and is used in a way that different conceptual domains are framed by underlying conceptual metaphors. The text is called ‘Half full or half empty?’ published on the BBC news website in 2005 (e.g. Group, 2007; Semino, 2008). In general, it discusses the outcome of a G8 Summit which took place at Gleneagles whose main items on agenda were poverty in Africa and climate change in the world. These were therefore the two themes developed and metaphorically shaped throughout the text. The topics themselves should not create major barriers for learners to get to deep text meaning since these are topics widely talked about in most political and economic discussions around the world.

What could possibly come across as a barrier is the high metaphorical density of the text. In this scenario, one of the questions one could raise is whether this permanent presence of metaphor in the text would require learners to possess certain cultural knowledge to access text meaning. The answer to this question is not straightforward as it falls within a rather controversial discussion over the universality and
culture-specific nature of metaphors (Kövecses, 2005). Research into metaphor suggests that most, if not all, conceptual metaphors are based on individuals’ bodily experiences and interactions with the world. This in turn makes metaphor highly universal in that most individuals, according to Kövecses, experience such domains of knowledge as physical distance, emotions and feelings in pretty much the same way. A clear example of such universality is the conceptual metaphor ‘sad is down’. All individuals experience, conceptualise and associate sadness with a lowered bodily position.

In Kövecses’ view, although possessing appropriate cultural schemata is necessary to most comprehension processes, coming to the right interpretation and comprehension of a metaphor does not depend so much on having culturally familiar information but on making the appropriate mapping between the source and target domains involved in the metaphor. Knowles and Moon (2006) believe that cross-domain mapping in metaphors is a unique attribute of all human beings; ‘people in all languages and all cultures understand certain concepts in terms of something else’ (p. 46).

From the above it can concluded that learners may not be required to possess culturally-specific information of the text or the metaphors in the text as, first of all, the text discusses topics with which learners probably have some familiarity and, secondly, all individuals are equipped with a capacity to map certain domains of knowledge onto another one.

One important consideration about the reading test described above, in particular about its administration, concerns the use of the same test before and after the teaching intervention period. Research in both L1 and L2 reading shows that using the same test twice in experimental or quasi-experimental research is not an uncommon procedure. Drawing on research from these two areas, this section provides a methodological justification for administering the same test before and after the teaching intervention period.

Several studies in L1 reading research (e.g. Francis, Snow, August, Carlson, & Iglesias, 2006; Leu & Kinzer, 1999; Tok & Mazi, 2015) have designed and utilised a single reading comprehension test to be applied under pre and post-test conditions. Although not all these studies provide a methodological justification for using the same reading test twice, some overtly favour its use and stress its methodological benefits. For example, Francis et al. (2006), who discuss a range of measures of reading comprehension, point out that using the same reading comprehension measure at different intervals with children beginning to read provides teachers with more consistency in the areas the child has developed or needs to be developed over time. In a study on the effects of stories on listening and reading comprehension, Tok and
Mazi (2015) utilised the same measure before and after their experimental intervention with Turkish children. Although the authors do not comment extensively on their choice of the same measure, they do mention that using the same reading test is a common practice when measuring primary school students’ reading skills in Turkey, especially under experimental conditions.

Within the L2 reading context, using the same reading comprehension measure as pre and post-test has not been an unusual procedure (e.g. Al-Nafiash, 2015). Back in the 1960s, Chansky (1964) asserted that much of the experimental research into reading understanding in EFL and ESL contexts would be for many decades predominantly quantitative. The implication of this positivist influence on measuring reading would be, in his view, that reading was likely to be assessed by means of ‘measures that provide language instructors with systematic indicators of learners’ reading ability and understanding’ (p.110). Although Chansky does not specifically elaborate on what a systematic indicator could be, he does specify what he called ‘systematicity of outcomes’ when measuring reading comprehension. He said that reading comprehension outcomes are more systematic and easier to interpret when ‘reading is assessed with the same measure in laboratory situations’ (p. 112). The methodological rationale for this is that by using the same measure the researcher is certain that the same unit of measurement is being tested (Chansky, 1964, p. 116). This allows the researcher and language instructor to notify the learner of their gaps more specifically. When learners’ reading understanding is measured with different tests in laboratory conditions, as he says, it is difficult to determine what might have influenced differences in reading comprehension outcomes. Regardless of whether the different reading tests belong in the same genre or on the same topic, subtle differences such as paragraph organization, vocabulary choices or length of texts could lead to dramatically different outcomes in reading comprehension.

In the present study, the reading test described in the previous section (4.5.1) was used as pre and post-test. Considering that the application of the same reading measure in research conditions is not an uncommon practice, it was decided to utilise the same measure to better observe the learners’ development of understanding in relation to where they started and where they ended. Having the same instrument at the start and the end may facilitate, what Chansky (1964) calls, the task of determining the areas that improved and those that did not. Had different measures been utilised, differences in learners’ understanding could have been more difficult to explain since, as Chansky says, variation in reading outcomes may be influenced by simply textual matters (for example, text organization), and not necessarily by the learners’ developed or underdeveloped reading skills.
Having described the metaphorical nature of the reading text utilised in the study and provided a methodological justification for using it twice throughout the intervention, it is central to have a closer look at the internal structure of the test, what items it was comprised of, and what they were aimed at.

### 4.5.1.2 Description of test items

A set of different test items were created in order to utilise the text as a reading test. With input, feedback and guidance from EAP teachers at DUELI, the researcher designed a test (see Appendix 2) that attempted to measure understanding at different levels and from different perspectives. The test was comprised of four different test items. The first section of the test comprised a lexical task which was aimed at touching upon learners’ understanding of twelve lexical items, which they were presented with, as used in the context of the text. All of the words presented to the students in this section had been metaphorically used in the text. However, learners were not advised of the metaphorical nature of the words. The learners’ task was to provide a definition of them without the help of the dictionary and were told to rely upon any contextual cues in the text that may have assisted them in getting a good grasp of the meaning of the words. The second test item was section which contained four multiple-choice questions. The first three questions were literally intended and basically required that the students searched for specific information in the text. The last multiple-choice question was, however, inferential and required learners to deduce the meaning of a quote taken from the text which was metaphorically oriented. The third section of the test encompassed three comprehension questions which required some elaboration on the part of the students. Students were expected to make reasonable inferences to go beyond the actual information contained in the text. As well, one of the questions required learners to make sense of some metaphorically-intended part of the text, that of the title ‘Half full, half empty’. These three measures of reading understanding, which represent the traditional and conventional view of reading assessment, have been complemented with another measure that views reading from a different perspective.

Reading understanding was not only assessed on the belief that comprehension can be quantified by using conventional and traditional measures, but also on the assumption that reading comprehension is an interactive process whereby the reader constructs meaning from the text. In this way, a reader-response task was designed to capture the students’ engagement with the text along with the ways in which text meaning was constructed. Reader response tasks have largely been incorporated into reading protocols in order to tap into learners’ experiences, feelings, views and understandings of the text (Landale, 2005). Such deep exploration of how students engage with texts and what their stance sheds some light on the
reader’s interaction with the text. Urquhart and Weir (1998) acknowledge that what makes up the reading process is the interaction between the reader and the text. This interactional process is pivotal not only to how the act of reading is viewed but also for how the reader arrives at the text meaning. The immediate implication is that meaning is, therefore, not static and fixed in the text but constructed through the interaction between reader and text. Urquhart and Weir (1998) go on to state that:

“Texts do not have unitary meanings potentially accessible to all, they rather allow for variety of interpretations by different readers, governed by factors such as purpose, background knowledge, and the relationship established in the act of reading between the reader and the writer” (p. 75).

This entails that, irrespective of the interpretations of the text different readers might have, text meaning is heavily dependent on the meaning-making process in which the reader is engaged. In order to capture the ways in which learners engaged with the text, a prompt question was presented to students which aimed at tapping into their understandings and/or interpretations of the text. The prompt question in the reader-response task was as follows:

‘Based on your interpretations and/or reactions to the text, what’s the overall message conveyed in the text? What do you think caused the situation discussed in the text?’

The purpose of the question above was to engage the learner in a process where genuine responses were elicited. Elliot (1998) points out that genuine responses are those which require the learner to delve into the text in a significant and meaningful manner.

The description of the test items discussed thus far has provided a general idea of the structure of the reading test and of what measures were used in the assessment of text understanding.

4.5.1.3 Validity of reading comprehension test

There are several aspects or, as Creswell (2003) says, standards that need to be set and achieved in research. Two of these are validity and reliability. In Chen’s (2010) view, these become more central to testing; that is, how one measures a particular phenomenon. This section discusses the issue of validity in relation to the reading test administered to participants in the study.

Before addressing the concept of validity, some observations on reliability need to be made. Despite some controversy over whether measures or scores should be considered reliable, reliability has
been defined as the capacity of an instrument to yield similar data from similar subjects over time (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 146). As well, it is a concept that closely relates to such notions as consistency, replicability, precision and accuracy. This means that if a certain measurement is designed to measure, for example, people’s weight, the instrument would be deemed reliable if similar results were obtained when applied to different people at different times.

Although reliability is an aspect that seems to be achieved in different forms of research, namely quantitative, qualitative and naturalistic (Creswell, 2003), it is a concept that becomes more central to studies that fall within a positivist paradigm. Cohen et al. (2007) point out that due to the fact that reliability assumes the standardization and control of the conditions under which the data collection and measurement are taking place, one would expect researchers to ‘set up experimental conditions that allow for minimizing external sources of variations in the findings in order to achieve consistency and replicability’ (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 148).

Considering that the present study did not set out to have an experimental design aimed at controlling conditions for higher consistency (see 4.2 for more details), the issue of reliability is not as central as it should be in a study under experimental conditions. Cohen et al. (2007) comment that in instances where researchers measure a phenomenon in non-experimental designs, it would not be unusual to have measures that are valid, but not reliable.

A central issue that is always extensively addressed in language testing is that of test validity. Test validity is so important that Chen (2010) sees it ‘as the most important single attribute of good tests’ (p. 193). In Chen’s (2010) view, validity is a concept that refers to the capacity of a test to measure what it intends to measure. Distinguishing different kinds of validity, Douglas (2010) says that validity generally refers to ‘collecting evidence to demonstrate that the interpretations and decisions we make on the basis of test performance are justified’ (p. 26). Validity involves the interaction of several important elements where one of the most central ones is validity evidence (Douglas, 2010). This relates to gathering evidence to support the entity that the test intends to measure. If a test developer is to measure word recognition, sufficient evidence needs to be gathered to support and ensure that such entity is measured, not for example lexical learning.

The test designed and administered to students in the present study intended to measure learners’ understanding of the text with embedded metaphors. To this, the first important step was to select a text which contained metaphors and, secondly, design a test that measured the learners’ text understanding in
relation to the metaphors that contributed to the overall text meaning. As described in 4.5.1, different test items were created to measure what the researcher wanted to measure. Given that, according to Knowles and Moon (2006), understanding of metaphor involves lexical understanding, a test item on understanding of metaphorical vocabulary items was constructed. Using a vocabulary test item as part of a reading a comprehension test has been a common procedure in measuring learners’ L2 reading (e.g. Silberstein, 1987; Ward, 2009). Aiming to measure learners’ overall understanding of the text, three other test items were created (see 4.5.1 for details). In Alderson’s (2000) view, multiple-choice and short-answer sections have been widely used in the measurement of reading comprehension. Although he states that the wide use of a certain measurement does not necessarily indicate that the test is valid, he acknowledges the validity of these measures in testing such reading comprehension skills as understanding of general and specific information in the text and understanding of literal and inferential questions (Alderson, 2000, p. 46). These measures have been extensively utilised in several studies in L2 reading studies (e.g. Al-Nafisah, 2015; Eskey, 1970; Shih, 1992), thus suggesting not only their popularity but also their valid nature to measure what researchers wish to measure. Researchers who have questioned the validity of quantitative measures of reading comprehension (e.g. Hirvela, 1996; McIntosh, 2003) comment on the need of tapping into the varied ways in which readers engage with texts. The measure suggested by these researchers amongst others is what is known under the name ‘reader response theory’. Addressing the methodological concern of these researchers who state that reading is not best measured by purely quantitative measures because it is something that is in constant development, that varies from learner to learner and that needs to be understood as a process, not a product (Hirvela, 1996, p. 129).

Responding to the potential lack of validity of using only quantitative measures of reading, the test used in the present study incorporated a measure, a reader response task, aimed at examining the varied responses of the learners of how they engaged with and understood the reading text. Researchers (e.g. Chase & Hynd, 1987; Hirvela, 1996; Sebesta et al., 1995) who have used and recommend using this measure comment that it does not necessarily have to be used as a single unitary measure of reading understanding; rather, it could be used as a complementary unit of measurement to provide a broader view of the reading phenomenon (Hirvela, 1996, p. 131).

The various measures utilised in the reading test in this study are intended to gather evidence from different perspectives to better support the validity of the test in relation to the interpretation of the test scores. Although, due to the non-experimental nature of the research design of the present study, validity
seems more central than reliability, one final observation on reliability is worth making. Given that the same
test was administered twice in the study, as discussed and defended above, this practice, that of ‘test and
retest’ as described by Cohen et al. (2007), could be inappropriate – and thus contribute to the test not
being reliable or not having stability – if an appropriate time span is not considered between the
administration of the test and retest. To this, ‘the researcher has to decide what an appropriate length of
time is; too short a time and the respondents may remember what they said or did in the first test situation’
(Cohen et al., 2007, p. 146). Due to the subjectivity involved in determining what is an ‘appropriate’ time
period between tests, the researcher, as Cohen et al. recommend, has to ensure that the findings are not
influenced by the memorability of tests. In the present study, there was a period of four weeks between the
administration of the pre and post-test. Although this time span could be debateable as to whether or not it
is considered appropriate, what is central here is that no reference to the test or its content was made
throughout the intervention period. As well, if participants obtained low scores in the pre-test, this would not
only indicate that their understanding of text with metaphors was low but also that there would probably be
less influence on the post-test as it would be less memorable.

**Classroom talk**

Aside from the reading comprehension test, another method of data collection was the gathering of
classroom talk. Gathering classroom talk proves useful to delve into what really goes on in the classroom.
Walsh (2011) points out that communication in the classroom context is very important because it
underpins everything that goes on in classrooms. Communication and interaction, both teacher-student and
student-student, is a fundamental aspect of the delivery of instruction. Not in all classrooms, however, there
are those instances where learners are afforded with opportunities to interact with each other. Walsh (2001)
comments that student interaction is not a common practice in some educational systems in certain
cultures, while in others, students are afforded with opportunities to actively interact with other members of
the class. In Australia, as Hennessey and Dionigi (2013) point out, cooperative learning is a common and
highly effective classroom practice in most educational contexts. From their perspective, this type of
classroom practice proves rather beneficial to students’ overall learning irrespective of the subject matter. It
promotes active participation, group accountability and independence. In the present study, there were
different instances where learners had the opportunity to work collaboratively with others and engage in
dialogue while performing tasks.
In the present study, a reasonable amount of data pertains to students’ talk in collaborative interactions. The type of classroom talk gathered for the purposes of this study comes from interaction resulting from students’ collaborative work on classroom tasks (see Appendices 4-6). Learners’ collaborative discussions were audio recorded, and then transcribed by using some Conversation Analysis (CA) conventions. The corpus of peer interactions is made up of three lessons with a length range from 25 to 30 minutes. The transcribed corpus is comprised of 25,400 words approximately. Due to the considerable length and amount of the transcribed data, it was decided to incorporate in the appendices transcripts of three out of five discussion groups throughout the three audio-recorded instances (see Appendices 7-15).

Data collected through this method, by audio-recording learners’ collaborative discussions, were utilised to tap into both core areas of the research question: learners’ understanding of text and awareness of metaphor. In order to approach each of these areas, different measures of analysis (as discussed in 4.8.3.2) had to be taken. The different ways in which the data, that is, the transcripts of students’ discussions, were analysed in order to capture learners’ understanding of text along with their awareness of metaphor are discussed in 4.8.3.

The contributions of this method of data collection to the overall research question can be observed as follows:

1. In regard to learners’ understanding of text, it was discussed in 4.5.1 that a reading test, which was administered at the beginning and the end of the teaching intervention period, was utilised to measure learners’ overall understanding of text. The test involved both some traditional measures (e.g. multiple choice questions) and a reader response task, which attempted to tap into learners’ engagement with and interpretations of the text. Although the test measured understanding from different perspectives, an additional measure, which included audio recording collaborative discussions as discussed in this section, was taken in order to explore some of the ways in which learners arrived at their understandings through discussions. This other way of capturing learners’ understanding of text allowed for an examination of the role of dialogue and interaction in the development and growth of understanding of text.

2. In relation to the analysis of learners’ awareness of metaphor, aside from using reflective journal entries, the present method of data collection contributed to its examination in that it was possible to analyse specific linguistic features of learners’ language use. This could
eventually provide an indication of how learners’ awareness of metaphor becomes manifest in their language use.

All in all, the data gathered through the elicitation of classroom talk in collaborative interactions contributed to the analysis of the two central areas of the research question under investigation: text understanding and metaphor awareness.

In measuring awareness of metaphor, not only was learners’ language use examined for particular indicative features of awareness, but also the learners’ own capacity to reflect upon their learning process and their involvement in learning. This reflective practice was evidenced by the use of journal entries given to learners throughout the teaching intervention period.

**Journal entries**

Journal writing is a tool that has been widely used in the analysis of a wide range of aspects of language, learning and teaching (McIntosh, 2003). Upon examining research into the role of journal writing in language and language learning, one finds that the centrality of using journals is found in what McIntosh (2013) assumes journaling to be: “...journal writing is a common reflective tool used to understand the experiential learning process” (p. 34). It becomes pivotal, as Boy and Fales (2003) state, that learning is conceptualised as a process, and therefore examined as a dynamic and potentially changing phenomenon. A way of exploring the dynamic nature of the learning process, they suggest, is the use of journal writing in the classroom. In their view, the value of using this tool lies in that learners are afforded with a reflective opportunity through which reflection is likely to become the primary means of learning through experience. Reflective instances, such as the use of journal writing, Thorpe (2004) believes, not only develop learners’ self-awareness but also enable them to have a critical understanding of their participation, involvement of self and commitment to the learning activity.

In view of the role of journal writing in the learning process as a reflective tool, it was decided to use journaling throughout the teaching period in an attempt to capture, as Thorpe (2004) states, learners’ awareness, understanding, active participation and involvement in the learning process. In particular, the use of journal writing in this study was intended to obtain data on the learners’ voices about their experiences of becoming aware of metaphor.
The journal entry (see Appendix 3) had some instructions at the beginning which prompted the student to elaborate on four questions presented in the journal. The written instructions on the journal entry read as follows:

In the following questions, write down any ideas, thoughts, feelings, or learning experiences that you have at the moment in relation to the following questions. Don’t worry about grammar or spelling as what is important is what you write.

These instructions were, on the one hand, intended to let the student know what to do and, on the other, encourage them to write as much as they could in reference to the questions they would read in the entry. In order to try to elicit as much data as possible, students were also explicitly asked not to pay much attention to grammar or spelling when writing.

The journal entry was comprised of four open-ended questions. The overall objective of the journal entry was to elicit data on four different domains: importance of MIP, awareness, students’ perceptions of metaphor, and text understanding. Thus, each question attempted to elicit data on each domain.

The questions were as follows:

1. What was important for you about the MIP?
2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?
3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?
4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

The first question was aimed at having students reflect on the importance and usefulness of the metaphor identification procedure. As the MIP was the vehicle through which metaphor awareness was raised, it was pivotal to gain insights into the tool utilised and how students perceived it; whether they viewed it as an important and probably effective, or totally useless and confusing procedure.

The second question was targeted at eliciting data on students’ awareness. Students had to think about the different stages of the MIP and reflect upon the steps in terms of how these have helped them become more aware of metaphors.

On answering question three, students were expected to show their views and perceptions about metaphor. This question along with the previous ones is important as it looks into how their experiences, views, perceptions, and knowledge of metaphors have been transformed during and throughout the teaching sessions. As for the last question, it is intended to elicit data on the possible effect of metaphors on students’ depth of text understanding.
It should be noted that although journal writing is a tool that has been widely used in different areas within education and applied linguistics, it has not been a popular method within the realms of CL when examining metaphor and metaphor awareness. One of the reasons for this is that metaphor analysis has not been typically conducted through interpretive methods. The incorporation of this method into the present study would provide insights into the learners’ views, experiences and processes of becoming aware of metaphor.

The description of the three methods described thus far – reading comprehension test, classroom talk and journal entries – provides us with an overall view of what was utilised in the process of gathering data to answer the research question. In summary, the reading comprehension test was designed to gather data on learners’ understanding of text from two perspectives: a traditional product-oriented perspective and one which views the reader as a meaning maker. Data collected from learners classroom-talk interactions were intended to tap into both areas of the research question: understanding of text and awareness of metaphor. In regard to the former, learners’ language use in collaborative activities was looked at in an attempt to examine the ways in which learners engaged with the text and how text meaning was constructed in collaboration. As for the latter, learners’ language use was examined for particular linguistic features which could provide an indication of their being aware of metaphor. The last method discussed above was the use of journal entries. This method was designed to serve as a window into the learners’ active process of and involvement in learning, and potentially into their experiences of growing awareness of metaphor.

On discussing the potential growth of learners’ metaphor awareness, one important question arises here: what may have caused learners’ awareness of metaphor to grow? Throughout the teaching period, a tool was utilised to raise learners’ awareness of metaphor. Such tool derives from a procedure used by metaphor scholars when searching for metaphors in discourse. The following section outlines the metaphor-awareness raising procedure used in the present study throughout the teaching period.

**The tool utilised for raising awareness of metaphor**

It was discussed in 2.5.1 that one problem associated with the Conceptual Metaphor Theory is related to the lack of clear criteria which determine what is metaphorical and what is not. It was noted that although one’s own skills, such as intuition, to draw the line between literal and metaphorical is important, these are not sufficient especially when it comes to a theoretical and methodological delineation of what
counts as metaphor. Partly, in order to solve this problem and minimize the ambiguity involved in determining the literal and metaphorical boundaries purely on the basis of intuition, metaphor scholars developed a systematic procedure which would enable them to lay down more objective criteria for the identification of metaphors in discourse. Such set of criteria were introduced in the form a procedure called the MIP. The MIP, as Semino (2008) states, was a procedure proposed by the Pragglejaz Group (Pragglejaz is an acronym formed by the initial letters of the names of ten members of the group) whose central aim was to provide metaphor researchers with a tool to identify metaphorical expressions in discourse. This procedure consists of four general stages with sub-divisions in the third phase:

1. Read the entire text-discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning
2. Determine the lexical units in the text-discourse
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.
   (b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. Basic meanings tend to be:
      - More concrete (what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell and taste);
      - Related to bodily action;
      - More precise (as opposed to vague);
      - Historically older.
   (c) If the lexical meaning unit has a more basic current-contemporary meaning in the other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.
4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical

This first step consists of reading the entire text in order to have a general understanding of the text meaning. The second is about determining and dividing the text into lexical units so as to establish the contextual meaning of words, phrases or expressions, that is, how the meaning applies to a given entity and, overall, how it contributes to the text. The purpose of this stage is to examine the metaphorical senses adopted by the expressions and how they are used in the text. The third step is to find out whether the words, phrases or expressions have other more basic meanings from that presented in the text. Basic
meanings are defined as those which tend to be historically older, more precise, more concrete as what they evoke is easier to imagine and to construct a mental representation, and finally they also tend to be more closely related to bodily action; in other words, the more basic the meaning is, the more literal it tends to be. The main objective of this part of the procedure is, in a way, to compare and contrast the basic (concrete or literal) meanings of the identified expression with those metaphorical meanings adopted in the text. This part of the procedure also allows for the construction of a lexical chain and focuses the attention on lexical coherence in order to become more aware of the metaphorical interrelations of words and expressions in the text and how these lexical chains form part of a conceptual metaphor. The last step involves identifying and labelling a word, phrase or expression as metaphorical. The above-mentioned steps of the MIP have been traditionally utilised by researchers in order to identify metaphors in discourse.

In the present study, it was decided to utilise this procedure and turn it into a teaching tool for raising learners’ awareness of metaphor. Given that the above-mentioned set of steps of the procedure has been developed for metaphor researchers, modifications were made to some of the steps in order to turn it into a more manageable teaching tool and more accessible to language learners as well. Some of the modifications were only in terms of the wording of the steps while others were more substantial in terms of making new additions or elaborations. Below is the modified set of steps utilised as a teaching tool throughout the teaching intervention period:

1. Read the entire text to gain a general understanding of what the text is about
2. Use your intuition to determine some possible metaphorical expressions or metaphorically-used words in the text
3. Determine the lexical units in the text. Look up the words in the dictionary to determine their part of speech.
4. For each word you have identified as metaphorical, establish its contextual meaning. What does the word refer to in the context of the text?
5. Determine whether the word has a more basic meaning than the one conveyed in the text. Remember that basic meanings tend to be more concrete, and related to bodily action.
6. Compare and contrast the contextual meaning with the meaning given by the dictionary
7. Decide which words can be considered metaphorical. Discuss with other students the concrete meaning given by the dictionary and the contextual meaning in the text. Are there any relationships? Do you find any connection between source and target domains? Discuss your views.

To illustrate some of the changes made in this adapted version of the MIP, one can see that the first step of the actual MIP says “Read the entire text-discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning” while the modified version reads “Read the entire text to gain a general understanding of what the text is about”. Thinking that the term text-discourse may not be as clear to learners as it is to researchers, it was decided to make some changes to the wording of the instructions in order to present this step, along with others, in plainer language to learners. A more substantial change, for instance, was in relation to an addition made to the procedure. The second step in the modified version allows learners to use their own intuition in determining some possible metaphorically-used language in the text. Understanding that most people have some kind of intuition of what may be a metaphor, the researcher considered that such allowance, that is, allowing learners to use their intuition at the start of the process, could potentially help them engage with the text in a different way as they would have to rely on their experiences, world knowledge, and possibly feelings about what could be counted as metaphorical. Another example of modification made to the procedure is found in step seven in the modified version of the MIP. In this step, one can observe that a central element here is the opportunity given to students to engage in discussions with peers about their views. Students are asked to discuss with peers differences and/or similarities found between the concrete meaning of a word given by the dictionary and its use within the context of the text.

Because the actual MIP is a tool for researchers to identify metaphors in text, the procedure does not provide researchers with instances for collaborative discussions about, for instance, how a lexical meaning given by a dictionary matches the contextual meaning of the word as used in the text. The rationale behind the creation of a procedure such as the MIP is precisely to avoid major differences in opinion, and therefore provide researchers with a tool that allows them to identify metaphors unilaterally and more objectively. In the present study, it has been decided to capture learners' views and experiences of how they perceive the nature of meanings as given dictionaries and as actually instantiated in texts.

A fundamental question that arises here is how this procedure, typically used for identifying metaphors in discourse, could now contribute to enhancing learners' awareness of metaphor. In order to do
this, students were explicitly taught each of the steps of the modified version of the MIP in different sessions (see details in 4.7.3). This explicit instruction of the procedure was intended to assist them in, first of all, identifying metaphorically-used words and expressions in texts and, secondly, in understanding the underlying patterning of metaphors. Such capacity to identify metaphors could potentially lead learners to a more developed awareness of not only the pervasive presence of metaphors in text but also of their underlying conceptual structures which usually shape overall conceptual domains in texts. Other than the potential impact on an enhanced awareness, the capacity to identify metaphor may also lead them to be able to access deeper meaning of texts with embedded metaphors.

In using the MIP as a teaching tool for raising learners’ metaphor awareness it was crucial that students became familiar with each of the steps of the procedure. Familiarity with the steps would enable them to have a more systematic way of finding metaphors in text. Not only was their familiarity with the steps important but also their capacity to use these steps in instances of metaphor identification in text. Throughout the teaching period, students had multiple opportunities to work collaboratively with different short texts and extracts of texts following each of the steps of the MIP in the process of identifying metaphors. A detailed description of the implementation of the MIP throughout the four-week teaching period is provided in 4.7.3.

**Procedure: how data were collected**

This section provides details of how the researcher went about collecting data. It is divided into two sub-sections in an attempt to provide clear-cut descriptions with respect the two major elements involved in the research question: reading comprehension and metaphor awareness.

Participants were exposed to an eight-session teaching period where the duration of each session was between 60 and 70 minutes. Data were collected on each session through the administration of different methods.

**Stages of data collection**

The following table summarizes the stages of data collection, the methods utilised and a summary of the procedure involved in the process. The first column on the right, which reads ‘stages’, represents the eight different sessions or lessons which took place over the four-week teaching period.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Methods / Implementation of MIP</th>
<th>Data collection procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>• Pre-test</td>
<td>• Reading comprehension test was administered to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>• Students’ talk</td>
<td>• Students are audio-recorded as they collaboratively work on a metaphor task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3 (MIP)</td>
<td>• Journal entry • Metaphor-awareness raising (2 steps)</td>
<td>• Students were given the first journal entry at the end the lesson. They were given 15 minutes to complete it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4 (MIP)</td>
<td>• Metaphor-awareness raising (3 steps)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5 (MIP)</td>
<td>• Students’ talk • Journal entry • Metaphor-awareness raising (last 2 steps)</td>
<td>• Having finished the implementation of the metaphor-awareness raising tool, students work on a text and collaboratively follow and apply the steps of the MIP into the text. • Students’ discussions are audio-recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students collaboratively work on an extract from the reading text found in the reading comprehension test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7</td>
<td>• Journal entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 8</td>
<td>• Students’ talk - Reflective discussion</td>
<td>• Students’ collaborative discussions of their views of the teaching period are audio recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7.1: Summary of stages, methods and data collection procedure

A more detailed description of the data collection procedures utilised to answer the research question are provided in the following section.
Collecting data on reading comprehension

During first session participants were administered a reading comprehension test, which comprised different items as described in 4.5.1. Upon arriving in the classroom and after being welcomed and briefly introduced to the syllabus for the four-week teaching period, students were told that they would be given a test that would measure their understanding of text; one would be administered on the day (pre-test) and one at the end of the teaching intervention period (post-test). Participants were not told about the metaphorically-oriented nature of the text in order to avoid any possible feeling of anxiety. They were handed out the reading test and were given 50 minutes to complete it. While sitting the test, participants were told that they could use dictionaries or mobile devices to check vocabulary if needed. The teacher-researcher collected the tests after the allocated time. The same procedure, instructions and allowances were given to students at the pre and post-test.

Another important set of data on reading comprehension pertains to the analysis of students’ collaborative interactions. As outlined in the table above, students’ collaborative interactions were audio recorded on three different occasions (session 2, 5 and 8). Once these data sets were collected, exemplars from each session were analysed in search for evidence that would indicate depth of understanding.

Collecting data on metaphor awareness

In Session 2, before the start of the lesson, students were asked to form groups of three or four. They were advised that the composition of the groups would remain the same until the end of the four weeks. Once the groups had been formed, students were reminded that some of sessions would be audio-recorded and that a small voice recorder would be placed on their tables. They were asked to not get distracted by the devices as nothing technical would be required of them in the manipulation of the recorders. After all these instructions, students were given a ‘metaphor task’ (see Appendix 4). Students were given a handout that contained 12 expressions, some of which were metaphorically intended. In an attempt to tap into students’ awareness of the metaphoricity of these expressions, they were asked to discuss in groups the meanings of each of the expressions. In particular, students had to judge the statements as metaphorical or literal and write a brief reason justifying their decision. After discussing their views and judgements of the statements, students were asked to come to an agreement on whether the statements were literal or metaphorical. Such group discussions around this task were audio-recorded in Session 2.
Once students had finished this collaborative task, some students were asked to share their choices with the class. After that, the students were introduced to the notion of metaphor, especially the notion of conceptual metaphor. As part of the introduction to the notion, students were told about some of the underlying principles of a conceptual metaphor. For instance, they were taught the notions of ‘source’, ‘target’ and ‘domain’ and were briefly introduced to such ideas as ‘literal language’ and ‘metaphorical language’. The aim of introducing students to these general concepts underpinning the notion of metaphor was to provide them with an overview of key terms which would be encountered throughout the implementation of the metaphor-awareness raising tool. It was also important to introduce learners as early as possible to these concepts so they could start developing an overall understanding of what underpins a metaphor. It is important to note that at this stage, Session 2 (first audio-recorded discussion), students had not yet been introduced to the MIP, so no mention or reference to it was found in students’ language at this stage.

In Session 3, students were given 15 minutes at the end of the class to complete the first journal entry. It was decided to give students the first Journal entry at the end of this session (Session 3) because they had already been exposed to the first two steps of the MIP, as shown in the above table. It was in Session 3 that students began to be taught the procedure. Therefore, it was crucial to capture their views of metaphor and, in particular, of the steps of the MIP they had been introduced to.

By the end of Session 5, students had been introduced to all the steps of the MIP (seven different steps). Three more steps had been introduced in Session 4 and the last two in Session 5. During the Session students were asked to work on a collaborative task which consisted of following and applying the steps of the MIP to a text (See Appendix 5). Students were expected to use the steps to identify metaphors in the text and discuss and justify their choices and reasons. This collaborative activity was audio recorded. Transcripts of audio-recordings were then analysed for awareness of metaphor (see Chapter 5).

In Session 7, nearing the end of the four-week teaching period, students were given the last Journal entry. This entry provided an opportunity to capture students’ overall experience, opinions and views of what they had gone through in the teaching sessions.

In Session 8, students were given the opportunity to engage in a reflective discussion (see Appendix 6) of the lessons they had attended, what they had learnt, and what they had been exposed to throughout the teaching sessions. This activity was audio-recorded. Transcripts of the discussions were analysed for evidence and possible indications of the awareness of metaphor. This reflective instance was
guided and prompted by five different questions which students could discuss in groups (see questions in Appendix 6). The overall purpose of the questions was to encourage students to express their views of metaphor, the MIP and the interplay between metaphor awareness and text understanding. The questions utilised to prompt their discussions were as follows:

1. What are some important concepts or ideas that you discovered or learnt over the last four weeks?
2. What are your current views of metaphor?
3. How do you see the MIP? Difficult? Useful?
4. Are you more aware of metaphors now?
5. Do you think you could better understand a text containing metaphors?

These questions were intended to not only initiate their discussions and maintain them more focused on the topic but also to tap into any possible changes in their beliefs, perceptions and views of what they had been exposed to throughout the four-week teaching intervention period.

In conclusion, the data collected through the journal entries (sessions 3, 5 & 7) and the audio-recording discussions (sessions 2, 5 & 8) provide different, though complementary, insights into the development of learners’ awareness of metaphor.

How data were analysed

Introduction

In order to answer the research question in the present investigation, both quantitative and qualitative paradigms were utilised in the data analysis. The description of data analysis is presented on the basis of the two central parts of the research question: reading comprehension and metaphor awareness raising. This section describes and discusses the ways in which reading comprehension was measured. Learners’ understanding of text was analysed by examining data gleaned from the administration of two different methods: a reading comprehension test and recordings of students’ collaborative talk.

How reading comprehension was analysed

Reading test

Reading comprehension was measured by administering tests at the beginning of the data collection period (prior to the metaphor awareness raising sessions) and at the culmination of it. As mentioned earlier, the reading comprehension tests were comprised of two broad sections which measured
text understanding from two different perspectives – one which looked at the act of reading as product, and therefore as easy to measure and quantify, while the other looked at it as a process of meaning construction.

The reading test was comprised of four different sections; a vocabulary section, multiple-choice questions, short-answer questions, and a reader-response task. With regard to the first section, (as described in 4.5.1) each of the words in the vocabulary task had been used metaphorically in the text. Students were asked to figure out the metaphorical meaning of the words as they appeared in the text and write down their interpretations or definitions next to each word. The researcher examined students’ responses and rated them into metaphorical or literal. The metaphorical and literal ratings were counted and then represented in a table. This enabled the researcher to identify how many students understood and interpreted the words literally and how many of them interpreted them metaphorically. This statistics was pivotal as results were compared with the post-test in order to have an indication of the extent to which students’ interpretations of the metaphorically-used words had changed over time as a result of the teaching intervention period.

The second section of the test was comprised of four multiple-choice questions providing the student with three alternatives (a-b-c) in each question. The manner in which this section was analysed resembles the analysis of the first section. Students’ number of correct and incorrect answers were counted and then represented in a table (see Appendix 21).

The third part included three short-answer questions. Backman and Palmer (1996, cited in Anderson, 2000) point out that short-answer questions can be regarded as a limited production response type. This type of question elicits a brief answer, which certainly goes beyond yes/no questions. Anderson (2000) claims that using short-answer questions provides insights into whether the student has really comprehended or not. Unlike multiple-choice questions, students provide some kind of justification for their responses. Although it was difficult for the researcher to construct these three short-answer questions as ambiguity had to be avoided, students’ responses fell into relatively the same range of objectivity. Yet, a few responses were rather subjective and did not match the range of possible answers expected by the researcher. This did not mean that answers were deemed incorrect, but involved a different way of dealing with them.

The last section of the test, the reader response task, involved the students in a meaning-making process whereby learners’ responses in the reader-response task were read and analysed (see
Appendices 19-20 for learners’ responses). Traditionally, the analysis of reader response tasks has been characterised by the parsing or division of the entire response into phrases, clauses, or simply general statements (Pragglejaz Group, 2007) that give the researcher an indication of what is being looked at. Once the response is divided, relevant general statements are considered for analysis. These are, then, examined in search of particular features depending on what the research is seeking to explore (e.g. Elliot, 1990; Hirvela, 1996). In the present study, it was decided to analyse the overall response produced by the learners without breaking it down into smaller parts (phrases, clauses or sentences). McIntosh (2003) suggests that an alternative to the analysis of reader responses is the examination of the overall content of the response where the researcher looks for specific features in the response such as the quantity and quality of information, key words signalling specific ideas or general linguistic features in the writing. Another analytical approach to reader response is offered by Sebesta, Monson and Senn (1995) who utilised ‘a hierarchy’ to assess reader responses. Their hierarchy consisted of four stages, each of which is sub-divided into other smaller components: (i) evocation, (ii) alternatives, (iii) reflective thinking, and (iv) evaluation. Amongst several other things, each of these hierarchies referred to the following. The first one, for example, refers to the reader’s capacity to either summarize the content of the reading, or part thereof, or, what the authors call, “relive the experience”. The second hierarchical level refers to the reader’s reliance and application of their own experiences and views in the response. The third one makes reference to the reader’s capacity to think critically and analytically about the text. This, in the author’s view, could allude to the capacity to either make generalizations or extending the meaning of text by finding applications to other domains. The last hierarchical level refers to the reader’s capacity to make evaluations of the content of the reading.

Although this set of criteria to assess responses has been traditionally used in the analysis of aesthetic responses to literary texts, the authors themselves recommend using or adapting this flexible hierarchy to the assessment of responses of genres other than literary. Partly informed by the two perspectives of reader response assessment discussed above, McIntosh’s (2003) suggestion about analysing the content of the reader response and the hierarchy set forth by Sebesta et al. (1995), the present study draws on features from each approach in order to analyse the responses elicited in the reading test. In line with McIntosh’s (2003) suggestion on analysing responses in terms of their content, the researcher in the present investigation began the analysis of responses by carefully examining the overall content of responses in order to get an overall impression of what they were about. This was
followed by a search of certain features within the responses that allow to categorise them into one (or more) of the following hierarchical levels that resulted from an adaptation of the hierarchy developed by Sebesta et al. (1995):

1. Summary
2. Elaboration
3. Questioning
4. Evaluation

Once the overall content of the responses was analysed and certain linguistic features (e.g. key words) identified, the researcher used the above-mentioned categories to assess the overall response. Each of these levels, as Sebesta et al. (1995) suggest, is used to capture the diverse ways in which readers engage with texts and how each of them understands and appropriates the text meaning.

To exemplify the process of analysis and categorisation of the responses, below is a sample of a learner's response:

The text only talks about a problem in poor countries that the G8 have to solve as soon as possible to deal with the poverty and the climate change in the world.

The above response, provided by one of the learners (S01) at the start of the teaching period, was analysed for any linguistic feature that could give an indication of the way in which the reader had understood, reacted to or interpreted the text. In this way, three key words were identified: only, talks and about. Having read the overall content of the response, it was decided that these key words were introducing a short summary of the main themes discussed in the text. Thus, the response was categorised into the ‘Summary’ level.

In a later instance, at the end of the teaching period, the same learner (S01) writes the following response:

The text that discuss the global warming problem says that the meeting didn’t achieve the objective, in other words that it was very pessimistic. The other problem, the one about the 14 African countries was very positive. For that, Bono says that he is looking down the... (I can’t remember). In my opinion, for the global warming it is important that everyone are aware that ourselves are damaging the world, with the food we eat, the chemicals, pesticides, and things
like that. *Does it make sense that politicians or famous people get together about this problem? Don’t think so.*

Aside from the length of the response, one element that was highlighted when reading and analysing its content was the learner’s use of certain key words and phrases that indicated something other than a ‘summary’. For example, the use of the words and phrases such as ‘pessimistic’, ‘in my opinion’, ‘it is important…’, and finally the question raised by the learner at the end of the response gave the researcher an indication that, first of all, the learner had engaged with the text differently and, secondly, that the response was beyond a ‘summary’ and close to an ‘evaluation’.

The examples above show the way in which learners’ responses were analysed and categorised into one (or more) of the hierarchical levels that were used to assess reader responses. Categorising learners’ responses according to different levels can provide an indication of how their understanding of text progressed from summary levels to deeper levels of understanding as shown by elaboration, questioning or evaluation.

**How awareness of metaphor was analysed**

**Introduction**

This section outlines the ways in which awareness of metaphor was measured in the present study. The examination of learners’ awareness of metaphor was carried out through the analysis of data obtained from two different methods: classroom talk and journal entries.

**Classroom talk**

In Creswell’s (1995) view, naturalistic and semi-naturalistic data, such as observations of human activity or recordings of individuals’ interactions, can always be examined from more than one perspective. Along this line of reasoning, Dörnyei (2003) illustrates that a sample of spoken data can be analysed from a purely quantifiable perspective, perhaps through the counting of particular features, from interpretive lenses where the researcher is empowered to arrive at open interpretations and justified conclusions of the occurrence of a particular phenomenon, or from a perspective that combines features of the former and the latter. In the present study, spoken data were collected and audio recorded on three different occasions: sessions 2, 5 and 8. On each of these sessions students were audio recorded while discussing and working collaboratively on different tasks. As soon as each session was audio recorded, the researcher
began to transcribe the interactions using basic transcription conventions and symbols from Conversation Analysis (see Appendices 7-15 for transcripts of learners’ discussions over the three instances).

Transcripts were analysed in two different ways in order to tap into learners’ growth in awareness of metaphor. The first measure taken to analyse the data included an analysis of transcripts particularly focused on the measurement of students’ number and length of turns in conversations. The second measure involved analysis of learners’ use of the metalanguage of metaphor. In this way, transcripts were examined in search of metaphor-related language that was used in students’ collaborative interactions.

The rationale for adopting these two measures of analysis of student transcripts is rooted, first of all, in the researcher’s own observations of student discussions and, secondly, and most importantly, in what is evidenced in the literature. Having closely observed students’ discussions, the way they engaged in conversation and how they went about completing tasks collaboratively, it came to the researcher’s attention that learners were talking more, participating more and contributing more to the discussions as they had more exposure to the teaching intervention. In line with this observation, Jin (2011) discusses the role of consciousness in second language learning and concludes that learners’ capacity to contribute to a dialogue usually increases as more consciousness and familiarity is gained of the topic of conversation. That is, a growth in learners’ consciousness, or awareness, of a given subject matter is likely to lead them to talking more about it.

In regard to the other measure of analysis of student transcripts, that of the metalanguage of metaphor, the motive driving its choice is primarily informed by research into the relationship between awareness and metalanguage. Steel and Alderson (1994), who discuss the interplay between language awareness and metalanguage, have pointed out that an individual’s ability to use language to talk about language, that is, using metalanguage, is usually indicative of explicit or conscious knowledge about language. Based upon this relationship between an individual’s metalanguage and his/her conscious knowledge about it, it was decided to capture learners’ awareness of metaphor by analysing their capacity to use the metalanguage of metaphor.

Both of the above-mentioned measures, analysis of learners’ turns in conversations and their metalanguage of metaphor, provide two complementary ways of capturing learners’ potential growth of knowledge, understanding and overall awareness of metaphor.
Having an understanding of the ways in which learners transcripts of their collaborative discussions were analysed, important questions arise in relation to the actual analysis of the data. What features were particularly looked at in the transcripts when measuring number of turns and length turn? Similarly, what elements and features were examined in the transcripts when looking at the metalanguage of metaphor? In order to determine what specifically would be looked at in the analysis of transcripts, it was fundamental to determine a unit of analysis for both types of measures. In regard to the analysis of turn length and number of turns, it was important to find a clear way that allows to examine the development of learners’ language, and their awareness of metaphor, as indicated by a potential growth in the number and length of turns in conversation. In order to do this, it was important to define what would count as a turn in the present study, and what linguistic features would be looked at within turns in order to examine the length of turns.

A turn, as defined by Jones (2008), is any instance where a participant begins to speak or one where only one party is talking at any one time. Any turn, according to Sacks, Scheglof and Anderson (1994) is comprised of at least one turn constructional unit (TCU). They go on to suggest that a TCU is the smallest complete unit that fully constitutes a turn. In other words, a TUC describes the basic units out of which turns are fashioned. Some of these basic units include lexemes, phrases, clauses and sentences. The unit that was utilised as a measure in the counting of learners’ number of turns was the clause. A turn was, then, any instance of talk that comprised at least one clause, whether it be dependent or independent. As such, the basic condition was that it should contain a predicate. However, those instances of talk which did not contain a clause but only, what is called, temporal regulators such as ‘right’, ‘uhm’ were not considered a turn. As well, in the learners’ transcripts there were several instances where a turn was comprised of ellipted clauses such as ‘what?’, ‘yes’, ‘no’, ‘maybe’ and so on. Although such utterances convey a great deal of meaning, it was decided not to consider them in the analysis when counting turns. The overall reason for not including these instances in the counting process was primarily because it was sometimes difficult to track in the learners' transcripts what they referred to when uttering such temporal regulators and ellipted clauses.

Since a turn is likely to be comprised of more than one clause, the internal clausal composition of turns was also examined in an attempt to look into their length in order to find out whether what learners were saying about metaphor became more complex over the three audio-recorded instances. In order to measure learners’ length of turns, the number of clauses embedded in each turn were counted. The embedded clauses that were counted in learners’ turns included noun clauses, relative clauses and
adverbial clauses. In the process of data analysis, however, no distinction between these different types was made since a linguistics analysis of the nature of clauses is outside of the scope of the present study.

The following is a short extract from the transcript of a conversation that exemplifies what was counted as turn and how turns may differ from each other in terms of their internal clausal composition:

25   S03:  Yeap ↓
26   m: : ah: () life is a dream
27   S02:  what? =
28   S03:  =life is a dream
29   T:  is that a Chinese metaphor?
30   S01:  yeap ↓
31   T:  what does that metaphor mean?
32   S03:  m: life is dream
33   because people () always don’t know what will happen the next time
34   an:: d they don’t know, what the future is () like a dream
35   T:  what is your metaphor? ((Teacher asks another student in the group))

What is highlighted yellow in this example is what was not considered to be a turn. S02’s question word ‘what’ at line 27 is not considered a turn in the present study since it is not a clause and does not have a predicate. At 25, one can observe that S03’s whole turn is comprised of ‘yeap’, some hesitations and a clause. The core unit in this turn was the clause highlighted in green. At 28, S03’s turn is comprised of a single clause. However, the same student’s turn is much longer at 32-34 since it is comprised of several clauses suggesting that what the learner was saying, as far as the clausal composition is concerned, was more complex.

Transcriptions of learners’ interactions were also analysed in search of features which could provide an indication of their use of metalanguage of metaphor. In section 2.7.2.1 it was pointed out that according to Al-Heijn learners’ awareness of language is likely to be reflected in their capacity to report on
what they have become aware of. In line with Al-Hejin’s observation, in an attempt to seek linguistic features of learners’ capacity to talk about metaphor, key metaphorically-related words in the learners’ language were identified and counted. In order to tap into learners’ engagement with the MIP, the metaphor-awareness raising tool, and their understanding of metaphor, such lexical items as ‘metaphor’, ‘literal’, ‘MIP’, ‘source’, ‘target’, ‘domain’ and ‘meaning’ were tracked in the learners’ language use (see 5.2.2).

Aside from counting linguistic features in learners’ language as evidence of awareness of metaphor, students’ written responses to journal entries were also examined in search of evidence that could indicate learners’ growth in awareness of metaphor.

**Journal Entries**

In the description of journal entries as a method of data collection in this study (see 4.5.3), it was discussed that journal writing is a widely used reflective tool for exploring learners’ learning experiences (e.g. Braun & Clarke, 2006; Chaudron, 1986; Davies, 1995). Analysis of individuals’ experiences has been traditionally done by using interpretive methods (Boyd & Fales, 1983). One of the multiple interpretive methods widely used is what is commonly known as thematic analysis. Braun and Clarke (2006) point out that despite being poorly demarcated, thematic analysis continues to be a widely acknowledged and utilised qualitative tool of data analysis.

Due to the nature of the data collected from the entries and the great flexibility of using thematic analysis, it was decided to utilise this analytical method in the examination of learners’ voices in the form of journal entries. To assist the analysis of themes, a statistical application QSR Nvivo was utilised. As shown in table 4.7.1 which summarised the methods and procedures of data collection (see 4.7.1), students completed three journal entries (sessions 3, 5 & 7). In order avoid accumulating data until the end the teaching intervention period, the researcher began to familiarize himself with the journal entries once each was administered to students. Chaudron (2006) comments that familiarization with the data, which typically involves reading and re-reading, is a crucial initial phase of the analysis as it enables the researcher to become immersed in its content. Being familiar with the overall content of the entries, the data were entered into Nvivo database in order to begin the coding and search of emerging themes.
The search of emerging themes in the data obtained from the journal entries was particularly aimed at finding key features and elements in the responses which would provide an indication of learners’ potential enhanced awareness.

Unlike the quantitative statistical analysis where learners were referred to by numbers from 1 to 25, in the thematic analysis of learners’ voices in the journal entries, learners were referred to differently. In order to give each learner some individuality as well as a sense of being, each learner was referred to by a different pseudonym (see Appendix 25).

**Conclusion**

This chapter has described and discussed the methodology adopted in the present investigation. Section 4.2 described the research areas on which the study draws. It was pointed out that due to the nature of the research question, which comprises the areas of metaphor awareness and text understanding, it was relevant to draw on research methods from applied linguistics and education. A description of who the participants were and the procedure utilised for recruitment was given in 4.3. In section 4.5, we provided a description of the methods used in the study to collect the relevant data to address the research question. A description of the Central to addressing the research question is the tool used throughout the four-week teaching period to raise learners’ awareness of metaphor. In section 4.6, we described the MIP along with the adapted version which was utilised for enhancing learners’ awareness of metaphor. The final two sections, 4.7 and 4.8, described the steps and procedures which characterised the collection of data. The ways in which these data were analysed were discussed in 4.8.

Although other methodological orientations could have been adopted in addressing the research question, the present chapter has provided a general account of and justification for the methodological perspective from which the research question has been addressed.

The next two chapters (Chapter 5 & 6) discuss the findings from the data analysis on awareness of metaphor and understanding of text. Let us turn our attention first to what was learnt about learners’ potential enhanced awareness of metaphor.
Chapter 5: Becoming aware of metaphor

Introduction

The examination of learners’ growth in awareness of metaphor involved the analysis of two measures: learners’ language as examined in the transcripts of group discussions and learners’ voices in the form of journal entries. Transcripts of student group (collaborative) discussions were analysed in two different ways in order to capture learners’ growth in awareness of metaphor. One was the students’ number of turns as well as their length. Another was the students’ use of metalanguage of metaphor. The analysis of both of these features provides us with an indication of potential growth in learners’ awareness as reflected in the linguistic features found in learners’ talk.

In relation to the measurement of metalanguage, key metaphorically-related lexemes were tracked in student language over time. Student reflections in the form of journal entries were analysed to capture an overall picture of student’s perceptions of the interplay between metaphor awareness and their increase in reading understanding. Journal entries were analysed thematically by using QSR NVivo (version 9.0). A wide range of themes emerged from student reflections which provide an overall picture of how becoming aware of metaphor and of its underlying relationships leads them to deeper levels of text understanding.

This chapter reports what was learnt from the two features of students’ language, length of turns and metalanguage of metaphors derived from student discussions, along with their reflections coming from the journal entries.

Awareness reflected in the students’ language

Introduction

Students were audio recorded on three different instances over the four-week teaching period. This data was analysed in order to provide an indication of how much students were talking about metaphor. Two features of their language were analysed in order to determine this. One was the students’ number of turns and their length, which in the present analysis are referred to as Time 1 (T1), Time 2 (T2) and Time 3 (T3) respectively. The other measure was the students’ use of the metalanguage of metaphor.
Measuring talk: learners’ number of turns in conversation

The three different instances (T1, T2 & T3) of class discussion seemed to have provided learners with opportunities to talk more about metaphor. Analysis of transcripts revealed that learners’ amount of talk increased from T1 to T3. This was evidenced by the increasing number of turns counted over the three instances. This increase in the number of turns shows that before the implementation of the metaphor awareness-raising tool (Time 1) students’ turns were lower than those later instances (Time 2 & 3) when learners had been introduced to the MIP. What was found in the counting of turns (see Appendix 22) revealed that learners’ average number of turns was 25.84 (SD=8.93) for Time 1, which grew to 29.92 (SD=11.4) in Time 2, and 50.16 (SD=17.9) for Time 3. The difference between means, especially from T2 to T3, clearly demonstrates an increase in the amount of student talk which demonstrates a developed capacity to talk more about metaphor. Having the capacity to talk more about metaphor suggests in turn that learners’ awareness of metaphor seemed to have developed over the audio-recorded instances as a result of the implementation of the MIP.

Figure 5.2.2 below shows that the majority the learners (N=21) showed a quite significant increase in T3. This instance, which was almost the end of the implementation of the MIP, clearly shows that learners’ amount of talk about metaphor had gone through important developmental changes.
There were some other learners, however, who didn’t quite clearly show an increase in the number of turns in conversation. In fact, some of them (S05, S21 & S24) revealed an opposite trend. Unlike S21 and S24, S05 had more turns in T2 than T1 & T3. S21 and S24, on the other hand, showed a higher number of turns in T1 than T2 and T3. Although these examples of unsteady development of turns in conversation could prompt much speculation, which is not the aim of the this section, it is worth highlighting that such decrease by T3 does not necessarily indicate that learners did not develop a capacity to talk more about metaphor and, therefore, that their awareness of metaphor hadn’t been enhanced.

From the overall increase in the amount of talk over time, as observed in the figure above and the table in appendix 22, it appears that learners have developed some kind of capacity to talk more about what they are doing in groups. It was discussed earlier (see 2.8.2.1 & 4.8.3.2) that awareness of language may become manifest in the learners’ capacity to talk about what they are aware of (1986). The increase in turns in conversations may provide an indication of learners’ being more aware of metaphor. Their capacity to talk more extensively throughout the development of group activities may shed some light on possible effects of the metaphor-awareness raising sessions to which learners have been exposed on their overall language use and, particularly, on their awareness of metaphor.

In order to have a clearer sense of the nature and clausal composition of turns analysed above, and therefore of the extensiveness with which learners’ talk increased over time, it was decided, as mentioned in 4.8.3.2, to further explore the internal structural composition of turns in order to have a better sense of not only the number of turns in conversation but also of their length. Understanding whether a turn was comprised of only one single clause or more than one would provide a better account of not only an increased in the amount of students’ collaborative talk but also of the complexity of the language.

**Measuring talk: learners’ length of turns**

Over the teaching period, learners’ talk in interaction did not only grow in amount but also in complexity. The number of clauses embedded in learners’ turns provides us with a clearer picture of, first of all, whether or not turns became longer and, secondly, of a possible development of more complex language about metaphor.
In Figure 5.2.3 an overall increase in the number of clauses over the intervention period can be observed.

The graph provides us with an overview of the number of clauses found in the transcripts of student discussions. The results indicate (see Appendix 23) that students’ average number of clauses was 33.6 (SD=12.2) for T1, 42.8 (SD=9.1) for T2, and lastly 66.3 (SD=13.1) for T3. The difference between the means indicates that there was an overall growth in the nature and internal clausal composition of learners’ turns. This, which clearly points to an overall increase in the length of turns, demonstrates that the language learners were using in conversations developed in more complex ways throughout the teaching period.

This increase in amount of talk and language complexity appears to indicate several things: first of all, it suggests changes in the involvement and participation of learners in the conversations throughout the teaching period. Secondly, it seems that throughout the implementation of the metaphor-awareness raising tool, learners have been afforded with ‘something’ which has enabled them to contribute more and talk more about what is discussed in groups. Considering that the type of talk that has been analysed is that which occurred in the development and completion of metaphor-related tasks, it could be assumed that such increase in students’ amount of talk, as indicated by the increase in length of turns in conversations, is then an indication of their capacity to talk more about metaphor. Such growth in their capacity to talk more
about metaphor while completing related tasks may shed some light on the possible growth in their being more aware of metaphor in language and, more specifically, in text.

In order to statistically test whether or not the increase in the number of turns, as discussed in the preceding section, and clauses was statistically significant across the three instances, a chi square test ($\chi^2$) was utilised with $p = .05$ as criterion for significance. According to the results yielded from the application of the chi square test, it is observed that there appears to be some factor other than chance operating for the deviation to be so great. Such minimal percentage in the possibility of mere chance as an interfering factor in the increase in learners’ length of turns give us an indication that the implementation of the metaphor-awareness raising tool may have role to play in learners’ increase in amount of talk. All in all, such statistically significant increase in learners’ length of turns in collaborative talk indicates a possible growth of awareness of metaphor.

Having analysed learners’ talk about metaphor for number and length of turns, it is time now that attention be drawn to other linguistic features in particular that of the metalanguage of metaphor, that were sought and counted in learners’ talk about metaphor.

**Using the Metalanguage of metaphor**

**5.3.1 Introduction**

Metalanguage has been generally defined, as discussed in 2.8.2.1, as the language used to talk about language (Al-Hejin, 2004). In this study, it was decided to measure student’s metaphorically-related language used in their audio-recorded discussions as potential evidence of growth in awareness. Although a number of possible linguistic features could have been examined in learners’ transcripts as evidence of awareness of metaphor, what was sought in the transcripts was occurrences of seven different metaphor-related lexemes. These included which are as follows: metaphor, literal, MIP, source, target, domain and meaning. These were identified as key words that would be explicitly taught to students as part of the metaphor-awareness raising procedure. Counting the occurrences of these lexemes in the students’ transcripts was fundamental in order to be able to determine a possible growth in awareness as indicated by the increasing use of these words; that is, a growth in the metalanguage of metaphor.
5.3.2 A general view of what was found in learners’ metalanguage of metaphor

Over the 8 lessons as part of the teaching intervention period, students’ use of the metalanguage of metaphor increased significantly. As already mentioned in 4.7.3, learners had not been introduced to the MIP by T1 (first audio-recorded instance); hence, no reference to it was found in the analysis of learners’ transcripts of Time 1 audio-recorded discussions. As can be seen in Figure 5.3, no occurrences of MIP were found in Time 1. However, an overall increase across the second and third instances can be observed.

A general glance at the data reveals that students’ use of the metalanguage of metaphor increased across the three instances where the average overall number of words was 66 (SD=46.03) for T1, 87.2 (SD=45.1) for T2, and 132.4 (SD=72.9) for T3. Although most lexical items show an increase in occurrence across the three instances, of interest is to observe that no change in the number of occurrences is observed in the first two audio-recorded instances, Time 1-2, for the lexeme ‘target’. In regard to the occurrences of the word ‘domain’, it can be seen from the above figure that, unlike most other instances, there is a decrease in the second instance (N=56) in relation to the first (N=73), rising to 88 in the third audio-recorded time. Although the occurrences of these two lexical items show quite an interesting and apparently opposite trend with respect to the rest of the lexemes, they show the students’ capacity to use the metalanguage of metaphor in different ways at certain points in time. The decrease in metalanguage of metaphor, especially in the occurrences of the lexeme ‘domain’, does not necessarily indicate a decrease in students’ overall awareness of metaphor. Such fall in the overall number of counts may have been
attributed to a number of different factors such as the nature of the task, students’ overall lack of confidence with the terminology, or perhaps the nature of the ways in which learners engaged in conversation over the three audio-recorded instances. All in all, as can be seen from the difference between the means, there is an overall increase in the amount of talk about metaphor that is reflected in the student’s lexicon. This is an indication of how what the students were saying contained more metaphor-related words, particularly those tracked across instances; thus, suggesting a possible change in learners’ awareness of metaphor.

In order to statistically test whether or not the numerical growth in the use of the metalanguage of metaphor was significant throughout the teaching intervention period, a chi square test ($x^2$) was utilised with $x = .05$ as criterion for significance. The results obtained from the application of the statistical test are significant ($p < 0.003$). This suggests that there appears to be a factor, or perhaps more, other than chance contributing to such great deviation. In attempting to establish a possible relationship between the increase in learners’ use of the metalanguage of metaphor and a growth of awareness of metaphor, one could suggest that such minimal percentage in the possibility of mere chance as an interfering factor could possibly be attributed to the implementation of the metaphor-awareness raising tool.

Let us now take a closer look at the data across students that give us a clear picture of how learners’ metalanguage of metaphor increased over time. In particular, a brief examination is provided of each of the lexemes that were tracked in the learners’ language across the three audio-recorded instances.

5.3.2.1 Metaphor

Metaphor was not a new idea to students. The results reveal that, although students had not yet been introduced to the metaphor identification procedure, learners demonstrated familiarity with the notion of metaphor; whether or not students had an accurate idea of what it was and what it involved, what the data reveals is that students’ discussions display, even in early stages (T1), an increasing use of the word ‘metaphor’.
The above graph shows that students’ use of language began to exhibit clear manifestations of the word ‘metaphor’ from the very first instance. In most cases, one can observe that the occurrences of the word increased over time. Although in some particular students’ (e.g. S17, S19 and S23) language a decrease in the use of the word ‘metaphor’ can be observed in T2 with respect to T1, one can clearly observe that occurrences of the term rose in a quite significantly manner in T3. The overall increase in counts over the three audio-recorded instances can be seen in the differences between the mean values which were 5.5 ($SD=2.4$) for T1, 6.3 ($SD=3.0$) for T2, while an even greater average for T3 was evidenced ($M=11.2; SD=3.8$). The overall growth in the occurrences of the word ‘metaphor’ in students’ language may signal learners’ enhanced capacity to talk more about metaphor, thus reflecting a possible development in their conscious capacity to use the metalanguage of metaphor.

Such increase in the metalanguage of metaphor, as indicated by the occurrences of the lexeme ‘metaphor’ in the students’ language, could also be a reflection of the learners’ capacity to identify metaphor. It would appear that as learners worked on metaphor-related tasks throughout the four-week teaching cycle, they became more aware of the presence of metaphor in texts, and therefore talked more about it. Having the capacity to use the metalanguage of metaphor could suggest that learners are not only able to talk about, and potentially identify, ‘metaphor’, but also to distinguish between what is metaphor and what is not.
5.3.2.2 Literal

It was discussed earlier (see 2.6) that most ordinary people as well as researchers, especially metaphor scholars, seem to be gifted with the capacity to distinguish between what is literal and what is metaphorical purely on the basis of their intuition. Such intuitive capacity becomes quite evident in most students’ language in Time 1. By then, students had only been introduced to general concepts about metaphor. No implementation of the metaphor-awareness raising tool had occurred yet. Although only general reference to some metaphor-related concepts had been made by Time 1, the majority ($N=23$) of the students’ language shows some use of the word ‘literal’. Unlike the majority of the learners, S02 and S03 display no use of the word in their language use in Time 1. The absence of occurrences by no means reflects that no students’ participation occurred at this stage. On the contrary, in the earlier graph which showed the occurrences of the word metaphor, it can be seen that these two particular students’ (S02 and S03) language exhibited use of the lexeme ‘metaphor’. What’s more, their use of the word increased across the three instances. This clearly means that students were actively participating in the discussions. Finding no use of the word ‘literal’ in T1 could be attributed to a number of factors, discussion of which goes beyond the scope of the present section. What is significant to highlight, though, is the fact that these two students’ language does show an active use of the term in the other two (T2 & 3) audio-recorded instances.

In general, over the three audio-recorded instances students’ demonstrated an increase in the use of the word ‘literal’. In earlier instances of their talk (first audio-recorded session) a total of 59 occurrences were found ($M=2.36$; $SD=1.46$). In later instances of group interactions students showed a growing number of occurrences; 74 ($M=2.96$; $SD=1.2$) were counted in T2 while 97 ($M=3.88$; $SD=2.04$) in T3.
The overall growth of the lexeme ‘literal’ in learners’ language over time clearly shows an increasingly developed capacity to talk more about metaphor. In line with the increase in occurrences of the word ‘metaphor’ as discussed in the above section, it appears that the increase in the use of the word ‘literal’ also suggests not only a possible change in learners’ awareness of metaphor but also a development in their understanding of what counts as literal and metaphorical.

5.3.2.3 MIP

As mentioned in 4.7.1, the MIP, as a concept and set of steps, was a new idea to students and had not yet been introduced to students by Time 1. At this stage, students had not yet been formally faced with the implementation of the metaphor-awareness raising procedure; that is the MIP. Therefore, the concept was rather a stranger to the students. This is mainly the reason as to why no occurrences of the term whatsoever are found in students’ language in the first audio-recorded instance (T1). In later instances, however, students’ language use shows an apparently active use of the term in their conversations. There are three students (S17, S23 & S24) whose language use shows no occurrences of the term in the first two instances (T1 & 2). This is not to be interpreted as having a passive role in conversation. On the contrary, analysis of their language as shown by the above figures demonstrates their active use of the terms ‘metaphor’ and ‘literal’ in the group discussions.

It is important to note that those students (N=22) who used the term MIP in their conversations in Time 2 and Time 3 referred to it in different ways. Some students attempted to use it in its complete form
(metaphor identification procedure). Others used the acronym (MIP) while other learners simply said either ‘the procedure’ or ‘the metaphor procedure’. When counting the occurrences of this term, the latter forms were also considered valid. A general look at the data reveals an overall increase in the use of the term in both instances (T1 & 2). In the second audio-recorded instance 49 occurrences ($M=1.96; SD=1.24$) were found while 91 ($M=3.64; SD=1.11$) were counted in T3.

Although a general increase in occurrences can be observed, one can see that two students’ (S12 & S19) language use shows a higher percentage of usage in T2 with respect to T3. A closer look at the analysis of the data shows four occurrences of the term for S12 in T2 and three in T3. Similarly, the language of S19 showed three occurrences in T2 and two in T3. Unlike most other students, this trend seems somewhat different since the majority increased in T3 in relation to T2.

Students’ overall use of the term over time shows to some extent the ways in which students appropriated not only the term but also the procedure as a whole, including all its steps. The overall growth in the occurrences of the term in T3 as compared to T2 possibly points to a developmental process whereby learners gradually assimilated the tools for metaphor identification. All in all, the overall increase provides an indication that not only did students’ talk contain more metaphorically-related language but also that students had developed more familiarity, and perhaps confidence, with the term and, maybe, with its corresponding steps. Although an increase in the use of the term ‘MIP’ does not necessarily suggest growth in the understanding of each of the steps involved in it, it could be suggested that such increase
does reflect learners' appropriation of the term which, consequently, may lead to the assumption that its underpinnings have also been gradually appropriated throughout the teaching period.

Having seen an overall increase in learners’ metalanguage of metaphor thus far, as evidenced by higher occurrences of ‘metaphor’, ‘literal’ and ‘MIP’, it was decided to analyse learners’ language use for three key terms which relate closely to the identification and understanding of metaphor. These terms are: source, target and domain. These three concepts, as discussed earlier (see 2.5), form the core of what underpins a metaphor. It has been pointed out that a conceptual metaphor is usually the process of understanding something in terms of something else (Cameron, 2003; Evans & Green, 2006; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). It turns that in such interplay between ‘something’ and ‘something else’ involves concepts (usually two) which refer to different domains. One, the concept being understood, is typically more abstract than the other, which is the one being used as a ‘source’ for understanding the abstraction. These concepts are referred to as ‘target’ and ‘source’ respectively. The centrality of these concepts lies in that a metaphor involves a cross-domain mapping between source and target. The source domain –more concrete concept –is the concept from which features, attributes and characteristics are usually taken and mapped onto the target domain –more abstract concept. The following sections report what was found in learners’ language when analysed for the occurrence of these words in their language use.

5.3.2.4 Source

Although the MIP was unknown to students by the time they were first audio-recorded (T1), other notions such as ‘source’, ‘target’ and ‘domain’ had already been introduced to students. These were pivotal for students to begin to understand, first and foremost, what underpins a metaphor, from the perspective of CL, and what is involved in it. Analysis of the data shows an overall increase in the counts of the term ‘source’ in students’ language. In particular, a total of 27 (M=1.08; SD=1.03) occurrences were found in T1. In T2 they increased to 68 (M=2.72; SD; 1.3) and continued to rise to 92 (M=3.68; SD=0.94) in T3.

This growth from 27 (T1) to 92 (T3) appears to be quite significant in that it shows some development in the students’ overall capacity to use, perhaps more confidently, the metalanguage of metaphor.
Figure 5.3.4: Occurrences of the word source in students' language over time.

On the whole, the data demonstrates an increase in the metalanguage of metaphor which, in this case, is indicated by the growing use of the word ‘source’ across the three audio-recorded instances. This suggests that students’ overall understanding of what is involved in a metaphor and what underpins it developed over time. In earlier chapters (e.g. 2.5) it was pointed out that, from the perspective of CL, a (conceptual) metaphor usually refers to the interplay between an abstract concept and a more concrete concept where the former is understood as the target domain while the latter as the source domain. The source domain, or concrete concept, serves as a base from which certain features and attributes are taken and mapped on the target domain in order to better understand the abstract concept. If learners’ overall capacity to talk about, and potentially identify, the source domain of a metaphor has increased over the teaching intervention period, it would appear that learners’ overall understanding of the underpinnings of metaphor has deepened over time.

In attempt to examine the ways in which learners were able to talk about the abstract concept, it was decided track the concept ‘target’ in their language use throughout the four-week teaching period.

5.3.2.5 Target

It is worth recalling that, as mentioned in the previous section, learners were introduced (in session 2) to some basic metaphor-related notions such as literal, source, target and domain before they were introduced to the metaphor-awareness raising tool (MIP) in session 3. It was central that students developed some familiarity and understanding of some key notions underlying the concept of metaphor.
Apart from the concept ‘source’, as shown above, learners’ language was also analysed in search of occurrences of the lexeme ‘target’. It was found that the overall number of times that this lexeme appeared in learners’ language was 45 ($M=2.1; SD=1.1$) for T1, 53 ($M=2.9; SD=1.19$) for T2, and 63 ($M=3.2; SD=1.27$) for T3. The difference between the means is a reflection of how the amount of metalanguage of metaphor increased in the students’ talk on task. The figure below gives a clearer picture of the data.

![Graph showing occurrences of the word 'target' in students' language over time.](image)

Figure 5.3.5: Occurrences of the word target in students' language over time.

Figure 5.8 provides an indication of an overall increase in the students’ metalanguage of metaphor as indicated by the lexeme ‘target’ across the three instances. It is relevant to observe here that not all students’ language show a steady increase in their use of the word. For example, it can be observed that two students (S05 & S12) do not show any use at all of the word in their language in the first audio-recorded instance. However, their use of the word became clearly evident in the second and third instances. Although the absence of the lexeme in these two learners’ language in the first instance could be attributed to several factors, their use of the metalanguage of metaphor did contain the lexeme ‘target’ in T2 increasing in T3.

### 5.3.2.6 Domain

We have seen thus far that students’ talk has exhibited an overall increase in the metalanguage of metaphor as indicated by specific lexemes that were tracked in the learners’ language. As far as ‘domain’ is concerned, the figure below shows an indication of most learners’ having an increasing capacity to use the concept ‘domain’ throughout the teaching period.
Although some learners did not appear to use the concept systematically through the three instances, one can observe that, unlike the use of other concepts discussed above, the use of the concept ‘domain’ was greater in some learners’ in T1 than in T2. In fact, the overall counts of the occurrences of the word turned out to be greater in T1 than in T2. In T1 an overall count of 54 occurrences were found while in T2 it dropped to 47, increasing in T3 to 76 counts.

5.3.2.7 Meaning

Students were naturally familiar with the word ‘meaning’. It is a concept that people, and students in particular, generally use when referring to, for instance, a new word or one that, depending on the context, may have several senses. Such familiarity with the word becomes clearly evident in the learners’ language in the first instance of discussion (T1), as can be observed in the figure below.
In T1, the number of occurrences of ‘meaning’ in the learners’ language was 55 (M=2.2; SD=1.23); this number rose to 79 (M=2.93; SD=1.19) in T2, and continued to show a slight increase to 87 (M=3.17; SD=1.27) in T3. Although students appeared to be already familiar with the concept in T1, one can clearly observe from the figure that ‘meaning’ was a concept that became more talked about amongst most learners. This could indicate not only the level of familiarity with the concept that students may have developed over time, but also growth in their capacity to engage in discussions about the literal-metaphorical nature of language; thus, suggesting both a better use of the metalanguage of metaphor and a potential growth of awareness of metaphor.

5.3.3 Conclusion

The linguistic features looked at in the present chapter, one could conclude, provide some evidence of how what the learners were saying in the discussions reflected a change in their overall conscious capacity to talk about metaphor. The analysis of learners’ turns showed that they became not only more numerous over time, but also longer; thus, suggesting an overall growth in the learners’ amount of talk about metaphor. The analysis and counting of certain linguistic features, particularly different metaphor-related lexemes, demonstrated an overall growth in the learners’ use of the metalanguage of metaphor. Learners’ longer and more numerous turns in conversation along with an increase in their capacity to use metaphor-related language points to a possible changed awareness of metaphor over time. This, in turn, does not only show a change in the learners’ cognition but also in their linguistic behaviour.
Aside from looking at learners’ awareness of metaphor as manifested in the analysis of linguistic features, it was also examined in the content of learners’ responses to three journal entries administered on three different occasions throughout the teaching period.

**Journal entries: student reflections on metaphor and metaphor awareness**

A number of emergent and recurrent themes came up in the students’ writing as summarised in Table 5.4. These themes reveal a multi-layered composition of elements that range from how learners appeared to develop a capacity to spot metaphor to how a potential growth of awareness leads learners to deeper levels of understanding of metaphor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Themes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Subthemes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor is important but difficult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The usefulness of metaphor</strong></td>
<td>Metaphors promotes lexical learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential of metaphor to develop language skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The visibility of metaphor, awareness and uses for it</strong></td>
<td>Recognition of the ubiquity of metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working collaboratively leads to more awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing awareness resulting from MIP steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor as a means of critical thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The interplay between metaphor awareness and text comprehension</strong></td>
<td>Awareness enables deeper understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness and text comprehension leading to more overall learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.4: Emerging themes and sub-themes from learners’ journal entries*
It is important to note that one of the complexities linked to coding and finding themes in a data set is the prevalence of a theme; the proportion or amount of evidence which needs to be displayed within the data for a theme to be regarded as such (Berry, 2005; Fortune, 2005). In this analysis, a theme was counted as such on the basis of two elements: the occurrences across the entire data set and the number (percentage) of participants who articulated the theme. Each theme, as shown in the above Table, had other subthemes subsumed within it, all of which are reported in this section.

In regard to the coding of participants and the three different journal entries completed by learners, learners will be referred to by their pseudonym as well as the numerical code (e.g. Nick-S15). The three different instances of journal writing are referred to thus: journal entry Time 1 (JE-T1), journal entry Time 2 (JE-T2), and journal entry Time 3 (JE-T3).

**The usefulness of metaphor**

The first subtheme to be discussed herein is in line with the complexity involved in metaphor understanding, and consequently the confusion to which it may lead.

Before the emergence of CL, access to the meaning of metaphor was viewed as secondary, and therefore more complex than literal meanings. It seems that this view is somewhat still reflected in the conceptions of second language learners. In earlier stages of journal responses (JE-T1, see Appendix 16), students deemed metaphor as being complex to understand:

*The metaphors is very difficult and maybe a bit confused for me. I don’t understand the metaphors very well* (Jenny- S17)

*I still don’t understand it (metaphor) very much* (Jess-S13)

In their first journal entry (see Appendix 16), Jenny and Jess express their views of metaphors and regard them as difficult and confusing. This might indicate that these students have probably never encountered metaphors before or that they associate metaphors with poetry or literature, and thus see difficulty in them. Picken (2005) points out that ESL learners constantly struggle to make sense of literary texts which usually contain a high number of metaphors that are used to convey the poetic vision. The following extract shows such a feeling:

*I don’t like poems because I read many poems in school…and the metaphors are very difficult because it’s like another language. I don’t understand the metaphors when I read the text. I get confused when I read them* (Sam-S03)
Sam, without being asked about poems, makes reference to poetry and the difficulty found in them due to the metaphorical language. Upon recalling his school days when he read poems, Sam finds the difficulty of metaphor to be like (learning) another language. Just as Jenny and Jess, Sam expresses the idea of confusion when it comes to understanding metaphors. At this stage, Jenny and Sam along with the rest of the students have already been introduced to the MIP, and their remarks regarding difficulty and confusion relate to metaphor and not to the MIP. It seems that their views of metaphor have been shadowed by what is commonly known as metaphor in poetry and literature. Another comment made by a different student reaffirms the students’ conceptualisations of metaphor as difficult and confusing.

It (metaphor) is confusing and I think I can’t understand the metaphor in the paragraph that we have to read… the test was too hard for me, I think I understood 10 %.

Sue’s reflections on metaphor are in line with Kevin’s:

It’s difficult to me to think about metaphor because is like not simple to express or understand the meaning, and when I read I don’t know if read metaphors, but if I read them maybe I don’t understand them because I can be confused about metaphors

One can see that both Kevin and Sue acknowledge that metaphors are confusing, hence their lack of understanding. Kevin, for instance, points out that he could not understand the metaphors embedded in the text which the students had to read in that particular class – the third session of the teaching period when students wrote their first journal. Kevin also comments on the reading test, which had been given to the students at the beginning of the teaching period, concludes that little text understanding was reached on his part; “I think I understood 10 %”. Sue, on the other hand, puts forward a number of ideas, one of which relates to the confusion involved in understanding metaphors; confusion which has probably led her to think that “metaphor…is not simple to express or understand the meaning”.

In later instances (JE-T2, see Appendix 17) and as the students engaged more critically, we can see how their views regarding difficulty and confusion involved in metaphors have changed. In later journal entries, in the second journal in particular, it can be seen how students’ view regarding the difficulty and importance of metaphor has changed. Students continue to value the importance of metaphors; however, their views regarding the difficulty involved in it are changing.

The metaphors and the MIP is like changing my view and my feeling about the metaphor, so I think that I feel more relax about the metaphors because in the past I felt more confused and difficult about the metaphors, but not now.
In Nick’s account we can see how confident he feels in his later encounters with metaphors. Although he does not elaborate much on what he means by ‘my feeling’, we can see that he also makes reference to the fact that he also “feels more relax about metaphors”. This suggests that perhaps his level of anxiety is lower when he is now faced with metaphors or texts with metaphors embedded. Nick is also aware that metaphors do not lead him to confusion now (second journal) as compared to “in the past” (first journal). It is interesting to note that, although he makes no reference to whether or not he is more aware of metaphor or whether his text understanding is deeper, he is well aware that his view of metaphor is shifting; metaphor is no longer confusing, nor difficult. This shift in the student’s views is also reflected in Kevin’s second journal, who also reflects upon how he has come to see metaphors differently.

*I think that now I can understand the metaphors more, I thought that the metaphor were difficult but now I think that you have to understand them and the relation in the metaphor and its good because I guess I also can understand more words in the text and maybe another text too (Kevin-S11)*

In an earlier instance (JE-T1, see Appendix 16), as reported above, Kevin deemed metaphors as confusing and difficult to understand. By looking at his second journal, it can be clearly seen that his view is pretty much in line with what Nick has reported; metaphors are no longer difficult, nor confusing. Kevin clearly states that his view regarding the difficulty of metaphor is a thing of the past (“I thought that metaphors were difficult”) while now (JE-T2) he believes that it is important to understand the underlying relationships of a metaphor; source and target domains.

The following response also reiterates such a shift:

*My idea about the metaphors is maybe very different than my idea in the beginning because now I can see that metaphors are very useful and not difficult. Also I can understand that metaphors help me to understand many other things like, other words or maybe other texts (Jo-S01)*

Jo’s writing shows us that a change has occurred in how she views metaphor. She clearly says that her views about metaphor are different from ‘the beginning’ – the first teaching session when students were faced with metaphors – and that metaphor is useful in that it broadens her understanding of “things”. This change in the students’ views regarding the difficulty and confusion involved in metaphor suggests that students have been able to reflect upon what they knew about metaphor and upon the teaching process which enabled them to become more aware of what is involved in a metaphor, thus rejecting the idea of difficulty and confusion.
It is also important to highlight that, besides students’ views regarding difficulty and confusion have changed, learners value the importance and relevance of metaphors for having a broader understanding of “other meanings”:

*The metaphors in the text are very difficult but I think they can be important for me because they could help me to understand other meanings and maybe the text.* (Jack-S18)

Although Jack explicitly refers to the difficulty of metaphors in the text and not to the text itself, he values the possible contribution of understanding metaphor to his overall text understanding. Jack also says that metaphor could be a potential tool to understand other meanings. Perhaps, what he is referring to is that understanding the meaning of a given metaphor could lead him to comprehending other vocabulary items. It also seems that Jack sees the understanding of text as deeper than lexical understanding by saying ‘…they (metaphors) could help me to understand other meanings and maybe the text’. This could indicate that Jack believes that understanding lexicon (“other meanings”) is a necessary condition to understand texts. What is clear, though, is that, in Jack’s opinion, metaphor is difficult but important in that it can potentially assist him in understanding ‘other meanings’ and possibly enhance his lexical understanding. Another student’s reflection that clearly demonstrates the importance ascribed to metaphor is Sally’s. She reflects upon the importance of metaphor to understand other domains:

*I don’t understand the name conceptual metaphor and the other names like… sources and I forgot the other one, but I think the things we discuss today about the MIP was very important and very useful because I could understand a bit more. I think that this important because the metaphors are important for understanding other things* (Sally-S19).

It can be clearly seen that, although this was the first journal entry (JE-T1), the student (Sally) already values the importance and usefulness of the MIP, which she has just been introduced to. Aside from this, Sally also makes reference to how metaphor can broaden her own understanding of “things”. This “other things” could easily be vocabulary, texts, or language in general. The value ascribed to metaphor by Sally reaffirms the idea of metaphor as a means of enhancing understanding. Although Sally acknowledges lack of understanding of such names and concepts as conceptual metaphor, sources and target, she is well aware of the importance of metaphor as it had led her to understand more.

Other students’ responses reflect a similar feeling:

*I think metaphors are very useful because they try to express the meaning in a different way* (Serena-S14)

*My opinion about metaphors is that the metaphor can be very helpful for understanding difficult meanings* (Jason-S06)
Serena, on the one hand, seems to understand the interplay of two domains involved in a metaphor as she says “metaphors...express the meaning in a different way”. This interplay, which enables to understand one thing in terms of another, is a useful feature of metaphors. Jason’s opinion, on the other, shows her understanding of one thing being understood in terms of another. It can be seen that Serena and Jason’s comments recognise the value and usefulness of metaphor.

Not only have students reflected on the usefulness and importance of metaphor but also on how metaphor along with the MIP are a means of promoting lexical understanding. In an earlier instance, first journal, we can see that Sev and Sun feel that their lexical understanding has benefited from metaphors:

- They (metaphors) have helped me to understand the meaning of words but not texts, maybe if I read a text next class, I’ll see (Sev-S22)
- The mip was very important because it can help me for understanding the meaning of the metaphors and the words, I can understand more than before (Sun-S24)

These representative themes demonstrate that students recognise the value of metaphor as a tool which enhances lexical understanding. Sev emphasises on the fact that metaphor has led her to understand “words and not texts”. Sun’s response in her second journal refers to the MIP and recognises that her metaphor and lexical understanding has benefited from it.

A comment made by a different student shows a similar feeling:

- For me I think that the mip is very interesting because my learning about vocabulary is more than before, so I think I will study this more because I want to understand more words and I think this is a good technique (Sev-S22)

In a later journal Sev reflects upon how the MIP has contributed to her lexical learning and understanding. She indicates clearly that she will keep studying the MIP as it will enable her to expand her understanding of words.

A slightly different opinion is seen in Jenny’s second journal:

- I think the mip can be very good but I think it was not clear in the beginning. Maybe I didn’t give much attention to the stuff but I think it can be good for understanding the words in the text (Jenny-S17)

Although Jenny does not explicitly state that the MIP has contributed to her vocabulary understanding while acknowledging the potential of it, she attributes her lack of understanding to not having paid enough attention when the MIP was introduced. Regardless of the fact that she has not yet experienced the contribution of the MIP to her understanding, she recognises that the MIP can be good for
her comprehension of words. Serena, a different student, tells us how she has come to understand the metaphorical meaning of certain words through the MIP:

I never thought that I could understand the meaning of words like mountain or battle, some words in the text, I think that maybe I couldn’t think about the metaphor in this words, but now I can understand the words in the text that is or have a metaphor meaning (Serena-S14)

Serena’s critical reflection on how she has come to understand words that she never expected to, clearly demonstrates how the MIP has assisted her in getting more lexical meaning, thus allowing her to able to understand metaphorically-intended words. This suggests that students have benefited from the MIP in that it has opened up a window to comprehending the underlying meanings of words.

The above representative themes give us an indication of how metaphor along with the MIP have enabled students to have a broader understanding of lexical meanings, which has contributed to comprehending metaphorical words. It is important to note that students have not only appreciated the value of metaphor and the MIP as a tool to enhance their vocabulary understanding, but also as a means of developing their overall language skills. The following students’ reflections demonstrate such an idea:

It’s interesting for me to talk about the metaphor because I think that I think a bit different now about the metaphors. Maybe the good thing about this technique is that I have more skills about reading and maybe about writing too (Fred-S16)

Fred’s second journal (JE-T2, see Appendix 17) tells us about how his language skills (reading and writing) have benefited from what he calls “this technique” (the MIP). We can see that he acknowledges the power of metaphor as a means of developing literacy levels. Sally’s reflection is in line with Fred’s:

I thought that metaphor could not help me to do so many things like understanding other words and language in general because we can learn more things about language if we study metaphors (Sally-S19)

Sally’s first journal (JE-T1), as reported earlier, showed us how she expressed the importance attached to metaphor. Although she claimed not to understand certain terminology at that time, she now (JE-T2) believes that metaphor can help her comprehend general things relating to language. This suggests that Sally has a feeling that much more than lexical understanding can be obtained from metaphors, and perhaps from the MIP as well.

Other student’s reflections reaffirm the same idea:

The mip is interesting, maybe in the beginning I didn’t like it because I though was too simple but now I think that my skills can be much more better than before because I could be able to understand more (Jack-S18)
Although Jack does not explicitly refer to any skill in particular, he acknowledges that metaphor can provide him with a way of developing them. The following student’s journal provides a recognition of metaphor as a key to understanding language and culture.

"maybe the mip can help me for understanding the language of a country and much more than that, for example I can probably understand the customs, or the way people believe about something, I think that my knowledge about things can be different with understanding metaphors (Li-S21)"

Of interest is the fact that Li believes that the MIP can assist her in delving into a culture. Li’s beliefs about metaphor go beyond the lexical improvement that can be obtained from it. Not only does she see metaphor as a tool to enhance her “knowledge about things”, but as a way of familiarizing with various cultural features. Li believes that coming to understand metaphors can take her to becoming acquainted with the language, customs and beliefs of a given culture. It is clear that Li does not make any reference to the development of language skills per se; however, it can be seen that what she puts forward is very much in line with pragmatic and intercultural knowledge which in the end become pivotal in the process of developing language skills.

What has been learnt thus far gives us an indication of how learners are becoming more aware of metaphor throughout the teaching period. Firstly, we saw how students in early instances of their journal regarded metaphor as difficult and confusing. Later journals showed the students’ growing understanding of metaphor which led them to a change in their views. Furthermore, students’ reflections also provided an account of how the understanding of metaphor along with the MIP had led them to improve their lexical understanding and language skills.

The following theme to be discussed looks into students’ reflections in order to find out whether students’ capacity to spot metaphors and to find a use and function to it increased throughout the teaching intervention period.

**The visibility and uses for metaphor**

As students were more exposed to the MIP and more opportunities were available for learners to think critically about metaphors in texts, they became more reflective and critical of their own views regarding their awareness of metaphor. In early instances of their journals (JE-T1, see Appendix 16), however, students are unsure about whether or not they are more aware of metaphors. The following representative themes show such an idea:
I'm not sure if I'm more aware of metaphors now, but I think metaphors are difficult (Kevin)

When I think about my learning or my awareness about metaphor, I don’t know. Maybe next class or later I can notice more metaphors (Ali-S25)

I'm sure that I can understand more words, now I don't know if that's more aware, but I think I am not very aware of the metaphors yet, maybe I need more time (Tom-S02)

Students’ earlier writing reveals a degree of uncertainty regarding their being aware of metaphor. It is interesting to see the concluding remarks by Ali and Tom who refer to a later time (“next class or later, “I need more time”) as a possibility for being aware. This might suggest that they deem awareness as a process, and not as product, through which something becomes more noticeable. Ali puts forward this same idea: “maybe next class or later I can notice more metaphors”. In later instances of their writing (JE-T3, see Appendix 18), one can notice that students express more confidently their being aware of metaphors:

My awareness is I think higher than that class when I did the tests in the first time. I think that I can think more about metaphors and when I read something I am more aware about something if it’s a metaphor (Mike-S23)

Mike’s last journal (JE-T3) shows his certainty about his growing awareness (“My awareness is...higher than that class...”), which has led him to be more critical of what he reads. Other students also show us their growing awareness:

These classes are making me feel more aware about the metaphors, maybe I didn’t think before that I could be aware and find that I can understand more (Tom-S02)

I can say now that the metaphors are like I am more aware about them, and I can see them more in the language now, more than before (Kevin-S11)

Of interest is to look at Tom and Kevin’s writing this time as compared to earlier journals. In earlier instances (JE-T1), as reported above, we saw that both students expressed hesitation about their being aware. In their third journal, they say quite convincingly that their metaphor awareness has grown. Tom refers to the teaching classes as contributing to his increase in awareness. Similarly, Kevin acknowledges growth of awareness, which has probably led him to “see” them more in language. It appears that his growing awareness of metaphor has enabled him to see the ubiquity of metaphor in language. Other journals also reflect how students’ awareness of metaphor is reflected in the recognition of the ubiquity of metaphorical language:
I think metaphors are more in different places, not in the formal texts only but in other kind of things, maybe like books, newspapers, and texts that we are going to use in the university. In the past I thought that metaphors was only in poems (Sam-S03)

It is interesting to see how Sam’s views regarding metaphor have dramatically changed. In an earlier instance –as reported above –Sam expressed explicitly his dislike of metaphor as he linked it to poetry. Now, in his third journal, he sees how ubiquitous metaphor is; he sees metaphor as being not only in “formal texts” but in other genres, including those he will be faced with at university. His concluding sentence, to a certain extent, debunks the myth that metaphors are only in poetry –belief which he held in earlier instances.

My aware of metaphor I think is more becaus e now I can understand that metaphor is in all languages in the world, maybe before I thought that the metaphors were in my language, but not in english and another languages in maybe the same way (Michelle-S04)

We can also see how other students’ journals reflect how they see metaphor as an everyday phenomenon than purely tied to literature or poetry:

I can say that metaphors are common than I was thinking before. I thought always that metaphors were more like those things that you read in books (Mike-S23)

I think that metaphors are more natural, and more common (Jess-S13)

These entries, which are in line with Sam’s comments, reflect that students seem to associate metaphors with everyday language. Both students refer to metaphor as being “more common”, which indicates that they are more aware of the pervasiveness of metaphor in language as being “in different places”, as Sam put it. Other students’ reflections reiterate their recognition of the ubiquity of metaphor:

I can understand now that metaphors is not in the difficult reading like poems, or literature like Shkepere and other books, but the metaphor is in all language (Rey-S20)

The metaphors is important because we find them in all places, texts and books so this is different from my old opinion because I thought it was only in books (Jack-S18)

One can see these students’ understanding of metaphor has changed over time. Students no longer associate metaphor with a particular genre ("…metaphors is not in the difficult reading like poems") but view metaphor as being present “in all language”. Similarly, Jack’s comments value the importance of metaphor in the first place, and also acknowledge the pervasiveness of it. This suggests that students have been able to notice some aspect of metaphors that they never noticed before, which has enabled them to analyse it and compare it to what they thought it was in other instances (“…we find them [metaphors] in all places …this is different from my old opinion”). This is an indication that learners have come to be aware of
something that they were not before. As Schmidt put it (1990), noticing is the first indicator that allows us to say that we are aware of something.

The quotes presented thus far give us a picture of how students’ awareness is indicated by the students’ own recognition of being more aware of metaphor and by their viewing metaphor as being pervasive in language. An important contributing factor to the students’ growing awareness was the steps of the MIP. The following reflections show us the benefits of the MIP to students’ metaphor awareness:

*The mip is important for all people, not only for students but even people that doesn’t go to university because the metaphors are in everywhere (Sev-S22)*

There are two clear elements in Sev’s journal. One is the prominence given to the MIP by saying that it is not only important for her as student, but even for people who do not attend university. The other is the recognition of metaphor as a ubiquitous phenomenon (“…metaphors are in everywhere”). Acknowledging that metaphor is so pervasive and, therefore, important to everybody gives us an indication that the MIP may have been an influence on Sev’s views (“the mip is important for all people…”). The following account tells us more about the contribution of the MIP to student’s awareness:

*My reflection about aware or if I’m aware is that yes, I’m aware about the metaphors, the mip is good for identifying and for understanding also, that is very important, because identifying is not understanding (Ali-S25)*

One of Ali’s journal entries –reported above –showed us his uncertainty about his being aware of metaphor. On this occasion, his third journal (JE-T3, see Appendix 18) clearly reflects a process of transformation from what he knew and what he currently believes about metaphor along with his being aware of it. Ali makes it clear that the MIP has contributed to his ability to identify and understand metaphors; a process which has probably led him to become already more aware of metaphors (“I’m aware…yes…I’m more aware about metaphors”). Jenny, in the following quote, shows us how some of the steps in particular have helped her become more aware of metaphors:

*The mip was an interesting thing for understand and be more aware about metaphors, maybe all the steps was important, the identify the parts, nouns and that, intuition, the context meaning, and all that (Jenny-S17)*

This account gives us some more details about which parts of the MIP seemed to have contributed to Jenny’s growing awareness. She elaborates on some of the steps and highlights the parts-of-speech identification stage where students had to determine the lexical units in the text-discourse. Other steps highlighted by Jenny are the intuition stage and the “context-meaning” stage, as she calls it. The intuition
stage was one of the additions made to the actual metaphor identification procedure. This stage allowed students to use their own intuition and prior-knowledge to identify what they believed was a metaphor. Interestingly, a substantial number of students agreed on the contribution of this stage to their growing awareness. Jenny also mentions the “context-meaning” stage where learners had to match the dictionary meaning with the contextual meaning in the text-discourse. Overall, Jenny’s account gives us an indication that these stages appear to have enhanced her metaphor awareness.

Tom acknowledges the importance of the MIP but also recognises other factors which contributed to his growing awareness:

For my awareness, I think there were different things that help me for be more aware, like the steps of the strategy that we studied in class, also Leonardo who answer my questions and my thinking about metaphor, that’s why I can think about metaphor in a different way and I think that it’s important in my language, too (Tom-S01)

It is interesting to see the factors that Tom highlights as contributing to his metaphor awareness. He understands that the steps of the MIP (“the strategy”) have assisted him in being more conscious about metaphor. Tom also acknowledges the assistance from the teacher-researcher who answered his questions. Such assistance seems to have contributed to his understanding of metaphor, and probably to his growth of awareness of metaphor as well.

Students worked in groups on several occasions, each of which provided a context for collaborative talk to flourish. Students’ recognition of these instances as ideal opportunities for becoming more aware are reflected in the following quotes:

My idea about metaphor and also the procedure is that it is important in every kind of language. In my opinion I think that I am more aware about the metaphors but it was important for me when I have discussions with my classmates (Rose-S09)

Rose’s reflection reveals that she seems to find special value in the discussions with her peers. Although Rose does not make explicit reference to how the group discussions contributed to her awareness raising, she highlights the importance of them. The relevance ascribed to group interactions is such that appears as though it were ‘the’ element which contributed to her awareness; “I think that I’m more aware…but it was important for me when...”. Wells and Chang-Wells (1992) point out that it is through collaborative tasks with peers that learners try to find solutions to problems, justify or clarify their points of views, react to other students’ comments, and so forth. Rose may have found some of these elements in
her discussions with her classmates; this suggests that participation in interaction may have contributed to Rose’s awareness of metaphor.

A similar idea is found in the following student’s reflection:

*My awareness is much more than in the beginning, maybe in the beginning I didn’t have any awareness. When my friends in the group told me every time that something was a metaphor or not, I thought about that for the second time and that helped me for being more aware about the metaphors (Kevin-S11)*

Kevin marks a before and after; he says that “in the beginning” he was unaware of metaphor while now, after having engaged in collaborative discussions, he is “more aware about the metaphors”. Kevin acknowledges that his group members’ comments and perhaps suggestions about whether something was a metaphor or not, helped him re-think about what was being discussed. It seems that these instances of collaborative dialogue have provided Kevin with an opportunity to be more aware of metaphors. Sue’s journal demonstrates how the opportunities for dialogue also contributed to her growing awareness:

*My awareness is more because I think many things happened. I think that it was important to understand the procedure because I could be more aware of the metaphors but also was important when my friends make me think about the sentences or the words and I can think more deep now. I think that was very important too (Sue-S07)*

There is a clear indication in Su’s reflection that at least two elements have played a role in her becoming aware of metaphors. She ascribes importance to her understanding of the MIP, on the one hand, and values, albeit implicitly, the opportunities for discussion with her peers. Sue appears to value the type of reflective discussions during which her “friends made her think” about the nature of the expressions being discussed. It seems that Sue’s reflective capacity to think about metaphors was, to a certain extent, triggered by her friends’ collaborative engagement in the discussions, and possibly the feedback she received from them which made her rethink about “the sentences or the words”. This, once again, demonstrates that learner-learner participation in interactional activities plays a role in the development and construction of knowledge. Of interest is also to see that Sue believes that she can think more deeply, which might suggest that the process of becoming aware of metaphor as a result of the MIP along with the discussions with her peers have led her to develop more critical thinking skills.

The following responses reflect students’ recognition of how metaphor awareness has enabled them to a more developed critical thinking stage:

*I think the words that I see now I think they are metaphor because I can think more critical now and more in a metaphor way (Rich-S12)*
In my opinion the metaphors is important for understanding and thinking about more deeper things, like other meanings (Mike-S23)

One of the commonalities that we find in these two quotes is linked to the ‘depth’ of thinking which metaphor enables them to do. This suggests that students have not only become aware of, say, the ubiquity of metaphor in language but also, and perhaps most importantly, of the ways in which metaphor influences and shapes their thinking. Rich’s last journal demonstrates how his awareness has led him to more critical thinking stages and also how metaphor has permeated his reasoning (“I can think more …in a metaphor way”). Mike’s comments, which are in a similar vein with Rich’s, refer to the depth of thinking to which metaphor can lead. He says that “metaphor is important for thinking about more deeper things”. This in turn might suggest that he views metaphor not only as a linguistic phenomenon but as a matter of thought as well.

Loren’s response shows us how she appears to be aware of not only her language but also the way she thinks:

my opinion is that the metaphors are effecting my language and my thinking because every time I think about something, maybe a word or something like that, I think if the is a metaphor or not, so when I’m thinking I’m thinking probably in metaphors, and that is funny (Loren-S08)

Loren clearly sees that metaphor is affecting her language and the way she is thinking. This, once again, aligns with previous quotes where students acknowledged the role of metaphor in shaping their language and their thinking. Loren concludes by saying that it is funny that she is probably thinking metaphorically now. The following journal reflects such a feeling, too:

My process is interesting I think because in the beginning I didn’t think that I could understand the meaning of the metaphors, then I thought that the technique can help me more, but now in the end I think that my language, my understanding of the metaphors and language, and my thinking is much higher (Michelle-S04)

First, it is explicit at the beginning of Michelle’s response that she conceptualises, perhaps, her learning experience as “process”. She expresses the different stages of knowledge construction she has gone through; first, she thought she couldn’t understand metaphors, then she thought the MIP (“the technique”) could assist her, and finally she quite convincingly says that her understanding of both metaphor and language is broader. As well, she goes on to say that her “thinking is much higher”. Even though in Michelle’s journal it is not clear how she has come to deeper levels of understanding and why she feels her thinking is being influenced by either metaphor or the MIP, one can see that she recognises a
developmental process which has enabled her to acknowledge the depth of both her knowledge and thinking.

The subthemes discussed in this section have given us a picture of how learners have moved from stages where they clearly expressed their uncertainty regarding their being aware to others in which they quite convincingly put forward the idea of being more aware of metaphors. It was interesting to look at students’ awareness indicated by their recognition of the MIP as an important contributor to their increasing metaphor awareness. In the same way, their awareness of metaphor was also reflected in their growing understanding of the pervasiveness of metaphor in language. Correspondingly, this led them to acknowledge that metaphor also permeates their thought, thus indicating depth in their critical thinking skills. Of interest was also to explore students’ reflections on the contribution of factors other than the MIP to their growth in awareness; they acknowledged that their participation in collaborative discussions assisted them in deepening their level of awareness of metaphor, their overall language about metaphor and their thinking about metaphor.

The following quotes show the ways in which learners’ growth in awareness of metaphor seemed to have an impact on their capacity to understand texts.

**The interplay between metaphor awareness and understanding of text**

The last major theme to be discussed relates to how students’ awareness of metaphor along with what they gained from the MIP appeared to have led them to deeper levels of text understanding. This is linked to how what the students have gained from the teaching period – namely the MIP, group discussions, journal entries, amongst others – has provided them with an overall opportunity for enhancing their learning which in turn may have impacted on their improvement of text understanding.

In earlier instances of journal writing (JE-T1, see Appendix 16) students visualized some potential benefits of the MIP to their reading understanding:

*I’m sure that this can help me for understanding the difficult texts, I’m just hoping to understand more next class* (Robert-S10)

*My opinion is that my reading is not better at the moment, maybe I need to wait and see if we do the test again in another classes and probably I can understand more* (Kevin)

What is common to these two students is that both seem to find some potential value in metaphor or perhaps in the MIP (“I’m sure than this [metaphor/MIP] can help me”) and believe that more
understanding could be reached in later occasions. Other students, however, struggle to picture how metaphor could help them understand texts; yet, there seems to be a minor recognition of possible profits:

For my text understanding, mmm… I don’t know and I don’t think that metaphor or my awareness can help me for improving my reading, maybe for my vocabulary and for understand the metaphors in the words, but… don’t know, maybe if I try to understand it more, maybe (Mike-S23)

Although Mike does not think that metaphor or metaphor awareness could offer a contribution to his growing text understanding, he concludes by saying that further comprehension could be reached on his part if he understood – perhaps metaphor or the MIP – more. This clearly suggests that he needs to move to further stages of metaphor understanding in order to be able to obtain more text meaning. A rather different view is seen in Sev’s journal. Sev, in the following response, already expresses that metaphor is helping her deal with texts:

I’m understanding that metaphor has different roles, and for me it’s helping for understand the texts, but I would like to think that it’s going to help with big texts (Sev-S22)

Knowles and Moon (2006) argue for the multiplicity of functions of metaphor, one of which is the capacity to convey more than can be transmitted through literal language. Sev admits to understanding the range of functions of metaphor (“…metaphor has different roles”) and claims to be assisted by metaphor in her process of understanding texts. It seems, though, that one of her preoccupations is to know whether or not metaphor awareness and the MIP will help her with “big” texts, which she probably means complex ones. In later instances of journal writing (JE-T3, see Appendix 18), Sev clearly states that metaphor awareness is helping her understand more “difficult texts”:

The big or more difficult texts will be maybe more easier in the future because my awareness will help me. I’m more aware about the metaphors and this is helping me understand more and more because I can see more critical (Sev-S22)

In this response, we can see how Sev expresses more confidently saying that “she is understanding more and more” as a result of her growing awareness of metaphor. A similar idea is found in Kevin’s journal:

My process I think is interesting because my experience in the beginning was that I couldn’t understand some things about the mip but now I understand and more aware about the meanings of the metaphor, so I’m also understanding more about the texts (Kevin-S11)

An important element worth noting that Kevin talks about two significant things: understanding and awareness. Given that Kevin acknowledges that he understands more and that he is more aware, one
could speculate that such growth in understanding might be related to or influenced by his developed capacity to be aware of metaphorical meanings.

It is interesting to see later instances of Mike’s journal writing (JE-T3, see Appendix 18) which gives us a clearer, and perhaps quite distinct, picture of what she wrote in the first instance:

*My opinion now is that awareness is a good helper for understanding more texts. The activities that we did in class were good for me to know that my aware about the metaphors can help me to think more about the things that I’m reading* (Mike-S23)

It is worth noting that a dramatic change in Mike’s views regarding metaphor and metaphor awareness can be observed. In an earlier instance Mike expressed great uncertainty about the contribution of metaphor awareness to his growing understanding of texts. The shift towards recognising that, first of all, he has come to be aware and, secondly, that awareness has turned out to be “a good helper” for deepening his level of text understanding, is of great value. Halliday (1971) makes it clear that everyone has the ability to use language, but people not always become aware of it. This suggests that becoming aware of certain linguistic or conceptual features is clearly not the result of using a language, but the outcome of a formal process.

The following reflections give us a more detailed account of how what the students read during the last session seemed to be more meaningful to them:

*This time I could understand more than before, and more than the classes. I didn’t know that we were going to read the same text today but I understood more this time. I think that my awareness has been great for helping to get this* (Jess-S13)

*I can understand that when you are aware of something you can understand it much more deeper, because this is my experience with the metaphor* (Jack-S18)

In Jess’s last journal (JE-T3, see Appendix 18) one can see that she admits to having deeper understanding than before, which resulted from her increasing growth in awareness of metaphor (“my awareness has been great help for helping to get this”). Jack’s comment, which is in a similar vein, seems to establish a relationship between awareness and understanding (“when you are aware you can understand it much more deeper”). Some research demonstrates that students’ higher level of awareness enable them to reach more understanding than those students who have lower levels of it. In Jack’s case, his convincing remark reveals that his higher levels of awareness have led him to deeper levels of text understanding.
In addition to recognising the active role of metaphor awareness in deepening levels of text understanding, students stressed the necessity to be in contact with metaphors and having certain levels of awareness so as to be able to understand texts.

*I would like to practise more for understanding other texts but I think yes, I understand more texts, and the mip helps me for my learning* (Jason-S06)

Jason stresses his need to have more practice with metaphor, and probably with the application of the MIP into texts, which might enable him to understand “other texts”. Jason’s concluding comment shows us his consideration of the MIP as conducive to learning. A similar feeling can be observed in Li’s reflection:

*I think so, and also I learn more English, so I improve my understanding of the text, my thinking about language and I also learn new words and I think I can improve my English* (Li-S21)

On the whole, Li conveys the idea that the overall teaching period has contributed to her learning; learning of English, text and new words.

A slightly more critical account is found in Paul’s journal:

*My reflection about the mip and my awareness is that it’s very encouraging because it makes me to think about the meaning of the word and also makes me to be more aware about the connections between words, and that’s learning for me* (Paul-S05)

Paul reflects on his learning process and states that the MIP along with his growing awareness has encouraged him to think more critically about lexical meanings and the relationship between words. This might suggest that Paul is not only able to find the underlying networks of a conceptual metaphor but also those which link different linguistic realisations to one another. The following reflection shows us similar thoughts regarding awareness:

*In my case because of my awareness I think that I can see further, I mean I can probably find that one thing is in connection with other, maybe in the text. I can see that different things can be related but at the same time they can talk about the same metaphor, this is a new experience and tells me that I have learn a lot here* (Jenny-S17)

It is clear in Jenny’s account that awareness of metaphor has enabled her to do things which she probably did not do before. Awareness seems to have provided her with an orientation towards new territories which can be explored through metaphor, thus leading her to discover things beyond the boundaries of literal meanings (“I can see further”). Just as Paul’s account, Jenny finds that texts seem to be more meaningful as more connections within the text can be established. This is a new discovery to her which has provided plenty of learning opportunities (“I have learn a lot here”).
Opportunities for learning were also found by Sam who also discovered in his search for meaningful learning that one of the utilities of metaphor is that of maximising his lexical retention:

*I feel that I learned a lot in this process and that everyday I had a chance to learn something new about the metaphors, this learning makes me more aware of the metaphors because they also help me for remembering the words more easily* (Sam-S03)

Learning seemed to have been an active process in which Sam engaged throughout the teaching period. Multiple learning opportunities were at hand. He clearly says, “everyday I had a chance to learn something new”; this gives us a clear indication that his experiences were leading him to other levels of learning. Sam also stresses the idea that metaphor awareness has enabled him to recall information more easily. Gibbs (1996) states that metaphor can enable the activation of semantic frameworks from long-term memory, thus allowing for a connection to new knowledge; activity which is conducive to better recalls. All in all, Sam’s emphasis is upon his increase in learning, which – in his opinion – has led him to higher levels of awareness.

The last quote to be introduced here provides us with another piece of evidence to reaffirm the idea that students’ experiences during the teaching period have led to overall learning:

*If I reflect about my process I have to say that I learn more, and I learn different things that will help me for my life in my studies and for my understanding of reading. It was good to discuss the meanings with my classmates in the group and find that sometimes we had different agreements and another times the same* (Jason-S06)

Of interest is, first and foremost, the fact that Jason along with various learners mentioned above seemed to be able to differentiate, in later instances of the journal writing, between task (what is to be done) and process (how the task is undertaken) (Leow, 2001). This is vital as learners seem to have been able to gather together all the pieces –tasks, activities, steps of the MIP, etc. – in order to construct a much broader picture as to how these pieces together have contributed to their overall awareness of metaphor, their learning process and to their understanding of text. In this quote, Jason’s critical reflection allows us to see different levels at which she got engaged as an active participant throughout the teaching period. Brockbank and McGill (1998) assert that critical reflection is an active process which enables the learner to engage in deep and transformatory learning. Evidence of such learning is found in Jason’s account. Firstly, one can notice that she is well aware that the learning resulting from her participation in the four-week teaching period will contribute to other instances in her life. As well, her recognition of the contribution of the metaphor-awareness raising sessions have resulted in increasing understanding of “different things”, as she calls them. What is also worth highlighting is the value ascribed to the opportunities for discussions in
the group, discussions which sometimes generated disagreement ("...and find that sometimes we had some different disagreements..."). These instances of disagreement in group interactions are particularly important as research has demonstrated that conflict in small group discussions contributes to intellectual development (1998), and that learning in small groups structured by controversy was shown to be greater than learning individually. This is precisely what appears to have occurred in Jason's case. Finding herself engaged in a conversation with differences of opinion appears to have led Jason to intellectual development as she clearly stated that what she has learnt will help her in life, in her future studies and also in deepening her understanding of texts.

To sum up, in this chapter different intersecting elements have been examined in an attempt to tap into learners' growth of awareness of metaphor and its potential impact on understanding of texts with metaphors embedded. The first measure of awareness of metaphor examined in this chapter looked at how learners' length of turns in conversation was progressively longer over the four-week intervention period. To put it simply, language learners were talking more as their familiarity with the MIP, and therefore with metaphor, grew along the way. Results of learners' turns and clause analysis of the transcriptions of learner interactions demonstrated that learners' turns in conversation became not only more numerous but also longer and more complex.

In order to find out whether learners' growth of language production as manifest in the longer turns in conversation was a reflection of their being more aware of metaphors, the researcher set out to examine students' metalanguage of metaphor. Findings pertaining to the analysis of metalanguage of metaphor revealed that learners' language, i.e. what they were saying while discussing, became increasingly more metaphorically-weighted as students went through the four-week period.

Finally, in order to capture learners' voices on their potential growth of awareness of metaphor and its possible impact on their understanding of text, it was decided to examine students' responses to journal entries which they were given on three different occasions. Themes and subthemes which emerged from learners' journal entries have been discussed. First of all, it was shown how learners came to recognise the value and usefulness of metaphor. Not only was it expressed that metaphor was useful to understanding language, but also that the MIP, the metaphor-awareness raising tool, was a useful procedure, as stated by Kevin earlier on, for "learning and understanding words in texts". Secondly, it was also demonstrated that learners' awareness of metaphor appeared to have grown over the course of the teaching intervention period. Examination of learners' responses, as shown earlier on, revealed that metaphors in text were more
‘visible’ to students. This growth of visibility of metaphor on the part of the learners gives us an indication that students were able to see and identify the presence of metaphorical meanings in texts with less difficulty than before the implementation of the metaphor-awareness raising curriculum over the period of four weeks. Such growth of visibility of metaphor also enabled learners to appreciate different uses for metaphor. Some recognised convincingly that metaphor would assist them in learning vocabulary; others believed that metaphors could help them retain more words, while other students expressed that metaphor helped them become more critical and think more deeply about language. Lastly, students’ recognition of the value of metaphor and the MIP along with their greater visibility of metaphor appeared to have contributed to their deeper understanding of text. In addition to the growing awareness of metaphor that apparently resulted in deeper levels of text comprehension, students expressed quite convincingly that the interplay between these two seemed to be intersecting factors conducive to learning.
Chapter 6: Understanding of text

Introduction

A central question was whether or not an enhanced awareness of metaphor could potentially deepen learners’ levels of understanding of text. Reading comprehension was tested before and after the intervention teaching period and this chapter will present the results of the reading test.

Since the reading comprehension test was comprised of two major sections, which in turn measured reading understanding from two perspectives, the test results are presented in two separate sections—one which covers the first three items of the test (vocabulary, multiple choice, and short-answer responses), while the other shows findings pertaining to the reader response task. The reader-response task, as described in 4.5.1 was examined from the perspective that readers’ understanding of text is not only the product of an activity but also a process through which readers actively engage in a meaning-making process.

This section reports on the results pertaining to the first major section of the reading test which covers the three above-mentioned test items. The results reported herein appear to reveal an increase in students’ reading understanding. In order to know whether this is increase is statistically significant, a t-test test was utilised for the results derived from the first three sections of the test (vocabulary, multiple choice, and short-answer responses).

Understanding of text

In order to examine the extent to which the implementation of the MIP through the four-week intervention period can potentially influence learners’ depth of understanding of text, it is essential to learn how students engaged with the text and what the results tell us about their potential growth of text understanding.

In general, a close examination and comparison of the results of the first three test items – vocabulary, multiple choice and short-answer questions – of the pre and post-test show an improvement in reading comprehension over the four-week teaching intervention period. The total test score of these three sections was 15 points, and the results of the descriptive statistics computed for the pre and post-test show that the average overall score was 7.44 for the pre-test (SD=1.19), and 10.24 (SD=1.64) for the post-test.
The difference between the two means is 2.8, which indicates that—although not conclusively yet—metaphor awareness may have influenced students’ text comprehension in an average of 2.8 points in the post-test.

The data in Figure 6.2 below show the total scores obtained by the students in the pre-test and post-test. This data represents the number of correct answers from a total of 15 points. It can be seen that all of the participants total scores in the pre-test ranged between five and nine marks while the post-test results show that students’ scores ranged between seven and thirteen. This increase in test scores gives us an indication that students appear to have gained a deeper understanding of text. Although all students demonstrate a certain degree of increase in the post-test as compared to the pre-test scores, very little variation can be observed in two (S05 and S24) students’ pre and post-test scores. Student 05, who only obtained 8 marks in the pre-test, scored only 1 mark higher in the post-test. Similarly, student 24 got 6 marks in the pre-test and increased his post-test score in 1 mark only.

Although the rest of the students do not show a variation greater than 4 marks between the pre and post-test, of interest is to note that the increase does appear to indicate that students’ understanding of text improved over the four-week intervention period.
This graphic representation helps us visualise the extent to which students' test scores varied from the pre to the post-test. Although this data already demonstrates an increase in students' test scores, and therefore potential growth in text understanding, it is worth having a more detailed look at the data pertaining to each of the sections of the test to highlight some striking points of interest.

The first test item was a vocabulary section in which students were required to provide a definition of eight different lexical items. Each of the words was metaphorically in the text. Students, however, were not advised of the metaphorical use of the words in the context of the text but were instructed to consider the context within which the word was being used on providing a definition.

The section of the test was worth eight marks, i.e. one mark for each lexical item. The graph below shows students' total number of correct answers in both the pre and post-test. Correct answers were considered those where the student provided a definition which was in line with the metaphorical use of the word in the context of the text. Incorrect answers, on the other hand, were those where students defined the word literally without making reference to its metaphorical use in the text.
A close look at the graph reveals that students’ overall correct answers in the vocabulary section of the pre-test ($M=2.76$) ranged between 1 and 4 marks from a total of 8. In the post-test, students’ lexical understanding varied from 3 to 7 marks ($M=5.16$). Some individual students’ scores in the post-test are considerably higher with respect to the pre-test. For instance, S07 obtained six out of eight correct answers whereas in the pre-test the student got only 1. Similarly, S07 got seven correct answers in the post-test while before the teaching intervention the student only got two.

From the above, it can be observed that students’ definitions of words became more metaphorically-oriented by the time the post-test was administered. The results suggest that students seemed to have recognised the potential for metaphorical meanings which they had not recognised at the time of the pre-test. This is reflected in the new definitions given to the lexical items in the post-test; definitions which in the post-test were more in line with the metaphorical use of the words in the context of the text. By way of illustration, the following exemplars give us an overall idea of the extent to which students’ vocabulary performance shifted away from literal to more metaphorically-oriented definitions, thus showing better understanding of how those metaphorical words functioned in the text. Let us look at student 08 (S08) who got only one correct answer in the pre-test, increasing to six in the post-test.

*Mountain: is something for going climbing and normally it’s higher, maybe more than a hill*
Without a doubt, S08’s definition of the metaphorically-intended word ‘mountain’ in the pre-test is clearly making reference to the literal, salient and more prototypical meaning thereof – a large elevation of the earth’s surface.

An examination of S08’s post-test definition of this particular word shows us a radical move to a deeper and more accurate understanding of the meaning of word as used in the text.

Mountain: mountain in this text maybe it mean that the people have a problem or maybe a goal that they must overcome.

A move from literal to metaphorical understanding can be clearly observed in S08’s definition of the word ‘mountain’. This is not only a reflection of the student’s broader understanding of the word’s multiplicity of meanings, but also an indication of how the student has come to understand the overall discursive context in which the word was used.

The above exemplar is representative of what the students wrote in their definitions and how their understanding of metaphorically-used words improved over time.

This increase in understanding metaphorically-related vocabulary items suggests that the four-week teaching intervention period may have exerted a positive impact on students’ understanding of metaphorically-used words in the text.

Of interest is also to look at the other two sections of the test – multiple choice and short-answer. The multiple-choice section was comprised of four questions, each of which was worth one mark. It is also important to note that these four questions were not metaphorically intended; rather, the section was focused upon general aspects of text understanding which didn’t require students to make metaphorical interpretations in order to answer the questions.

The results pertaining to this section are quite diverse in that great fluctuation can be observed, and sometimes an opposite trend can be seen in the post-test with respect to the pre-test.

In Figure 6.2.2 we can see how the results of this section in the post-test show a different scenario from what the vocabulary section presented. The overall results of this section reveal that no improvement resulted from the four-week teaching intervention sessions. In fact, an opposite trend can be observed. Students’ overall scores are slightly higher in the pre-test ($M=2.6; SD=0.94$) than in the post-test ($M=2.4; SD=0.65$).
A closer look at students’ results reveal that 6 (24%) students obtained higher scores in the post-test, 12 (48%) students remained the same in their scores, while 7 (28%) performed better in the pre-test than in the post-test, thus showing an opposite trend with respect to other students and other sections in the test.

This fluctuation and overall lack of improvement in the multiple-choice section are perhaps not surprising. Anderson (2000) states that one of the serious disadvantages of multiple-choice questions is that the way in which the candidate or student responded is totally unknown to the tester. There could have been a number of reasons involved in why the students responded the way they did in the pre and post-test. Having obtained higher scores in the pre-test rather than in the post-test may be attributed to, for instance, a simple guess at the question. This could have been the factor contributing to an opposite trend in the findings pertaining to the multiple-choice section. Although the reason for these results is not clear, it will be further discussed in the discussion chapter (see Chapter 7).

The last test section, before the reader response task, required students to write short answers to three questions. One of the questions was a looking-for-specific-information question while the other two were inferential questions. The length of the students’ answers varied between two and three lines (4-6 simple sentences), which fit into the space provided on the test. In Figure 6.2.3 a slightly different picture
can be seen with respect to the results pertaining to the multiple-choice section. A global look at the graph reveals that an improvement can be observed in the students’ scores in the post-test ($M=2.6; SD=0.57$) with respect to the pre-test ($M=2.0; SD=0.7$).

![Figure 6.2.3: Results of short-answer question](image)

A detailed observation of the results reveals that only 1 (4%) student obtained a higher score in the pre-test than in the post-test, thus showing an opposite trend; 11 (44%) students remained the same in their scores, while 13 (52%) students’ scores were higher in the post-test. Although the percentage of students whose scores increased in the post-test was above 50, it is important to highlight that this slight increment still demonstrates improvement in students’ understanding of text. This growth also demonstrates that the teaching intervention period, through which metaphor awareness was raised, exerted a positive impact on more than half of the group. The descriptive statistics results shown above demonstrate that, regardless of the differences found in the multiple-choice section, understanding of text improved for all students over time. In order to see whether the students’ increase in text understanding as shown earlier is statistically significant, a t-test (paired two samples for means) was utilised. This statistical test was utilised only with three test sections which have been discussed so far. The reader response task, which is discussed later, is analysed on the basis of different criteria.

Having looked at the overall results of the each test section, except for the reader-response task which is reported below, an important question that needs to be answered is whether the above findings
prove statistically significant. In order to compare whether the difference between the two sets of scores, those relating to the pre-test and post-test, is statistically significant, a paired-samples t-test was computed on the data. Comparing the difference between the two sets of scores implies looking at learners’ understanding of text before and after the implementation of the metaphor-awareness raising procedure through the MIP. Results of the paired-samples t-test showed that there was a significant difference in the scores of the pre-test ($M=7.44; SD=1.4$) and post-test ($M=10.24; SD=2.69$) conditions; $t(-14)= 2.4$ ($p < 0.001$). The meaningfulness level of the tests for deducing significance was $p=0.05$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-test</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-test</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P(T&lt;=t)$ one-tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical one-tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P(T&lt;=t)$ two-tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Reporting t-test statistics

The significant difference between the scores of the pre-test and the final-test demonstrates that, irrespective of the fluctuation and sometimes an opposite trend found in some of the test scores, the overall students’ growth of understanding of text is clearly not due to a coincidence of random sampling. On the contrary, it shows that understanding of text statistically increased for all students. Such statistical growth could potentially be attributed to the effect of the teaching intervention period aimed at raising learners’ awareness of metaphor. The extent to which learners’ deeper understanding of text is the result of their
potential enhanced awareness of metaphor through the implementation of the MIP is discussed in later chapters (see Chapter 7).

**Reader Response Task**

**Introduction**

Students text understanding was not only measured by using the three measures reported above – which largely view the act of reading from a product perspective, their understanding was also measured by a reader response task, which aimed at exploring the ways in which students interpreted, engaged with and reacted to the text, and by looking at the ways learners dialogically interacted in discussions. The former is discussed in the present section while the latter is looked at in 6.4.

As discussed earlier (see 4.5.1), the rationale for using a reader-response task as an additional measure of reading understanding lies in how the reader, the act of reading, and reading assessment are viewed in this study. By utilising a reader-response task, reading is viewed as an activity which leads the reader or the learner to engage actively to a point where they can raise meaningful questions, comments, and interpretations of the text (Botvin & Murray, 1975). This suggests that meaning is not passively obtained from the text but actively constructed while the reader, and what is brought to the reading process, interacts with the text. From a sociocultural perspective, reading is viewed as a process of meaning construction which is situated in a cultural and historical context (Christenbury, 2000). Viewing the reader response task from this perspective implies that each individual in the classroom becomes an important active constructor of text meaning; meaning which is embodied in their experiences and interactions in and with the world and others, including the interactional instances which occur in the classroom.

The reader response task required students to engage with the text in a critical manner so they could write down their interpretations, reactions, reflections and understanding of it. The instructions to this section were as follows:

“Write down your interpretations, reactions and/or understanding of the text in a way that you do not summarise it”.

Although all students worked on the test under the same conditions before and after the teaching intervention period, they produced a variety of responses where those from the pre-test were, to a large extent, quite distinct from those in the post-test. Students’ responses were all read and examined by the
teacher-researcher and classified into a categorization scheme based partly upon the taxonomy (hierarchy) of aesthetic response (Murphy, 2000). The scheme was adapted, some new categories added and others modified, thus resulting in a four-level (criteria) model for analysis of reader responses, as discussed in 4.8.2.1. The categories within which the responses fell are thus: summarizing, elaboration, questioning and evaluation. These categories represent different layers of students’ depth of understanding of text. The first one, summarizing, represents a level of text understanding where the reader does not show capacity to elaborate on their views, question them or evaluate them, but simply provide a rather descriptive summary of the text. This, in Alderson’s(2000) view, reflects a superficial or, as he calls it, a shallow level of text understanding. The other three categories – elaboration, questioning and evaluation – have been considered to represent deeper layers of students’ understanding of text. They give us an indication of how the learner has moved beyond descriptions or facts presented in the text and responded by elaborating on ideas, questioning and evaluating outcomes, author’s position, etc. At these levels, students’ responses show a profound level of thoughtfulness, reflection and critical engagement which is evidenced by how they have elaborated, questioned and evaluated different aspects of the text. Similarly, such critical and reflective engagement also demonstrates students’ active construction of knowledge through interpretive interactions with the reading (Sebesta et al., 1995).

In an attempt to show the significance of the responses on the basis of the different levels within which they were categorised, the description and discussion of students’ responses in this section mingles those which were produced in the pre-test with those in the post-test. The responses referred to in this section are representative of what students said and how they responded to the text.

In order to avoid repetition, the terms ‘first instance’ and ‘second instance’ are also used in order to refer to the reader-response task in the pre and post-test.

The exemplars illustrated below show what and how students responded to the text before and after the teaching intervention period. Nonetheless, these responses are not to be taken as ‘before’ and ‘after’ instances of text understanding; on the contrary, they give us an indication of how learners travelled through the four-week teaching intervention period, thus alluding to the processes of meaning construction.

One last observation worth making relates to the coding of participants. It was discussed in chapter 4 that while the participants in this study were coded numerically in the quantitative statistical analysis, in the journal entries and reader response tasks pseudonyms were used to refer to them (see Appendix 25).
First responses to the text

Summaries of the text

A close look at the responses pertaining to the pre-test shows us that students had some difficulty understanding the overall meaning of the text due to the complexity thereof. Jack (S18) and Paul’s (S05) responses are a clear example of this (see Appendix 19):

The text is like very difficult for me and I think I don’t understand all the text. (Jack)

It’s a text that have many metaphors and a little difficult to understand in the beginning (Paul- S05)

Although the above quotes are not the complete responses given by these two students in the first instance, they clearly show us how Paul and Jack appear to be faced with a complex text that they don’t seem to understand. Of interest is to see that Paul recognises the metaphorical orientation of the text and appears to attribute the complexity of it to its metaphorical density.

Right after judging the text as ‘difficult to understand’, in the same response Jack goes on to describe what the text is about:

The text is about a meeting or summit which happen in Africa and the meeting is for solving the problem about the poor people in Africa. The singer of U2 was in the meeting too. The poverty problem is very serious and I think people should try to find other ways for solving the problem (Jack-S18).

The rest of Jack’s response to the text clearly shows an attempt to demonstrate what he has understood. His understanding of text is, however, constrained to statements which don’t go beyond summarizing levels – “the text is about a meeting...”, “... a summit which happen in Africa...”, “...the singer of U2 was in the meeting...”, etc. At the end of his response, Jack appears to identify a problem, which in his opinion ‘is very serious’, to which alternative solutions should be sought. It is unfortunate that Jack does not engage in a deeper discussion on what ‘other ways’ could be found in order to solve the problem which he deems serious. Nor is it mentioned how those alternative solutions could possibly solve the poverty issue.

Aside from recognising the presence of metaphors in the text and judging it “difficult to understand in the beginning”, Paul also provides a summary of the text (see Appendix 19):
...but I think that I read it more than one time I can understand a little more. For me the text talk about the meeting in Africa that is for find some answers and solutions for the problem of the poor people. This is big problem for many countries. (Paul-S05)

As shown earlier, Paul’s response to the text starts off by expressing his struggle in understanding the text. Later in the same response, he acknowledges that his difficulty in understanding the text could eventually be minimised if he read it more than once. In line with Jack’s response, Paul’s reaction to the text is limited to a couple of sentences which only provide factual information and summarize the overall event talked about in the text – the G8 Summit.

Other similar responses produced in the first instance (see Appendix 19) which also fall within the summarising category are as follows:

I think the text is about Africa because Africa is a very poor country and they must to find something for not having so much poo people (Jess-S13)

I feel very confused, the text makes me think about my feelings about the poor countries. Some language I don’t understand in the text but the text is about Bono and other politicians that try to discuss some solutions for the poor countries. (Jenny-S17)

Although the text does make mention of 14 African countries which will not have to pay any of the billions to international banks, Jess expresses that the text is about Africa and comments on the fact that it’s “a very poor country”. Jenny’s response goes a little deeper in that she appears to engage emotionally with the text by saying “...the text makes me think about my feelings about the poor countries”. Such statement appears to be in line with Rosenblatt’s (Kucer, 1985) calls ‘the aesthetic response’ which refers to how the reader feels about something. Although Jess doesn’t elaborate further on how and why she feels that way, this already gives us a slight indication of how affect could potentially influence her creation of meaning and, therefore, the ways in which she interprets and engages with the text. As well as the previous responses, Jenny ends her response by focusing upon the solutions that should be sought to tackle poverty issues and fails to engage in a deeper discussion on her understanding of text.

Sue’s response shows some critical engagement with the text at the beginning but gets lost in its inconclusiveness and in the emphasis on what the G8 summit attempted to do.

The text is interesting for me because it talk about an important problem in the world that is poverty and I want to study economics, I think maybe distribution of resources. I think it was a good idea for the meeting and think about different way for fixing this problem. It is also important because important people like Bono have influence in the meeting. (Sue-S07).
Sue’s overall response is quite different from the other students’ mentioned above. Unlike the previous quotes, Sue starts off by expressing how interesting the text is to her. Her interest in economics is what probably leads her to put forward an interesting, though inconclusive, argument which, in my opinion, appears to be rooted on the premise that a better distribution of resources could potentially help solve poverty problems in the world. It is unfortunate that this argument is not well elaborated, although some underlying coherence in relation to its previous sentence “I want to study economics” can be observed. However, it can be clearly inferred that such is the idea that she has attempted to convey. Her last two sentences assess the importance of the meeting and of influential people like Bono in resolving the problem of poverty.

Sam, who is apparently a big fan of U2, comments subtly on the central theme of the text and goes on to express his likes about music:

*It is good that Bono singer went to the meeting because he’s a very important figure in the music industry. I heard about Bono when I was 15 and now I like U2 music a lot, especially U2 music. I went to one concert one day. The text is not about music but it’s important that some music figures go to that summit. Maybe Bono can do some concerts to get money for the poor countries and find more solution to problems.* (Sam-S03).

Sam seems to respond to the text clearly and positively, but his thinking seems to head off in a different direction. Much of what Sam comments on doesn’t tap into the key theme of the text, yet his response is worth looking into. Sam’s passion for music is quite apparent. This leads him to engage in a bit of a narrative about when he first heard of Bono along with the concert he attended. In relation to his comments on the text, he assesses Bono’s presence at the meeting as being “good” given his influential nature as a rock star. Simon’s admiration for his apparently favourite rock star leads him to assume that his participation at the meeting could eventually exert a positive impact on its outcome.

Although the above response doesn’t demonstrate a profound understanding of the central theme discussed in the text, it becomes clear that Simon has engaged in a reader-text transaction giving rise to a process of meaning transformation imbued with the reader’s experiences, his knowledge of music along with his interpretations of the text. This is precisely the perspective from which a reader-response task is approached. Chase and Hynd (1988) point out that one of the main characteristics of a reader-response task is that meaning is not contained in the text, but emerges as a result of an interactional process between the content and structure of the writer’s message and the experience and prior-knowledge of the reader.
Simon’s response is indeed interesting in that it shows the uniqueness of his engagement as a culturally and individually situated reader; yet, it does not tap into the depth and breadth of the core discourse meaning channelled through the text. This suggests that, for the purpose of the analysis of the responses in this study, his response hasn’t gone beyond descriptive, summarising and reporting levels.

A similar response which also shows limited understanding of the text meaning but provides rich insights into how the student’s experiences and personal interests get tangled in the interpretation of the text:

*Maybe I don’t like the text very much because sometimes the words are difficult but I understand that the meeting has the objective for finding solutions for poverty in some poor countries... I saw a documentary because I like them, and the documentary was about some of the most poor countries in the world, when I was reading the text I reminded me when I went for travel to the Philippines and I saw some poor towns and poor people. Maybe the government should do some more effective things for this (Nick-S15)*

In reference to how much understanding of the text is shown, Nick’s response, as well as Simon’s discussed above, is constrained to a statement about the ‘meeting’ (the summit) and the presumed objective thereof. Although Nick’s response does not show a deep understanding of the text, of interest is to see how he engages quite reflectively in a narrative where he recalls some crucial events which, in the end, leads him to conclude that it is the responsibility of the government to implement measures to solve poverty around the world.

First of all, Nick’s first reaction to the text shows us his apparent difficulty with the complexity of lexis, which could probably be associated with the metaphorically-used expressions which frame some of the major ideas in the text. Nick has understood that the overall text meaning is to do with a meeting whose major aim, in his opinion, is to find ways of solving poverty around the world. Very broadly, Nick’s understanding is, to some extent, right in that the text does talk about poverty but doesn’t elaborate much on ‘ways’ of solving poverty.

Interestingly, the majority of the responses have shown students commenting on ‘ways of solving poverty’, which is not directly addressed in the text. Other responses discussed above have shown how individual, social and cultural factors may be brought up in a reader’s interpretation of a text. Nick’s response is not an exception to this. Upon reading the text, Nick recalled when he travelled to the Philippines and saw poor areas and poor people. Having travelled to a country where poverty may be an issue, coupled with his interest in documentaries Nick appears to have a broader understanding of how
poverty could be tackled, leading him to point out that ‘governments’ should be responsible for introducing ‘effective’ measures to address the problem.

Although Nick’s response does not tap directly into the central theme of the text, his experiential account has given us insights into how readers comprehend differently, how memories are evoked and also how prior-knowledge and past experiences can get activated upon reading a text. Chase and Hynd (1987) point out that readers arrive at different text meanings because every reader is culturally and individually unique.

In Nick’s response, however, the meaning or interpretation of the text that he has arrived at doesn’t become clear as his response is mostly devoted to an account of his experiences. It would have been quite different to have a clearly articulated account in which those experiences had shaped his understanding of text. What becomes prominent in his account is, therefore, not how his understanding of text is socially and culturally influenced by his memories, experiences and prior-knowledge, but how a small portion of the text has triggered related memories along with travel experiences which led him to provide such experiential account. This indicates that Nick, as well as the other students previously mentioned, has failed to demonstrate a deep understanding of text, what it was about, how the topic developed, the issues it addressed, etc. His short statement about the ‘meeting’ and its presumed objective reveal a rather superficial level of text understanding.

The above-mentioned quotes show us how students responded to the text in the first instance and the extent to which they have understood and approached the text. Through the analysis of their responses pertaining to the first instance three major things are worth highlighting. Firstly, it was interesting to observe that the majority of students’ first reaction to the text related to its apparent difficulty and complexity which may have been the result of the different ideas expressed in metaphorical terms. Secondly, the responses reported in this study, all of which are representative of the majority of the students, demonstrated that learners attempted to engage quite interactively. However, such interaction appears to have failed since most responses excessively emphasised learners’ past experiences and anecdotes, thus relegating the centrality of the text to a secondary place. Reading, according to Roebuck (1987), is “the continuous integration of the available information, from both inside and outside the text, in order to construct a coherent representation of the text” (p. 3). Such interaction between the inside, the meaning channelled through the text, and the outside, what the reader brings to the text, was missing in students’ responses at
this stage. Finally, it could be observed that those statements which did allude to the text were very minimal and generally referred to ‘a meeting’ whose overall aim was ‘to find ways to solve poverty around the world’. These statements in turn revealed the overall ‘summarising’ nature of the responses, thus indicating an absence of a well-articulated engagement between the reader and the text.

Nevertheless, students’ responses in the second instance (see Appendix 20), i.e. after the teaching intervention period, showed a different kind of reader-text interaction. At this stage students appeared to have been guided towards a discovery of other elements in the text which led them to responding differently. This is perhaps seen in that the reader responses showed more explicit response to more specific parts of the text.

Let us turn our attention to the next section which discusses students’ responses in the second instance. The exemplars shown below are representative of what the majority of the students responded in the reader-response task.

**Showing depth of text understanding**

**Elaboration and Questioning as text understanding**

Looking closely at students’ responses in the second instance, i.e. after the teaching period, it can be observed that the ways in which students approached and reacted to the text differed from those in the first instance. It was mentioned earlier that the analysis of students’ responses was based upon a categorisation scheme whose major aim was to examine the depth and breadth of students’ understanding of text. In this section three levels of the categorization scheme are highlighted and discussed: elaboration, evaluation and questioning. The quotes presented in this section provide an indication of how students shifted away from purely ‘summarising’ statements to other levels of text understanding which were reflected in how students ‘elaborated’ on their responses, ‘questioned’ the text, and assessed portions thereof.

In the following responses (see Appendix 20) it can be seen that Simon and Jess, who didn’t show much understanding of text in the first instance as discussed above, appear to have approached the text quite differently, thus showing a deeper understanding of text reflected in how they elaborate on their arguments:
I think that what happens in the text is a very good idea because different important people lead the summit to discuss solutions for avoiding poverty in some African countries. That’s maybe the reason why they got the solution for 14 African countries for not paying the money to the big international banks. For that reason Bono said that they have climb a mountain (Sam-S03)

The text talk about two topics. One is the anti-poverty program for African countries and the other is the problem with global warming. One topic I think was very successful because they relieved some African countries from not paying the debt and the other topic they thought it was very pessimistic because the it’s people’s fault (Jess-S13)

A close look at these responses shows us the extent to which these two students’ accounts differ a great deal from their previous ones. First of all, unlike their responses in the first instance (see Appendix 19), Sam and Jess do not engage personally in their accounts. As their approach to the text does not touch on any personal experiences, memories, prior knowledge, etc. it appears that their responses are now quite heavily text-based.

It is clear that their responses are not constrained to purely summarising statements; on the contrary, they show a set of well-articulated ideas which tap into different issues and events discussed in the text. Such articulation is clearly marked by certain discourse markers, namely ‘because’, ‘that’s the reason’ and ‘for that reason’, which demonstrate the elaboration of the ideas along with the interconnectedness between them.

It is worth highlighting how Jess shows confidence in her response by stating that the text ‘talks about two topics’. Although briefly, she elaborates on each of those, in particular on what she calls ‘the anti-poverty program’ which succeeded in wiping off 14 African countries’ debts to international banks. On the other topic, that of climate change, Jess points out that the outcome of the meeting was quite pessimistic in that it is a problem for which everybody is to blame.

In his earlier response, Sam made little mention of the text and got carried away by his experiences and particular interest in music. In the second instance, however, it appears that one is faced with a response of a different person. Now, Sam shows a deeper understanding of text which is reflected in the elaboration of his arguments and his apparent understanding of the metaphor used by Bono ‘climb a mountain’. It is likely that Sam regard the outcome of the summit as quite positive in that it has led 14 African countries to get their debts cancelled. He then points out that ‘for that reason’ a mountain has been climbed. This gives us an indication of Sam’s understanding of the metaphor through which he establishes a subtle relationship between the positive outcome of the meeting and the act of climbing a mountain.
Although these responses give us an indication of how Sam and Jess have now been able to provide arguments and elaborate on them, and therefore better sustain their ideas, the absence of their personal contribution and individual interpretations of the text suggests that the readers have given the text a position of authority within their interactions with the text (Hirvela, 1996). This authorial orientation of the responses has completely shadowed the contribution of the reader to the interactive process of the reconstruction of the text meaning.

Perhaps, if the students, in particular Sam, had integrated his personal, social and cultural situatedness as reader, his response would have shown the reader’s active participation in the making or construction of meaning. As Luke and Freebody (1999) suggest, the reader as a meaning maker is one who participates in understanding and constructing a meaningful variety of texts, always taking into consideration.

Another response which also shows the elaboration of ideas is that of Sue. Unlike Simon and Jess’s responses, Sue’s reaction to the text shows a clear and well-balanced interplay between what Roebuck (1998) calls ‘the inside and outside the text’:

I feel pretty good now about the text because maybe the metaphors let me see the meaning in the text. Before I didn’t understand many meanings about words but I think I can guess very well now. That part of the story about the 14 countries from Africa that don’t have to pay the money is very good and is a challenge that the people who attended the meeting have overcome. I think that climate change is a major issue and we have to take some responsibility. School plays a very important role in educating children about this. (Sue-S07)

Aside from Sue’s statement on how she ‘feels’ about the text, one important element worth highlighting concerns itself with Jess’s understanding of metaphor. First of all, of interest is to examine her use of a particular metaphor to describe her own understanding of metaphorical meanings. Jess, without being completely aware perhaps, uses a linguistic realisation of the conceptual metaphor ‘understanding is seeing’ (Hirvela, 1996) through which she clearly and confidently expresses that metaphors have enabled her to understand the text meaning. This is quite fundamental in that we are faced with someone who openly acknowledges how metaphors have led her to deeper text meaning. What’s more, she also points out that she is even in a position where she can guess the meaning of unknown words very well. It appears that metaphors have not only enabled her to discover those hidden meanings which she didn’t ‘see’ before, but also to generalize rules and principles when faced with an unknown metaphor.
After showing her understanding of text, which is clearly deeper than what was shown in her first response, Jess concludes with an evaluative statement on the issue of climate change by saying that, first of all, it is our responsibility to take appropriate measures and secondly school systems have an important role to play in educating children to protect the environment.

Coupled with a clear understanding of text, the following two students also showed some concern about how people and societies in general are contributing to the destruction of our land:

The text that discuss the global warming problem says that the meeting didn’t achieve the objective, in other words that it was very pessimistic. The other problem, the one about the 14 African countries was very positive. For that, Bono says that he is looking down the... (I can’t remember). In my opinion, for the global warming it is important that everyone are aware that ourselves are damaging the world, with the food we eat, the chemicals, pesticides, and things like that. Does it make sense that politicians or famous people get together about this problem? Don’t think so. (Nick-S15)

I don’t know how to talk about the text now because now I can understand more and the vocabulary is more simple for me now. The G8 made a lot of progress because they relieved the 14 countries for not paying the huge debts. Other people have other opinions but in general was good. Probably if they did the same thing in other countries like Philippines, South Americia, maybe we could have less poor countries. Actually, it wouldn’t be a very good idea probably because a lot of people in these countries are in corruption. So what’s the point in doing a similar thing? I think it’s not the best (Jack-S18)

At first glance, of great interest is to observe the length of their responses in the second instance. It seems that students now have much more to say. Although length itself in not an indication of depth of text understanding, a close look at the responses reveals students’ deeper engagement with the text. In his first response, Nick starts off by pointing out his trouble understanding ‘some difficult words’ while now, his second response, he goes straight to the issue of global warming without making any mention of lexical complexity throughout the response. There might be a number of reasons for this. Firstly, It might be that Nick no longer has difficulty understanding those ‘difficult words’ in the text, hence the absence of statements commenting on the difficulty of certain words. Secondly, it could also be possible that the way in which he has approached and interacted with the text has mitigated the complexity of those lexical items, thus drawing his attention to the overall meaning of the text rather than small portions which presented complexity to him. As a consequence, it is likely that such an approach from which he engaged with the text may have impacted on what he was able to recall at the time of writing the response. Anderson and Pichert (Kövecses, 2010; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980b; Rodriguez, 2002) point out that the different perspectives from which readers approach a text might result in different information recalled. As Nick has now directed his
attention to diving deeper into the text, it appears that those isolated complex lexical items are either not relevant or not memorable.

Although there are a number of possible reasons for Nick not mentioning his difficulty with complex words at this stage, it is possible that he has developed a deeper understanding of metaphor which has led him to not make mention of those ‘difficult words’; difficulty which may well may have been associated with the metaphorical nature thereof. Nick’s understanding of the metaphor, which he doesn’t remember well but has clearly understood, ‘looking down....’ ‘the valley’ gives us an indication that he has come to be aware of how our physical-spatio-social interactions with the world influence the way we think (1978).

Of great significance is to examine Nick’s reflection on the issue of global warming. He comments that it is important that everyone is aware of how we contribute to the destruction of our world in multiple ways, especially through the consumption and use of chemically and genetically-manipulated foods. His invitation to consciousness raising leads him to question the value of such meetings as the G8 summit. He goes on to question whether this makes sense or not and concludes by asserting that it is not worth it. In line with Nick’s questioning statements about the value of the VIP meetings, Jack proposes that if similar events were conducted in countries such as Philippines or continents like (South) America, poverty could eventually be reduced. Nevertheless, shortly after he puts forward such an idea he questions it by saying ‘what’s the point of doing a similar thing (a summit)’ if corruption appears to be widespread in these countries. Although he understands and acknowledges that the G8 made considerable progress in relieving some African countries from their huge debts, he expresses that such initiative might not be applicable to certain nations.

The most relevant aspect worth highlighting in Nick’s and Jack’s responses is the fact that both showed capacity to put forward their views and elaborate on them. Their elaborations are not only evident in some of the linguistic devices used in their responses, i.e. ‘the other problem’, ‘for that’, ‘actually’, ‘because’, ‘so’, etc., but in how they rely on their own experiences and opinions to support what they elaborate on. As well, common to both responses is the fact that the readers raise some questions at the end of their responses. These interrogative statements show not only the students’ their capacity to make judgements and critical assumptions about different aspects of the text, but also their capacity to question them. This is central to how readers arrive at text understanding. Ludwig (2003) points out that it is through
a process of critiquing, evaluation and questioning that readers construct meaning and, very often, unique positions towards the text.

In a similar vein, Serena also raises a couple of fundamental questions about the value of Bono’s presence at the summit.

*It’s important to understand that the G8 is only vip, but now I am just thinking that why is Bono in the meeting. Does a rock star have to in an important meeting like this? Is it because his money and his popularity around the world? I think he could help countries to create campaigns to reduce the poverty. If this will be a good solution or not, we will see. (Serena-S14)*

Although Serena doesn’t elaborate on the central issues discussed in the text, she appears to be a little concerned about the nature of the composition of the G8 group. In her opinion, the group is rather exclusive, which is probably what justifies Bono’s participation, she says. Serena goes on to question whether it is the money and popularity of Bono, which have led him to partake in this event. Although Serena doesn’t appear to fully agree on the involvement of a rock star at the meeting, she concludes by saying that Bono could carry out similar campaigns in other countries so as to reduce levels of poverty. It can be observed in Serena’s response that regardless of the fact that she doesn’t touch upon the central issues discussed in the text, she engages quite critically in a brief discussion on the active participation of Bono as a member of the G8 in events such as the G8 summit. The questions she raises about Bono’s involvement and the extent to which such participation was effective and more conducive to successful outcomes demonstrate the manner in which Serena has approached the text along with how critical her stance is in regard to the text. Her position towards this issue, Bono’s involvement in the summit, and her capacity to discuss and elaborate on it, shows that text meaning is not only within the text, as demonstrated in the first instance, but also outside of it. As well, Serena’s elaboration displays how what is brought to the text—the reader’s own prior knowledge, past stories, other voices of the text, as well as previous experiences, contributes to the ways in which someone arrives at text understanding.

On examining students’ responses indicating depth of understanding of text, so far we have looked at some responses which show how students were able to elaborate on their ideas and arguments along with other responses which demonstrated how questioning, raising questions on the part of the learners, was a central feature in how they approached and engaged with the text. Such ‘elaboration’ and ‘questioning’ stages give us an indication of the depth of text understanding shown in the learners’ responses in the second instance.
Evaluation as text understanding

Another interesting feature which also taps into the learners’ depth of text understanding is the ability to make informed contributions to the text by evaluating events, outcomes or situations described in the text. In the following quotes it can be observed how learners’ evaluative statement responses show not only their understanding of text but also their active engagement with it (see Appendix 20).

...the situation in the text is interesting but at the same time I disagree with the result of the meeting. My reason is that relieving the poor countries from the debts doesn’t not help them in the future’ (Jenny-S17)

My thoughts about the G8 and the meeting is that they simply do it, in one hand, to promote their fame and political influence, and not necessary for helping poor societies. I think that if that is the situation it should be different, and important figures like Bono should do things that last in time (Jess-S13)

Jenny’s and Jess’s responses show an evaluation of different aspects of what the text discusses. Jenny’s reaction to the outcome of the meeting is quite critical and clearly expresses her disagreement towards what she appears to consider a partial solution to the problem of poverty. It appears that Jenny’s overall evaluative statement on the African debt relief calls for a long-term solution (“...relieving the poor countries...doesn’t help them in the future”).

In a similar vein, Jess’s overall evaluation of the G8 summit is in line with that of Jenny’s in that she also seems to view the poverty relief solution as something not ‘lasting in time’.

A subtle connection between Nick’s evaluative comments and the two mentioned above can be observed in the following response.

Probably every time poor countries have problems with huge debts and simply the poverty they should look for real political and economical assistance that, for example, help them to create more employment opportunities and exploit their own resources (Nick-S15)

Nick’s response to the text aligns well with Jenny’s and Jess’ in that he also feels very strong about the idea of seeking “real political and economical” solutions to the poverty issues of some African countries. It appears that Nick doesn’t seem to fully agree on the idea of relieving poor African countries from poverty by paying off their international debts. Nick’s and Jess’ critical position on this issue seems to suggest that the problems of poverty and global warming have not been dealt with effectively. Nick’s use of the word ‘real’ points to the need for searching for, perhaps, permanent
solutions that bring about positive changes to these complex situations. Another learner’s response to the text shows his critical evaluation of poverty and global warming issues.

*I don’t understand why people like Bono or other politicians went to that meeting to talk about the global warming and poverty problem. That problem is a problem from many areas, like sciences, engineering, teaching, etc. It is an issue that can be solved with the help of people from different fields. (Jack-S18)*

What Jack seems to be trying to get across is that poverty and global warming are problems that should not only be looked at through economic and environmental lenses. Rather, they are problems that cut across several disciplinary areas. This is quite a critical perspective on the issues discussed in the texts as the student seems to acknowledge the need for looking at problems such as global warming and poverty from a broader perspective. The learner’s capacity to evaluate Bono’s participation at the meeting and the need for looking at poverty and global warming issues from several perspectives shows his critical stance on how these issues require the involvement of several stakeholders.

The above quotes, which are representative of how the majority responded, point to how students’ understanding of text developed, thus showing a more profound engagement with the text as well as more complex responses to the text. Looking at responses of both instances, one can observe that both, though to different degrees, draw on the text. Learners in the first and second instance wrote about the text. However, the nature of their responses, how learners approached the text and the roles they took on when responding to texts changed quite significantly in the second instance. Responses in the second instance showed learners’ capacity to provide elaboration on their views and ideas, to questions and evaluate different aspects and issues discussed in the text. The learners’ capacity to critically evaluate different issues discussed in the text shows clearly the ways in which the learner’s voice has mingled well with the writer’s voice, thus giving rise to individual and unique interpretations of the text. This has demonstrated that readers’ understanding of text is not derived from what is printed on the written page. On the contrary, as Chase and Hynd (1987) state, the text has power to guide and shape the text meanings that take place in the readers’ mind. However, it is the readers’ own position towards the text what will largely determine the meaning systems that will be constructed at the time of approaching a text.

In line with what was discussed in 3.2.4.1, learners seem to have adopted a text-critic role when approaching the text. The exemplars analysed herein provide an indication of how text meaning is not self-
contained in the text; rather, it is actively constructed as the reader, and what he/she brings to the reading process, engages and approaches the text from their own personal stance. As discussed earlier (see 3.2.4.1), the text-critic role emphasises the idea that readers are capable of, as Ludwig (Tyler, 2012) points out, critically evaluating the social and cultural purposes of the text put forth by the writer.

All in all, the learners’ responses discussed above reveal the ways in which readers have come to understand texts in different ways. Readers’ responses have ranged widely from brief summaries of the text to critical positions and evaluations of issues central to the overall text meaning. This, aside from indicating an evolution and progression of learners’ understanding of text, shows the unique ways in which readers’ construction of text meaning was shaped not only by their own experiences and prior knowledge of the topic, but also by the very own ways in which they approached a topic based on their socially and culturally situatedness in the world.

Learners’ understanding of text was also examined in the ways they collaborated with other readers when engaged in discussions. The following section provides samples of collaborative talk where learners refer to several elements and resources that appear to have contributed to their understanding.

**Classroom talk**

Learners’ understanding of text was also measured by looking at the ways in which students collaboratively participated in joint activities throughout the four-week teaching intervention period. As discussed in 3.2.3.2, instances of collaborative talk have the potential to afford learners with opportunities to enhance their learning and to engage in what Kucer (2003) calls ‘deeper explorations of meaning’. Transcriptions of the recordings of students’ classroom interactions were carefully examined and representative exemplars were selected in order to analyse them by using features of content-analysis techniques. Content analysis, in Dörnyei’s (2007) view, refers to “techniques for making inferences by systematically identifying special characteristics of messages” (p. 112). Although some researchers point out that content analysis can take a quantitative form, others believe that the value of content analysis is in its overall capacity to exploit the meanings of a text by highlighting relevant aspects of the messages, commenting on underlying structural aspects of them or unpacking specific meanings of the wording of statements. This qualitative orientation of content analysis was adopted in the examination of the transcripts of learners’ talk.
Once the transcriptions had been carefully read and representative examples of talk had been selected for analysis, a search for specific features of the collaborative interactions was in place in an attempt to find instances which could possibly indicate the extent to which collaborative talk had a role to play in learners’ depth of understanding of text. Some of the key elements that were sought in the data were the learners’ recognition of the value of collaboration, the interplay between collaboration and metaphor understanding, their reliance on meditational tools in the process of understanding metaphors in text, and a search for instances which could shed some light on collaborative talk and depth of understanding of text.

In conclusion, the ways in which understanding of text was measured provide us with an overall view of not only the different methods utilised in the data collection process but also, and most importantly, of the complementary methodological perspectives from which reading understanding was analysed.

**Collaborative dialogues: an opportunity for deeper understanding of text**

In earlier sections (see 3.2.2) we discussed the reading activity as a sociocultural practice which entails, amongst several other things, the active joint participation of individuals in the reading process (e.g. Silverman, 1993). Central to this joint activity is the role of collaborative dialogues which afford learners with opportunities for learning and knowledge construction (Roebuck, 1998). In view of this facilitative role of collaborative dialogues, it was discussed in 3.2.3.2 that such dialogic opportunities for knowledge construction, and overall language learning, could contribute to a deeper understanding of text. The following section shows and discusses exemplars of transcribed dialogues of learners which occurred while working on the application of the MIP to some short reading texts.

The exemplars shown below represent samples of dialogues which occurred at different stages of the four-week teaching period. Different key terms have emerged from the content analysis of these dialogues. Each of these key terms along with its exemplars are discussed separately in the section below.

**The value of collaboration**

In early instances of teaching period (second session), of interest was to see that learners valued the opportunities given to them to discuss and share ideas. This is evidence by the following exchange:

Sally: I think that…maybe it’s a good idea to have the possibility for discuss all together, the things that know and maybe the things that we don’t know
Jack: I think so. Because maybe if I don’t know something, maybe you know that and together we can discuss.

It is evident that these learners seem to be very appreciative of the opportunities that have been given to them to discuss in collaboration with others. As discussed earlier in 3.2.3.2, Haneda and Wells (Swain, 1997, 2001) recommend that learners should be given frequent opportunities for dialogue. They go on to state that the classroom should be a place for generating instances for dialogues that allow learners to engage in meaning-making processes. From the exchange, it also becomes evident that Sally and Jack consider this opportunity as one where each of them can make their own contributions by complementing each other (“maybe if I don’t know something, maybe you know that”).

Another exchange which also provides insights into the value of collaboration is seen what Jason and Sev discuss:

Sev: mmm… in my country [China] this activity is not very common, actually it’s not common, never…

Jason: yes, because we have to memory many things, and read many books and repeat, but I think this group discussion is very good because sometimes you can learn more.

Sev: I think this is very common in Australia in school and universities and very useful.

Apart from acknowledging the lack of opportunities for dialogue given to students in China, Sev and Jason seem to value the collaborative opportunities that have been given to them stating that they can be “very useful” (Sev) and that these opportunities may have a potential for enhancing their learning experiences (“group discussion is very good because sometimes you can learn more” [Jason]). As discussed by Swain (2008), collaborative dialogues are instances which provide opportunities for language learning through the co-construction of knowledge. Similarly, Wells (1986) states that “every occasion of joint activity provides a potential opportunity for learning” (p.58). Another exchange stresses the need for listening to each other’s contribution as everyone in the group:

Jenny: everyone in a group has something important to say so…

always has “something important to say”:

Fred: yes, it’s good because we can all talk about the things we know and what we understand.
Jenny: *mmm, that’s why we have to hear the things that we say careful*

Jenny acknowledges that everyone in the group has some active role in the discussion. She considers that what each person in the group has to say is important and deserves careful attention. Fred seems to understand that group collaboration and discussion is beneficial to their understanding.

In later instances of collaboration (sixth session), students openly express their satisfaction with what groups discussions have enabled them to do:

Kevin: I am satisfied with all these group discussions because I can have different opinions from you and that also help my, erm…. my ideas and my… how I understand things better

Mike: yes, the understanding of things, yes, I think it’s better to do things in groups. What is that expression in English? Erm… two heads, or brains? think better than one. Is that right?

Of great interest is to examine what Kevin also said in one of his Journal entries (see details in 5.3) where he commented that he is more aware about metaphors and he can ‘see’ them in language more often than before. This seems to be backgrounded by what Kevin says in the above exchange where group discussions have contributed to his greater understanding of things. It seems that his overall enhanced understanding of things has been the result of the collaborative discussions where each participant has contributed with ‘different opinions’. This, in Wells and Chang-Wells’ (1992) view, is what characterises collaborative talk. They note that of the central key characteristics of collaborative talk is that participants in these collaborative instances learn from each other’s differing opinion bases.

Kevin’s view is further supported by Mike who says “I think it’s better to do things groups”. One important observation that needs to be made at this point is that very often participants tend to refer to different classroom activities as ‘things’. Kevin also talks about ‘understand things better’. Perhaps, the use of the referent ‘things’ is considered by the students a familiar and more generic way to refer to the different reading and metaphor-awareness related activities conducted in class. It is clear to Mike that working collaboratively is more effective than working alone. Although a little hesitant about the write wording of the expression, he goes further to recall a common English proverb. His recall of this proverb gives an indication of what he assumes learning to be. To Kevin, people working together appear to have more chances of solving a problem than person doing it alone. Other exchanges show more clearly how these
instances of collaboration have not only contributed to the overall learning experience of students but also to their understanding of metaphor in text.

The following exchange show instances where students discuss metaphorical meanings encountered in the extract of a text. It shows how meaning is constructed in collaborative talk.

**Collaboration and metaphor understanding**

This example I have chosen is taken from an exchange between four students who are following the steps of the MIP and applying them to an extract of a text which contains some metaphors. At this stage of the conversation, the students have already identified words and expressions which could be counted as metaphorical and are discussing, as the example will show, the metaphorical meaning of one particular phrase.

21 Jack: …the valley is something that is normally at the end, down, at the end of something

22 Paul: when I was a child I used to live a town that was in a valley

23 Jess: Is it like a city in a hole?

24 Paul: well, sort of…

25 Jess: why?

26 Paul: in the town where I lived, it was in a kind of hole because there were huge mountains in both sides

27 Simon: so you could see the mountains up there from down the town?

28 Paul: yes, of course because the town was in a valley

29 Jack: so, in this context, in the reading…mmm

30 Simon: what is the meaning?

31 Jack: look down the valley

32 Jess: so, if a valley is here and the mountains up it means two things

33 Jack: what two things:

34 Jess: that somebody is maybe up in the mountain seeing something down in the valley
In trying to understand the metaphorically-used expression in the text ‘look down the valley’, Paul brings up memories from his childhood (22). This helps other students, who apparently don’t know what a valley is, to have a depiction of what a valley looks like. Paul elaborates by saying that the town, which was located in a valley, was surrounded by huge mountains. Having a town surrounded by huge mountains created a sense of a city lying in a hole (23). This depiction, though, seemed to help other students to understand that a valley is ‘down at the end of something’ (21). Seeking clarification to this idea of a city located in a hole, Simon asks if it was possible to look up the mountains from down the valley (27). Paul answers with great certainty saying “of course because the town was in a valley” (28).

Although no one in the exchange has given a definition of valley, each of the participants’ contribution to the discussion helps them have some shared understanding of what a valley is. Each participant has contributed in different ways. One has, for instance, relied on his experiences and interactions with the world to illustrate a valley based on his childhood memories (Paul). Others seek clarification and extension of what was said (Jess). The interrelation between each of these contributions where no one imposes their own view but collaboratively discuss ideas in order to achieve a particular purpose is precisely what has led these students to construct knowledge together, and therefore arrive at a simple but apparently clear understanding of valley.

This knowledge-construction instance has enabled participants to delineate the boundaries between literal and metaphorical meanings of the word valley. Without explicitly saying it, the students clearly started the discussion by understanding what could be the most basic, concrete and literal meaning of the word ‘valley’. Having arrived at some understanding of the literal meaning of valley, the students move on to discuss how this concrete meaning may be applied in the context of the text.

35 Simon: so the meaning for the text would be…?
36 Jess: just like the valley in Paul’s town, the valley down here and the mountains up there
37 Simon: and what?
38 Jess: the sentence say that ‘look down the valley’. So, the valley is here and someone is up there
39 Jack: so, somebody is standing up in the mountain watching down the valley
40 Paul: the mountains around my town are really huge
Jess: there are mountains in Australia?

Paul: think so, maybe huge, there are some in Dandenong I think

Jess: if you want to be standing up on the mountains, huge mountains, you need to climb

Paul: and it’s a lot of work, you have to walk and walk… not easy

Simon: so in the reading, if someone is ‘look down the valley’ means that… maybe it was difficult to get up to the top

Jess: and of course he had to climb, a lot of work

Jack: so the meaning in the text is that someone have done a lot of work to get to the top of the mountain

Jess: and now he is looking down and thinking that he has achieved something

Paul: but before you achieve that, there are problems in the way, huge rocks, long grass, steep trails, and other things.

Jess: when you look down the mountain, you have to see those huge rocks that you didn’t climb maybe

In this part of the exchange students have gone on to discuss the relationship between the literal meaning of ‘valley’ and its use in the context of the text. Jess seems to be certain that there exists a relationship between the literal and metaphorical. In answering to Simon’s question (35) about the meaning of the expression in the text, Jess appears to suggest that there exists some kind of mapping from the literal to metaphorical (“just like the valley in Paul’s town, the valley down here and the mountains up there”). That is, Jess appears to be relying on her knowledge of real and concrete valleys and mountains to discuss its application to the metaphorical context. This is in line with what underpins the conceptual metaphor theory: our physical-sensorimotor experiences and interactions with the outside world tend to have an impact on how we think and talk about reality (2000). Jess and Paul (43, 44) further their comments by saying that in order to be standing up on top of a mounting, there’s climbing to do. Jess’ emphasis (46) on the hard work involved in climbing a mountain is perhaps intended metaphorically to suggest that anything that is to be achieved in life requires some ‘climbing’, that is, a lot of hard work. This metaphorical interpretation seems to have been quickly captured by Jack (47) who begins his utterance
with ‘so’ – perhaps, in an attempt to convey the idea that he has already captured the relationship between the literal and metaphorical. He continues by elaborating on what Jess has pointed out concluding that the meaning as used in text refers to someone who has done a great deal of work in order to get up to the top of the mountain. However, in order to get to the top, some problems need to be overcome. Paul points to the fact that a climber may face certain difficulties along the way before reaching final destination (49). There may be huge rocks, long grass and other obstacles which will need to be either removed or overcome.

As these students engage in a discussion on the metaphorical meaning of the expression ‘look down the valley’ as used in the context of the text, the students find themselves supporting their arguments with their understanding of reality to further extend it to the metaphorical domain. Through a process of reflection and collaborative discussion on what they know and how that may be applied to another domain, that of the text, students are led to the overall understanding of what appears to be an underlying conceptual metaphor.

Of great interest is to examine the use of some key words throughout the dialogic exchange. Words such as ‘mountain’ and ‘climb’. For example, ‘mountain’ could metaphorically refer to problems faced by someone while ‘climbing’ could refer to tackling those problems (V. Evans & M. Green, 2006; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980a, 1980b). It seems from the students’ final discussion that reaching the top of a mountain requires tackling problems (climbing) and obstacles (mountain, huge rocks and long grass) which are encountered along the way. Having reached the top, one can ‘look down’ and reflect on, perhaps, the paths that were taken, the obstacles that were removed and the ones that were overcome. On looking down the valley, it is also important to reflect on those obstacles and problems which were not tackled (“you have to see those huge rocks that you didn’t climb” -50).

It becomes clear that students’ active participation in this dialogic instance has led them to such understanding of the metaphorically-used expression ‘look down the valley’. The ways in which all participants have engaged in the discussion, by giving examples, asking questions, elaborating on answers and making interpretations, provide an indication of how their co-operation in completing the task have led them to construct the overall metaphorical meaning of the expression.

In a later instances of the four-week teaching period, students had the opportunity to discuss their views of the MIP implemented throughout and of what how they had experienced this process. The
following exemplar shows how several instances of collaborative talk have led students to believe that not only their awareness and visibility of metaphor has improved but also their capacity to understand them in written texts, thus suggesting a deeper level of understanding of text.

**Collaborative talk and depth of text understanding**

Central to the students’ discussions and reflections on their understanding of text is how they acknowledge the importance of different tools that have contributed to their depth of understanding. The exemplar below is an exchange between three students.

73 Mike: ... no but the MIP was not easy for me to understand the first day

74 Rey: Do you remember the first day? I was so confusing and when I read that text, oh my God...

75 Mike: it was interesting but I found it was difficult to understand all those concepts about metaphor

76 Ali: yes, it was confusing for me too but I think the help of the teacher was very good

77 Rey: yes, always giving examples, explaining all the things, coming to us to check our work

Ali: all that helped

78 Mike: when we start with the steps of the... the MIP it think that comparing the meaning of the dictionary and the meaning in the text was very good. The dictionary is actually good for doing that

79 Ali: sometimes the dictionary help, but I think it doesn't help sometimes

80 Mike: I think it helps me to know more the real meanings of words and the think in...

81 Rey: yes, maybe then think about the meaning in the text

In earlier chapters (see 3.2.3.1) it was discussed that one central notion to SCT (Sociocultural theory) is that of mediation. Human action, on both the social and individual planes, is always mediated by a wide range of tools (Semino, 2008). In the above exchange, one can observe that participants make reference to different tools which appear to have mediated their learning. Mike and Ali (78, 79) acknowledge the role of the dictionary in their understanding of metaphorical meanings. The use of the
dictionary has helped him “know more the real meanings of words” (80). Using the dictionary has helped Mike become more aware of the nature of meanings. Perhaps, by comparing how a dictionary defines a word and how the word is actually used in a text, Mike has realised that meanings may vary considerably from context to context. A word defined in a dictionary, with little or no context at all, does not always provide the reader with the necessary information of the ways in which a word may be metaphorically used in the context of a text. It seems that a dictionary does not only provide encyclopaedic meanings of words but also serves as a powerful meditational tool. It has mediated Mike’s process of understanding word meanings in the context of a dictionary and in the context of a text.

Another important element which seems to have contributed to build up their understanding of metaphor, and eventually their understanding of text, was the assistance provided by the teacher. Although the introduction and implementation of the MIP was somewhat overwhelming to some students at the start of the teaching period, students have come to recognize the important role of the teacher in providing guidance and support to come to a better understanding of the procedure. In the process of beginning to make sense of metaphors and understanding a procedure which students had never heard before, the teacher became central to the development of learners’ understanding. This fits into what has been traditionally defined as Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). This is a metaphor that refers to a psychological distance between what a learner can accomplish alone and what can be accomplished with the help of an expert or someone more knowledgeable (Lantolf, 2007c; Wertsch, 1991). The assistance and support provided by the expert, in this case the teacher, in the early stages of learning becomes crucial to the development and accomplishment of a task. Ali acknowledges that the MIP was confusing at the start but the assistance provided by the teacher was useful (76). The ways in which the teacher provided assistance, examples, explanations and regular checks of students’ work, seem to be an important contributor to learners’ overall understanding of the MIP.

Later in the conversation, students move on to discuss their views of the reading text they had faced at the start and the end of the teaching period.

Ali: ... the poverty in Africa

Mike: that’s probably the valley that he looks down. There’s still a lot of poor people in Africa
Ali: but a mountain was climbed

Rey: I think in general it was a good outcome, at least what the G8 people said about climbing a mountain

An interesting element in this short exchange is that as learners participate in joint activities and internalize the effects of working together, new strategies are acquired (Lantolf, 2007a; Wertsch, 1980, 1991). It becomes clear in this short exchange that students show the capacity to use metaphors in discussing their understanding of the text. Although they are using some of the same metaphors embedded in the text, they use them confidently and their use in response to each other’s comments show their being more aware of what these metaphors refer to. Their use of metaphor may also be an indication of what Wells and Chang-Wells (1992) call ‘appropriation of cultural systems’. Appropriating a cultural system or pattern, in their view, refers to the adoption of cultural elements required to perform a particular task (Lantolf, 2007c). In this case, students have appropriated the metaphors used in the text in order to express their views of the reading text. Mike’s response to Ali’s comment shows his view of what the valley (looking down the valley) may refer to. In his view, the valley appears to allude to some of the current problems of poverty in Africa which still need to be addressed (89). However, some of these problems have already been tackled because, as Ali says, a mountain has already been climbed (90). By way of conclusion, Rey comments that the general outcome of the G8 Summit was positive; his use of the same metaphor Ali has used reinforces the idea that climbing a mountain, in their view, refers to having achieved something.

Students have also shown understanding of text through a series of questions which they raise and attempt to answer in collaboration.

Kevin: what is you understand about the text?
Li: the text talk about two things. Poverty and global warming
Kevin: and what is the final result?
Robert: result? mmm
Li: the final result in the meeting?
Kevin: yes, the G8 meeting… what’s the word?
Robert: Summit?
Kevin: yes, the G8 summit. So the result?

Li: the result is very good. Bono says that he got to the top of the mountain

Robert: mmm, he didn’t go to the mountain but he says that…

Li: yes, that’s what I mean. A mountain was climbed

Robert: yes, it’s positive so I think the glass is half full (laughter)

Li: but I also remember something about a roar and a whisper

Robert: so if it’s only a whisper, the results wasn’t very good

From this it becomes clear that Kevin, along with the other participants, is actively engaged in the discussion. He seems curious about learning what other participants have understood and what their views are. At this point in the discussion, he raises different questions (24, 29, 31) which are intended to elicit information from other participants on their understanding of text. This is initiated by an open question about what others have understood. In response to the question, Li answers confidently highlighting two main ideas of the text. Wanting to explore further, Kevin now asks another question which pushes other participants to think about the outcome of the meeting (“what is the final result?” -26). In answering the question, Li seems confident again and says “the result is very good” (32). In support of his view, he attempts to use the metaphor used by Bono in the text where he says ‘…a mountain has been climbed’. What seemed to be a passive participation on the part of Robert, he now jumps in and quickly corrects Li by emphasizing that it was not Bono who got to the top of the mountain but that a mountain was climbed. Robert’s contribution is crucial in highlighting the perspective from which Li was looking at the outcome. It seems that Robert was saying that it was not Bono’s achievement but probably a collaborative accomplishment or one in which mention of those who achieved it is not relevant. Robert goes further to contribute to this collaborative discussion on the outcome of the meeting by using another metaphor from the text “so I think the glass is half full”. His apparent good and clear understanding of this metaphor helps him support his comment on the positive outcome of the meeting (35). Other students are led to use metaphors to express their views. Li recalls a metaphor used in the text where “something” – he can’t seem to remember what it is – is referred to as roar and whisper (34). Showing his understanding of these metaphors, Robert’s interpretation of the word ‘whisper’ alludes to a poor outcome of the meeting. This, however, doesn’t necessarily suggest that Robert has completely changed his mind considering that his
opinion was that there was a positive outcome. It may be just a reflection of his critical contribution to the discussion in attempting to make observations and interpretations of the metaphors that arise in the course of the discussion.

From this exchange on can observe that each participant’s contribution to the discussion has built up on the overall understanding at which they have arrived. The interplay between questions, answers, comments and interpretations of metaphor have helped students collaboratively construct the text meaning. In conclusion, all the exemplars examined in this section share one important commonality; they all clearly show how each participant has contributed to the discussion in one way or another. This is in line with what Bakhtin calls ‘responsitivity’. In his view, responsitivity refers to the idea that hearers do not take passive roles in conversation. On the contrary, an active and responsive attitude is adopted in the context of conversation. Another important element which cuts across all the exchanges analysed herein is they all represent instances of problem solving. This, in Swain’s (Wells & Chang-Wells, 1992) view, is a fundamental characteristic of collaborative dialogues. In a collaborative dialogue, “speakers are engaged in problem solving and knowledge building” (Swain, 2000, p. 102). Every dialogic instance analysed above shows ways in which learners collaboratively engaged in talk that sought to find solutions to different types of problems. Some of these were focused on the determining the literal and metaphorical meanings of certain words, others focused on negotiating different views and understandings of the overall meaning of the text. It seems that these instances of co-construction of knowledge assisted learners in developing their understanding of language, in appropriating metaphors into their linguistic repertoire, and in developing a deeper understanding of text. It is important to highlight that such depth of understanding may have been achieved without the use of different mediational tools which played an important role in guiding, leading, supporting and assisting learners in their learning experience.

**Conclusion**

The present chapter has presented and discussed results pertaining to reading and understanding of text. Although some of the reading test results, in particular the multiple-choice section, as mentioned in 6.2, did not clearly show a significant increase in understanding, other test sections such as vocabulary and short-answer questions did show a statistically significant increase in understanding of text. Aside from these findings, of great significance was to examine learners’ voices in their written responses to the text. Analysis of such responses showed an interesting development of the ways in which learners approached
and interpreted the text at different times (before the teaching period and after the teaching period). Learners’ collaborative discussions with other readers demonstrated some of the ways in which learners appear to come to text understanding and of those elements and resources that contribute to it. These results along with those pertaining to awareness of metaphor are to be discussed in the following chapter in an attempt to unpack some of the factors contributing to a growth in understanding of text.
Chapter 7: Discussion

Introduction

The research question under investigation has sought to examine whether ESOL learners’ understanding of text in the target language can be enhanced through metaphor awareness raising. Each of the different parts of the research question, awareness of metaphor and understanding of text, has been dealt with separately in the preceding chapters. This chapter is aimed at discussing and bringing together what was learnt about each of the two parts of the research question. In particular, it first discusses the data relating to awareness of metaphor beginning with the linguistic evidence found in learners’ language, followed by the content of what was reported in the journal entries. The chapter then discusses the findings relating to learners’ understanding of text. Salient features of what was found in the reading test and in the learners’ transcripts of collaborative discussions are discussed.

Summary of findings

The description of the findings, as presented in Chapters 5 and 6, relating to reading understanding and metaphor awareness can be summarised thus:

1. In chapter five it was examined how what the learners said in their classroom discussions provided an indication of awareness of metaphor. Students’ discussions were examined on the basis of two linguistic features. One was the length of their turns. The other was their use of the metalanguage of metaphor. Analysis of the former revealed that students’ length of turns became longer, more numerous and more complex over the teaching period. The latter showed that students’ talk exhibited an increase in the metalanguage of metaphor as indicated by the metaphor-related lexemes tracked in the learners’ language over time.

2. Analysis of students’ journal entries provided useful insights into learners’ growth in understanding of metaphor. The responses showed that learners appear to have developed a capacity to identify metaphor, understand it and find a function to it. It was also evident in the journals that learners’ growth in awareness of metaphor helped them move to deeper levels of text understanding.
3. As mentioned in the preceding chapters, learners’ understanding of text was measured in three different ways. It was measured from a traditional (decoding) quantifiable perspective; from the perspective of reader-text interaction in the form of a reader response task; and, it was also measured within the context of dialogic collaboration with other readers. It was shown in Chapter 6 that the overall mean scores were 7.44 for the pre-test (test administered at the beginning of the teaching period) and 10.24 for the post-test (test given to students at the end of the teaching cycle). The mean difference between scores reflects an increase of 2.8 points in the test administered at the end of the four-week teaching period. The t-test conducted to compare the scores derived from the pre and post-test demonstrated that this difference was statistically significant $t(24) = p < 0.05$. Students’ reading understanding was also measured through a reader-response task. The task, which mainly consisted of students writing their interpretations and understanding of the text, showed that students’ responses clearly shifted away from summarising levels to others more elaborate and critical over time.

4. Learners’ transcripts of collaborative discussions revealed several elements which appear to have contributed to learners’ depth of understanding of metaphor and text. Some of these were the learners’ explicit recognition of the value of collaboration, the ways in which collaboration assisted learners in coming to grips with the understanding of metaphor, and the ways in which learners utilised several meditational tools in the process of understanding metaphor in text.

The results indicate an overall increase in both understanding of text, as indicated by the test scores, responses to reader-response task and exemplars from their dialogic interactions, and the students’ awareness of metaphor as evidenced by a growth in number and length of turns, the growing amount of metalanguage, and the students’ voices in the journal entries.

Having looked briefly at the findings, it is now pertinent to engage in a discussion in an attempt to answer the research question and find out how awareness of metaphor might have influenced the growth of text understanding.

**What has been learnt about awareness of metaphor**

Consistent with findings of previous research studies into awareness of metaphor (e.g. Boers, 2000; Guo, 2007; Kalyuga & Kalyuga, 2008; Picken, 2005), the present investigation revealed that drawing learners’
explicit attention to source and target domains underpinning conceptual metaphor helped learners identify the metaphoricality involved in the non-literal expressions they came across throughout the teaching period.

Initial stages of the teaching period showed that learners did not seem to be aware of the metaphoricality involved in the phrases and expressions found in the reading test administered to them. It seems that learners had not developed, or were not in possession of, the capacity to identify metaphorical meanings. This is probably because, as Picken (2005) comments, metaphor, especially its identification, is obscure and less clear than the identification of literal meanings. Although Knowles and Moon (2006) argue that most people, at least in their L1, have an intuition to distinguish metaphorical from literal meanings, learners in this study did not seem to have such sensitivity in early phases of the study. Another factor that may have contributed to the learners’ apparent inability to identify metaphors was their not being able to map salient features from the literal domain to the metaphorical domain. The CMT, as put forward by Lakoff and Johnson (1980a, 1999), postulates that the essence of a conceptual metaphor lies in the mapping of features from a source to a target domain. This suggests that processing, identifying and understanding metaphor requires a cross-mapping domain ability.

Although most of the intervention period involved explicit teaching of the source and target domains of metaphor, the primary focus was on developing learners’ heightened awareness of the source domain of conceptual metaphors. This allowed for the development of awareness of the concrete and literal meaning of the phrases and expressions that were used metaphorically in the texts learners were working with. Boers (2000, p. 563) states that concreteness stimulates mental imagery. This in turn enables learners to grasp the concrete and most salient meaning of an expression, and map it onto its metaphorical domain. This teaching procedure based on explicit instruction on source and, to a lesser extent, target domains has opened up insightful opportunities to teach idioms (e.g. Li, 2009), phrasal verbs (e.g. Boers, 2000), proverbs (e.g. Condon, 2008), and reading comprehension (e.g. Picken, 2005).

One significant effect of explicit attention to concreteness is in relation to an increased capacity to spot metaphorical meanings. Previous research findings, in particular those mentioned above, have indicated that raising learners’ awareness of the literal domain of metaphors impacts on the learners’ capacity and sensitivity to identify metaphors in language. Boers (2000) has pointed out that having the capacity to recognise metaphors in language is indicative of an enhanced awareness of metaphor.
Kövecses and Szabó (1996) state that ‘if learners recognise conceptual metaphors, then we may assume they will be in a better position to work out the meaning of newly encountered L2 metaphors’ (p. 351).

The following sections discuss the different data sets relating to each of two areas of the research question.

**The MIP as a tool for metaphor awareness raising**

Before discussing what was learnt about the different data sets relating to awareness of metaphor, it is important to take a close look at the ways in which the tool utilised to raise learners’ awareness of metaphor contributed to its growth. This was observed in the learners’ responses to journal entries.

Although the concept of metaphor was not entirely new to learners in early instances of the teaching period, the concept of MIP was. Having been exposed to the MIP systematically over a period of time, learners’ language did not only evidence use of the term ‘MIP’ in conversation with others, but also learners showed consistent recognition of the value of the procedure to their becoming aware of metaphor.

The majority of learners’ first journal entry showed varied positions towards the MIP. Some found it difficult to follow while others seemed to be a little confused about how a set of steps could help them arrive at an understanding of metaphorical meanings. These ideas and perceptions began to change as learners were more exposed to the procedure. Learners began to have clearer and quite positive opinions about what the MIP was and what it was for. They recognised that it was a ‘technique’ that was changing their ‘views and feelings’ about metaphor. Learners seemed to recognise that the MIP was having an impact on their cognition and on, what Al-Hejin (2000) calls, a change in cognitive behaviour. A change in cognitive behaviour, according to Al-Hejin (2004), implies both a changed view of the world and a change in the way people go about doing things.

Both elements of what is meant by change in cognitive behaviour can be observed in how the MIP impacted learners’ cognition. Firstly, learners’ views had changed. This change became clearly manifest in how what the learners were saying about the MIP developed quite positively over time. Having had exposure to and familiarity with the MIP, learners felt that the procedure was not only a useful tool to use when identifying metaphors in text but also something that enabled them to have a deeper understanding of metaphorically-used words and expressions. Secondly, the way learners were going about identifying and coming to an understanding of metaphor was also changing. Aside from being explicitly taught each of
the steps of the MIP, learners were also allowed opportunities to put these steps to practice. These instances provided learners with an opportunity to do things differently. Perhaps, before learners were familiar with the MIP, the way in which they went about identifying metaphor, if they ever explicitly engaged in these practices, was driven by their own intuition. Now, learners had a procedure to follow. Having a hands-on opportunity to follow the MIP and apply it to different texts had a considerable impact on how learners came to view the applicability and usefulness of the MIP.

Learners felt that every step of the MIP was contributing to something. Some learners commented on the process of searching for metaphorical expressions in the text, others commented on the use of the dictionary. Perhaps, learners’ changed views about the MIP were primarily because they were doing things in a different way. Learners were not just looking up words in a dictionary, practice which they were very likely to be familiar with; they were also examining concrete meanings, abstract meanings, comparing dictionary meaning with that which was being used in the text and discussing meanings with other learners. This new way of approaching metaphorical meanings as presented in texts through the use of the MIP was quite central to a change in learners’ cognition.

Another significant point worth making in relation to learners’ changed views of the MIP is that their confidence in using it became greater over time. Learners’ voices as observed throughout the journals, especially by the end of the teaching period, were quite clear in stating how their confidence in using the MIP had built up. This is important since greater confidence did not only facilitate their use of the MIP in the identification of metaphor but also enabled them to project themselves into using the procedure in their own language. It was probably that growth in confidence in the procedure and its suitability to identify and understand metaphor that influenced their views on how the MIP could also be used in every language.

One important implication of the value learners ascribed to the MIP is that it could be used to make an understanding of conceptual metaphor accessible to L2 learners/readers. Learners acknowledged the value of the MIP to better understand the relationships between source and target domains in conceptual metaphors. This, in their view, enabled them to capture the metaphoricity of the words and expressions they came across throughout the teaching period.

Although the MIP is a tool widely used by metaphor theoreticians to identify metaphor in discourse, one can observe that its adaptation and implementation as a teaching tool can assist learners in better understanding the relationships between the source and target domains of conceptual metaphor, thus
enabling them to not only spot metaphor in text but also to have a more developed capacity to understand how the mapping between domains contribute to overall text meaning.

The following sections are intended to discuss what was learnt about the different data sets relating to awareness of metaphor and the ways in which it became manifest in the learners’ language and in their journal responses.

**Awareness as evidenced in the language: turns and metalanguage**

Learners’ growth in number of turns and turn length suggests several things. Firstly, it points to the fact that learners’ contribution to group activities became increasingly more active throughout the teaching period. Learners’ active involvement in conversation in late stages of the teaching period was evidenced by a higher overall number of turns in conversation. Such growth in learners’ participation and contribution to discussions may be an indication of several interrelated factors; some pertaining to an increased familiarity with the steps of the MIP, while others probably related to social and contextual factors within which the teaching and therefore the interactions were taking place. For instance, it is possible that learners’ growth in amount of talk may have been influenced by their developed familiarity with each other. Most of the learners who attended the four-week teaching period had not met each other before in other classes at University. Their not knowing each other in early stages of the teaching intervention could have been a possible factor that accounted for the low and short number of turns in conversation. As well, familiarity with the classroom practices could have been another possible factor influencing learners’ amount of talk. Throughout the implementation of the MIP, most of the teaching sessions followed a relatively similar format that consisted primarily of teaching at the beginning of the lesson followed by group work. When it came to working in groups, students knew that groups would remain the same until the end of the teaching period, and therefore group members would not change.

Another possible factor that may have contributed to the learners’ amount of talk over time is teacher talk about metaphor. Extensive research into the role of teacher talk in language learning has been undertaken (e.g. Chaudron, 1988; Nunan, 2006; Sinclair & Brazil, 1985; Tsui, 1995) for several decades. Its centrality is reflected in what Yanfen and Yuqin (2010) comment on its role in language learning and teaching. They state that teacher talk is an indispensable part of foreign language teaching in organizing activities and enhancing students’ learning. As Sinclair and Brazil (1985) point out, teacher talk serves as
not only a source of input to learners but also a medium through which learners’ knowledge of language is expanded.

In the present study, teacher talk had a central role in the implementation of the MIP throughout the teaching sessions. When it came to give instructions, explanations and examples of what underpinned a conceptual metaphor and what the different steps of the MIP consisted of, teacher talk was essential. Being the teacher the primary source of information on what the MIP was about, his talk about metaphor in the teaching sessions provided a foundational basis on which learners’ awareness of metaphor would develop and build up over time. When learners worked together in groups applying the MIP steps that had been taught by the teacher, teacher talk was kept to a minimum. His contribution to group discussions was limited to answering questions, usually yes or no, about general aspects of the group activities to be completed in class.

Overall, given the centrality of teacher talk throughout the development of the teaching sessions and implementation of the MIP, it should be noted that such teacher-talk contribution to the study could have been a contributing factor to the increase in learners’ amount of talk. However, analysis of teacher talk was not a unit of analysis in this study. Its relevance, centrality and usefulness to the learners’ overall learning process could be investigated in the future.

Considering that the researcher’s interest was in what the learners said and how their talk elaborated over time, one key element that probably contributed to growth in talk was the learners’ increasing confidence and familiarity with the MIP, procedure with which they actively worked throughout the teaching period. Learners may have felt more confident with the MIP and its steps. Being more familiar and confident with the MIP probably empowered the students with the tools and the language to talk more in conversations. Such familiarity and confidence with the procedure (MIP) was what enabled them to develop a capacity to have a more active involvement which became manifest in more numerous turns in the discussions about metaphor.

One observation that needs to be made relates to the fact that not all additional talk necessarily indicates increasing awareness of metaphor. It is possible that the learners over time would have spoken more in class, therefore showing more numerous turns in conversation, without necessarily showing evidence of talk about metaphor. However, learners did speak more, and they specifically used more of the metalanguage of metaphor.
Aside from being more numerous, learners’ turns also became longer, suggesting that their participation in discussions about metaphor did not only become more active, as evidenced by the increase in number of turns, but also more complex. Learners seemed to have more ideas, arguments and opinions about metaphor which contributed to their turns being increasingly longer over time. This seems to reaffirm the idea that learners’ active involvement and overall increase in amount and length of talk about metaphor was likely to be the result of familiarity and confidence with the MIP. Given that the type and nature of talk in discussions was mostly talk about metaphor, learners’ longer turns are likely to have been influenced by the implementation of the metaphor-awareness raising procedure over the teaching period.

Secondly, learners’ capacity to talk more about metaphor indicates a development of their consciousness. Al-Hejin (2004) points out that an increased capacity to talk about language typically signals a change in learners’ cognitive activity. In Al-Hejin’s (2004) view, a change in cognitive activity involves, amongst other things, a change in the person’s understanding, knowledge and perception of what is being learnt. Having the capacity to talk more about metaphor and contribute more to conversations would then be, according to Al-Hejin’s (2004) view, indicative of a change in learners’ overall knowledge, understanding, perceptions, views and ideas about metaphor. Learners’ increase in amount of talk about metaphor, as evidenced by the growth in number and length of turns, can be understood in terms of their development of how their views, understanding and perception of metaphor changed as they had more exposure to the MIP. Such change in cognitive activity is also indicative of how learners had become more aware of metaphor. Both Lindberg (2003) and Al-Hejin (2004) point out that a change in cognition is often associated with a change in someone’s conscious capacity to perform tasks. In this case, learners seemed to have addressed the collaborative tasks differently, hence the growth in amount and length of talk about metaphor. It would appear that, having experienced a change in their cognitive activity and in the conscious capacity to do things, learners have become more aware of what they were doing.

Learners’ increase in amount of talk and growth in length of turns, then, demonstrates a change in their conscious capacity to talk about metaphor. They were talking more because they were more aware of metaphor. Such growth in awareness was driving them to have more active participation and provide more elaboration on what they were saying. The change in learners’ awareness is likely to have been driven by their familiarity with the MIP to which they had been exposed. Learners were probably more aware of what was involved in a metaphor, how a metaphor related to other domains of life, and most importantly how
metaphor is used to shape and convey text meaning, hence their involvement and participation in discussions became more complex.

Learners’ change in their conscious capacity to talk about metaphor was also evidenced in how they broadened their use of the metalanguage of metaphor – another linguistic feature analysed in learners’ language. Analysis of learners’ metalanguage of metaphor revealed a significant amount of metaphor talk throughout the three audio-recorded stages of the teaching period.

The higher number of occurrences of the metaphor-related lexemes tracked in the learners’ language over time is indicative of several important elements. Firstly, it indicates a potential development of learners’ awareness of metaphor. Considering that learners used the metalanguage of metaphor in collaboration with others, Borg (2004), within the context of language awareness methodology, discusses the importance of encouraging learners to not only think about but also, and most importantly, to talk about language with other peers. Using language to talk about language with others is, in his view, an important feature of an individual’s awareness. When learners were found to use the metalanguage of metaphor with other peers, they were clearly not only thinking about metaphor but also talking about it with others. This points to the fact that learners were, in the first place, focused on what they were doing and, secondly, aware of what they were talking about and the language they were using. In Borg’s (1994) view, this capacity to think and talk about language, which in this case was metaphorical language, is a clear indication and feature of development of learners’ awareness of metaphor.

Secondly, aside from indicating a development of awareness of metaphor, learners’ use of the metalanguage of metaphor points to a capacity to control and manipulate language. Preston (1994) points out that having a conscious capacity to perceive features in a language signals language control and manipulation. Such language control and manipulation is typically realised in the ways learners are able to use language more flexibly, in different contexts and for different purposes. Learners seemed to have gained some control over their metaphor-related language. They used it and their use increased over time. This was clearly reflected in how the learners in later stages of the teaching period showed dominion of such terms as source, target and domain, terms that were unfamiliar to them in earlier instances. Their increasing use of the metalanguage of metaphor is not just an indication of their capacity to perceive certain features in the language, which was evidenced through their use of particular lexemes, but also an indication of their capacity to exert some control on their own language. Such control is evident in that
learners were more capable of talking about metaphor in later stages of the teaching period than in earlier ones. They used more metaphor-related terms, and more frequently in later stages of the teaching sessions. This demonstrates that learners became more capable of having control over metaphor-related language, suggesting a development in their capacity to skilfully deal with it.

Finally, learners’ growth in the metalanguage of metaphor is also indicative of a growing capacity to better understand metaphor. Stainton (1992) points out that, apart from demonstrating evidence of language awareness, metalinguistic knowledge and use gives an indication of the ways in which learners have developed a better understanding of certain linguistic features, its uses and functions. Learners’ capacity to talk about metaphor is, then, a reflection of their depth of understanding of metaphor. Perhaps, learners had better understood the differences between literal and metaphorical and could better identify the boundaries between them. It is also possible that learners had a better understanding of the relationship between the abstract and the concrete domains that lie beneath a metaphor. Whether it is the capacity to distinguish literal between metaphorical, the relationship between abstract and concrete domains, or something else that learners came to better understand, what is worth highlighting is that learners’ growth in use of the metalanguage of metaphor is indicative of their capacity to better understand metaphor.

In conclusion, what has been discussed in the present section has demonstrated the ways in which the evidence found in the learners’ language use – turns and the metalanguage of metaphor, indicated a development of learners’ conscious capacity to talk more about metaphor and use more metalanguage of metaphor in group discussions. It could be suggested that learners’ developed capacity to talk more about metaphor led to overall increased vocabulary in English. This is in Knowles and Moon’s (2006) view “the hallway to understanding metaphor” (p. 39). Although they agree that a capacity to match features of source and target domains in a metaphor is central to getting to its meaning, they point out that the main entrance to ‘discourse meaning’ is what they call ‘access to word meaning’. Having shown an increased capacity to talk more about metaphor, which could indicate ‘access to word meaning’, one could conclude that it could have an impact on getting to ‘discourse meaning’; that is, on their comprehension of text with embedded metaphor.

**Awareness as evidenced in the learners’ voices: responses to journal entries**
What was found in the learners’ use of language is complemented and supported by what was found in the learners’ own voices as observed in the responses to journal entries (JE-T1, JE-T2 & JE-T3). Over the teaching period, as shown in the analysis of journal responses, learners developed a capacity to (i) spot metaphor, (ii) find uses and function to it, and (iii) and come to a better understanding of metaphor which, in their view, contributed to a better overall understanding of text.

In early instances of the four-week teaching period (JE-T1, see appendix 16), quite a number of students held the belief that metaphor was difficult to understand and difficult to identify. Learners’ lack of capacity to identify metaphors seemed to be, to a certain degree, related to their shortage of vocabulary. There is a strong possibility that all the students in the present study, who were all successful readers in their L1, already had some familiarity, understanding and capacity to identify metaphors in the first language. If this were the case, it would be reasonable to think that some of the cognitive, analogical and associative strategies that they use in the L1 to identify metaphors could be used in the process of identification in L2. However, learners recognised having trouble identifying metaphorical words.

As learners had more exposure to explicit teaching of the MIP, it became evident in learners’ responses that it was not actually shortage or unfamiliarity of vocabulary what was causing difficulty; it was the learners’ ‘lack of access’ to the metaphorical meaning of words. That is, learners did know the lexical items, but did not have the capacity to identify the metaphorical nature of the words within the context of the text. This, then, suggests that learners’ greatest difficulty, as far as identification is concerned, was not associated with spotting the actual word, but spotting what it was referring to.

This issue points to the salience and prototypicality of words. The prototype theory along with embodied mind thesis postulate that every category of concepts has a prototypical member which is more salient and familiar to most people. When applied to word meanings, one finds that every polysemous word has one meaning that is more salient and prototypical than others. Salient and prototypical meanings, which tend to be largely literal and more concrete than less prototypical ones, are based on people’s bodily and sensorimotor experiences with the world. From this one can observe that learners, at least in early instances of the teaching period, were particularly more familiar with the concrete, salient, prototypical, and more literal meanings of words.

It was perhaps this overt familiarity with the concrete and literal domain of words what drove most learners’ responses at the beginning of the teaching period. This in turn led them to confusion and, at
times, disappointment and frustration when searching for the metaphorical meaning of a word. Similarly, not having the capacity to distinguish between the literal and metaphorical was probable what led learners to considering metaphor as difficult.

Having been exposed to explicit teaching of the MIP, learners, in later instances (JE-T2 & T3, see appendices 17 & 18), shifted to a different perception of metaphor and its identification in language and texts. Learners came to recognise that the MIP had helped them distinguish between the literal and metaphorical more easily, but also that it had helped them spot metaphors more easily in language and in texts. This became more clearly expressed when some learners reported that they ‘could see’ metaphor more easily. Some of the learners’ own use of the metaphorical sense of ‘see’ gives an indication of how these learners have come to understand the relationship and mapping between the concrete and abstract domain of metaphors. A great deal of research (Ungerer & Schmidt, 1996) into the conceptual metaphor ‘understanding is seeing’ has shown the interplay between the ways in which individuals physically and bodily experience the world and the ways in which we think and talk about the world. By using the verb ‘see’, learners were probably not only expressing the idea that they could ‘literally’ see and identify more metaphors in text, but also that their understanding was greater.

Learners’ overall developed capacity to identify metaphor led them to finding and acknowledging different functions and uses of metaphor. Learners’ views of metaphor seemed to have shifted from finding them challenging and difficult to useful and important to learning and understanding. Learners, first of all, acknowledged that the MIP was changing ‘their views’ and ‘feelings’ about metaphor. They reported that they were feeling less confused and were finding metaphor less difficult than ‘in the past’. This change in learners’ views became evident in how they were finding particular uses and functions to metaphor.

First of all, learners came to see metaphor as useful to their understanding of what some of them called ‘difficult meanings’. Perhaps, what students referred to as ‘difficult meanings’ was precisely associated with the metaphorical sense of words or expressions. As discussed earlier, learners’ major difficulty was probably not having the capacity to understand the ways in which those words, which they had understood literally, matched the metaphorical context in which they were being used. To exemplify this, some learners put forward the idea that they “couldn’t think about the metaphor in battle and mountain before”. This suggests, to a certain extent, that learners were most likely to be familiar with the literal meanings of these words, but not with how they were metaphorically used. However, being exposed to the
MIP and, therefore, more aware of metaphor, learners were able to see beyond the literal and capture the metaphoricity of those words. This capacity to see beyond the literal was probably what shifted learners’ views from regarding metaphor as complex and difficult to understand to being useful to understanding ‘difficult meanings’.

Secondly, journal entries showed that learners felt their vocabulary had benefited from their growth in awareness of metaphor. Learners commented that their thinking and “feelings” about metaphor had changed. This, which indicated a change in learners’ awareness of metaphor, impacted, according to learners’ voices, their vocabulary. This idea is, to a large extent, supported by extensive research into the role of awareness of metaphor in vocabulary learning. As discussed in 2.8.2, some metaphor scholars (e.g. Boers, 2000a; 2003; Charteris-Black, 2000; Gao & Meng, 2010) have investigated the facilitative role of enhancing language learners’ awareness of metaphor and turning this into a channel for vocabulary acquisition. This facilitative role of awareness is clearly evident in what some of the learners reported in the journals. For example, some pointed out that their vocabulary was greater than, what they called, “before”, referring to the period before the introduction and implementation of the MIP. Others pointed more clearly and explicitly to their growth in vocabulary as a result of their being more aware of metaphor. This shows not only the value attached to the MIP but also, and most importantly, how learners thought of their growth in awareness as having an impact on their vocabulary learning. This is of great importance since it points to the multiple roles and benefits that can be gleaned from raising learners’ awareness of metaphor, some of which, according to the learners’ voices, relate to a better understanding of texts.

This leads us to a discussion about what was found in the data about understanding of text in order to tap into the interplay between awareness and text understanding.

**What was learnt about learners’ understanding of text**

From the findings of the reading test, it was learnt that an overall increase in the learners’ test scores was found. Learners’ understanding of text showed differences in how learners approached and understood the text before and after the teaching intervention period. This provides an indication of various elements.

Firstly, since the reading test was mostly comprised of metaphorical and inferential questions, the increase in the test scores indicate that learners moved from literal to metaphorical and inferential levels of
comprehension, thus reaching deeper levels of understanding. Alderson points out that within the reading research different levels of understanding can be identified. Some scholars, Alderson (2000) says, may differentiate between literal understandings of text and understanding of inferred meanings. Others, such as Gray (2000), make a distinction between reading the lines, reading between the lines, and reading beyond the lines, where each of these makes reference to different levels of understanding. The first one alludes to understanding of literal meanings; the second refers to understanding of inferred meanings, and the last one makes reference to critical evaluations of the text. In this study, students’ growth in text understanding clearly reflects a move through these three levels. Students in the post-test, for example, demonstrated considerable improvement in the understanding of metaphor-related vocabulary in the first test section, and in the understanding of inferential questions. In regard to the improvement in the vocabulary section, this growth reflected the students’ ability to move from the understanding of literal meanings to understanding metaphorical meanings which, in one way or another, required them to engage in an inference-making process. This is in line with a pragmatics view of metaphor understanding which argues for the use of contextual meaning and inferences in order to come up with appropriate interpretations of metaphor (Knowles & Moon, 2006). Similarly, students’ increase in understanding of inferential questions is also a reflection of the shift towards the understanding of inferred meanings, which in turn represents deeper levels of understanding. Inferred meanings, in Alderson’s (2000) view, appear to be deeper than understanding of literal meanings. Alderson goes on to state that readers very often learn to read texts literally first, then move onto understanding inferred meanings of the text, and finally learn to approach the text critically. Students in this study would appear to have gone through these stages, thus showing a shift towards deeper levels of meanings and text understanding.

Secondly, of interest is also to relate what was learnt from the increase in test scores to what was learnt about the reader response task. Students when faced with this task had an opportunity to express freely their understandings and interpretations of the text. This task, according to Chase and Hynd (1987), provides the students with an instance to re-think about the text more interactively. Such interaction enables the students to engage in a meaning-construction process. Chase and Hynd (1987) state that, from a reader response task, meaning is not obtained from the text; rather, it is constructed in the interaction between the text and the reader’s experience and prior-knowledge.
From the analysis of students’ responses it was learnt that learners moved from summarising levels to evaluative and questioning levels of understanding. This is particularly revealing in various respects. First, students’ move towards evaluative and questioning levels is an indication of the depth of understanding of text. This aligns with Gray’s (1960) distinction between levels of understanding where the deepest appears to be that where readers are able to read beyond the lines; in other words, that where readers critically evaluate the text. Similarly, as mentioned earlier, Alderson (2000) puts forward the idea of hierarchy of levels of text understanding where critical evaluation of texts is by far more complex than literal understanding and understanding of inferred meanings. Second, it is also revealing in that it demonstrates that students seemed to have approached the text in slightly different ways. A clear indication of the differences in how the text was approached by students is given by the variation of response statements. Students’ responses varied in that they fell within different categories—predominantly within the categories of summary, elaboration, evaluation and questioning. Students seemed to have different reactions to the text as some responses were more inclined to elaborating on ideas, others to questioning the text while others to critical evaluations of it.

This situation, however, raises different questions: if readers approached the text differently, and therefore different responses were obtained, does that imply that readers have arrived at different interpretations of the text? If that is the case, would it be accurate to argue for ‘correct’ or ‘incorrect’ understandings of text? In other words, is there such a thing as ‘perfect comprehension’? Alderson (2000) states that “it is clear that what readers understand from text varies” (p. 5). This suggests that the reading process leads different readers to different understandings of the text. This assumption is particularly true if reading is viewed as meaning making. From a constructivist lens, reading is neither a serial nor solitary process but social whereby meaning, knowledge and learning are actively constructed (Flint, 2010). Reading as an activity of meaning construction challenges the meaning-extracting notion supported by some (e.g. Perfetti, 1985; Fry, 1963; Stitch, 1984, cited in Urquhart & Weir, 1998) which states that meaning is fixed in the text. Learners’ approach to the text as indicated by the reader response task, therefore, suggests that the students, rather than extracting meaning from the text, engaged in a meaning-making process through which meaning was brought into the text. This meaning constructing activity led the students to approach the text in different ways resulting in diverse responses which fell within different categories, all of which reflected a move to deeper levels of comprehension. From this viewpoint, the idea of ‘perfect comprehension’ or ‘correct understanding’ does not find support within the approach to reading.
from a meaning-making process as texts are not packages of meanings. Learners’ responses have therefore demonstrated that students were actively engaged in a search for meaning, thus producing what in Roebuck’s (1998) terms is labelled as a new text. In one way or another, the production of these new texts became manifest in how learners constructed the text meaning from different angles: some from a questioning stance, others from an elaboration point of view while other learners approached it from an evaluation perspective.

It could be concluded that the learners’ increased capacity to get more text meaning was probably impacted by the teaching and learning process used over time. In Boers’ (2000) view, understanding the inferences and judgments underpinning figurative expressions, especially metaphor, helps learners recognise the author’s point of view and facilitate certain aspects of in-depth reading comprehension (p. 140).

**Text understanding, awareness of metaphor and the MIP**

Although several elements could be recognised to have influenced learners’ increased understanding of text, based on the findings discussed in the previous chapters (Chapters 5 & 6) two key contributing factors are worth noting. The first is the impact of the specific input in the form of the MIP on not only the learners’ changed views of metaphor but also on their developed capacity to exhibit more talk about metaphor. This indicated higher levels of awareness of metaphor. The second was the actual process through which learners actively collaborated with each other on the application of the MIP to different tasks. This was reflected in that learners valued, liked and seemed to have benefited from working and talking in groups.

In regard to the teaching/learning tool (the MIP), learners recognised the value, and most importantly, its impact on their enhanced awareness of metaphor and increased capacity to understand the text used in the test. Learners’ earlier instances of their journal writing (JE-T1, see appendix 16) showed clearly their difficulties in understanding not only metaphor but also the reading text. Most learners considered the text difficult and challenging where some ascribed such difficulty to the presence of metaphor. As stated earlier, it is possible that learners’ difficulty in dealing with the text was not due to the actual presence of metaphors, but due to a literal reading and interpretation of them. Not being able to read a metaphor as metaphor probably led students to viewing the text as difficult and challenging. Picken (2005) states that a literal reading of a metaphor can result in a different understanding of text. It seems
likely that learners, before the metaphor-awareness raising procedure were introduced, interpreted metaphorically-used words and expressions literally, thus arriving at different, perhaps confusing, readings of the text.

Learners' second journal entry (JE-T2, see appendix 17) showed a shift in their views and attitudes towards the text. By the time they wrote the second entry they had already worked on the application of some of the steps of the MIP to an extract of a text that contained several metaphors. At the time of writing this entry most learners had a feeling that their awareness of metaphor was helping them get more text meaning. Other learners, however, felt unsure about whether or not their understanding of text was greater but were expectant of what would happen in the following weeks. Perhaps, they had not yet clearly understood some of the concepts introduced in the teaching sessions or were not confident enough using the steps of the MIP.

In the third journal entry (JE-T3, see appendix 18), learners showed more confidence in relation to how their awareness of metaphor as a consequence of the MIP had helped them better understand texts and how it could help them understand other texts in the future. At this stage, where learners had already gone through the implementation of the MIP, the entries reported a shift in learners' views and attitudes towards readings texts containing metaphor. Learners no longer regarded texts containing metaphor as difficult to understand or challenging. On the contrary, they acknowledged the value of metaphor, the MIP and of their being more aware as important contributors to their understanding of text. Learners seemed not only confident about the fact that they could better understand the texts they had worked with, but also confident that the MIP and their greater awareness could assist them with other “bigger” texts, as described by some of the learners. This is particularly interesting since learners were not only projecting themselves as readers dealing with other texts containing metaphor in the future, but also because they were demonstrating, in one way or another, a capacity to deal with texts more independently.

This is in line with what Picken (2005) commented on the value and benefits of implementing a metaphor-awareness raising methodology. He stressed that the implementation of an awareness-raising methodology is likely to have both short and long-term implications for language learning and teaching. In regard to the short-term implication, he points out that an enhanced awareness of metaphor is likely to stimulate and facilitate readings of metaphors in texts at a given point in time. In the long term, a growth in awareness of metaphor could help learners develop their interpretative skills, thus enabling them to
become more autonomous in the reading, interpretation and understanding of metaphors in other texts in the future. Learners in the present study felt they had been equipped with a tool that assisted them in not only developing the necessary skills to make sense of the texts with metaphors they were faced with during the teaching sessions, but it also helped them find possible applications for other texts that they will encounter in the future.

Aside from the possible impact of the MIP on learners’ increased understanding of text, the actual process through which learners collaborated in group discussions on the application of the MIP seemed to have played a central role. This became manifest in what the learners said while talking to other learners. It was found, through the analysis of exemplars of collaborative discussions, that learners, first of all, acknowledged quite explicitly the value of having the opportunity to discuss and collaborate with other readers. This could have been the idea and belief that led learners to contributing more actively to discussions and, therefore, talking more about metaphor over the teaching period. Aside from recognising the value of collaboration, learners saw these instances as potential opportunities for learning. Wells (1986) points out that every instance of collaboration and dialogue gives the learner a potential opportunity for learning. At some point during a conversation, a student (from China), for example, said: “yes, because we have to memorise many things, and read many books and repeat, but I think this group discussion is very good because sometimes you can learn more”. Aside from recognising some of the traditional pedagogical practices in China such as memorisation and repetition, the student acknowledges the value of group discussions as opportunities for learning ‘more’. This is of great importance as Chinese students’ views and conceptualisations of language learning tend to be, to a large extent, heavily rooted in the Confucius heritage philosophical tradition, which views learning as primarily monologic, as opposed to dialogic (Yu, 2013, p. 2325). Learners’ views on the significance of dialogues as important contributors to enhance their learning seemed to be shifting away from such traditional forms of learning as rote learning. Another student with a similar opinion said: “I am satisfied with all these group discussions because I can have different opinions from you and that also help my ideas and my… how I understand things better”. In line with the previous quote, this student was also inclined to participating in group discussions since these would enable them to not only share different ideas but also help them get a better understanding of metaphor and/or text.
In discussing the ways in which these group discussions contributed to learners' understanding of text, it is worth referring to what Roebuck (1998) calls the use of internal and external resources in the process of understanding a text. Unlike Pugh (1978) who believes that understanding is a matter of accomplishing a product, Roebuck (1998) points out that understanding a text goes beyond accomplishing a product or applying skills to texts. Understanding a text entails an interactive use and exchange of, what she calls, internal and external resources. Internal resources are referred to as learners’ individual factors contributing to the processing and understanding of text. These elements include memory, retention, cognitive skills and attention amongst others (Pritchard & Woollard, 2010). External resources are defined as all those social and cultural elements utilised by the reader when approaching the text. In Roebuck’s view, some of these external resources include, what others (Roebuck, 1998) have called ‘material tools’ such as the use of a dictionary, other peers, teachers or any other resources which help the reader solve problems, clarify ideas and, in the end, come to a better understanding of text (e.g. Lantolf, 2007b; Wells & Mejia, 2006; Wertsch, 1980).

Although in the samples analysed it is not explicitly stated by the students whether or not they thought they could understand texts better, they did recognise the importance of using certain tools that allowed them to understand metaphorical meanings to a greater extent. Learners, for instance, commented on the benefits of using a dictionary as well as the knowledge and assistance provided by other peers in the discussion. Material tools, the use of a dictionary in this case, are, as well as psychological tools, powerful artifacts that allow learners to not only mediate their learning but also, as Wertsch (Roebuck, 1998) stated, to “assist in the formation of human intellectual capacity” (p. 97). In the samples analysed, learners showed an inclination towards using a dictionary as, in their opinion, it could help them think about the dictionary meaning in relation to the metaphorical meaning in the text.

One of the reasons as to why the use of a dictionary seemed a salient element to learners is because part of the explicit teaching of the MIP consisted of using a dictionary. Its use allowed learners to compare the basic and concrete meaning given by a dictionary with the metaphorical meaning used in the text. This was not just a matching activity where learners had to match the dictionary meaning with the meaning within the context of the text. Rather, it was an opportunity for them to think reflectively about the nature of literal and metaphorical meanings and see how a dictionary meaning helps them understand the meaning realised in the text. Although the use of a dictionary is likely to help learners understand both the
literal and metaphorical meanings of individual words, and not the overall meaning of a text, it could contribute to the learners’ overall capacity to construct text meaning on the basis of, for instance, tracking and linking key metaphorical items in the text.

Although learners’ discussions did not clearly evidence explicit recognition of deeper understanding of text but just pointed to the overall value of collaborative discussions and resources, learners’ voices as evidenced by the journal entries acknowledged having a better understanding of text as a result of the teaching period. What is more, it became evident in the learners’ voices that the MIP as well as a growth in awareness of metaphor had contributed to their deeper understanding of text.

To conclude, what was learnt about learners’ awareness of metaphor and understanding of text has provided an indication of the ways in which an enhanced awareness of metaphor, as a result of the implementation of the MIP, has impacted learners’ language use, their cognitive behaviour as well as their capacity to deal with and approach texts. Learners’ growth in awareness of metaphor was evidenced by the increasing amount of talk about metaphor and the learners’ growing capacity to use the metalanguage of metaphor. This linguistic evidence of learners’ enhanced awareness was complemented and further supported by what was found in their responses to journal entries. Learners’ own voices demonstrated not only that their awareness had progressively grown over the three journaling instances but also that the MIP had been an important tool in becoming more aware of metaphor, which had in turn helped them better understand texts. Learners’ deeper understanding of text was evidenced in the statistically significant difference between the test scores in the pre and post reading test. Learners’ understanding of text and the varied ways in which they approach texts was evidenced in the responses to the reader response task and in how learners valued the dialogic instances as well as other resources as opportunities for collaborative reading and learning. Although several factors other than an increased awareness of metaphor may have contributed to learners’ increased understanding of text, the findings discussed in this section demonstrate the ways in which the learners’ use of the teaching/learning tool (the MIP) assisted them in unpacking the metaphorical meanings embedded in the text used in the reading test.
Chapter 8 : Conclusion and Implications

Introduction

In this concluding chapter I intend to provide a thumbnail summary of the research along with a discussion of what was learnt from the findings derived from text understanding and awareness of metaphor.

A synthesis of the research study

Developing literacy skills, reading in particular, has always been one of the increasing preoccupations of educators. Carrell (1980) points out that one of the four skills which has attracted the most attention amongst teachers and researchers is reading, especially in second and foreign language contexts. Within these contexts the development of effective reading skills become quite central as the number of ESOL learners who get a place at English-medium universities continue to grow dramatically. In these university-based contexts where English is the language through which instruction is imparted reading, according to Carrell (1988), becomes primary, especially in those situations where english is taught for academic purposes. At this level learners, who are faced with a number of academic materials and resources written in English, are expected to have acquired the necessary skills which will enable them to succeed in their studies. However, we very often encounter numerous cases of students, whose English is a second or additional language, that must constantly seek academic support in order to meet the demands of academic reading and writing. From anectodal experience, I must confess that I have had and known of a number of international students who are not fully equipped with the necessary literacy skills to cope with the readings of numerous academic materials written in English. This situation lays a great deal of responsibility on both researchers, who must constantly develop theoretical and methodological tools to assist teachers, and language practioners who are responsible for the implementation of those tools in the classroom in an attempt to assist learners in the search for deeper text meaning.

The increasing need for developing effective tools so as to help ESOL learners enhance their understanding of texts is what primarily underpins this study. The present study, which focused on raising learners' awareness of metaphor to deepen text understanding, developing and implementing a tool which would assist learners in deepening their understanding of texts, thus providing them with a means to make sense of challenging and academic texts.
In this study it was decided to enhance learners’ text understanding by means of raising their awareness of conceptual metaphors as embedded in written texts. Various reasons drove the researcher’s choice of metaphor and metaphor awareness as a central focus and means to deepen learners’ text understanding. One important reason lies in the pervasive nature of metaphor in language and thought. This relatively new notion of metaphor, which basically arouse from the work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), has inspired a number of researchers to scrutinise its benefits for language teaching and learning. Nonetheless, the majority of the studies aimed at investigating the role of metaphor and metaphor awareness in second language teaching and learning have predominantly focused upon lexis. This primary focus on lexis raises one central question: if metaphor is ubiquitous in language and thought, why have the role of metaphor and metaphor awareness in lexical learning received far more attention than other areas such as their role in text understanding? Whichever the reason, if any, is behind the paucity of research in the area of metaphor awareness and text understanding, it becomes clear that scrutinising the effects of metaphor awareness at a textual level is a pressing need, primarily because it is required that effective tools be explored and developed so as to assist language learners in their dealings with complex academic texts.

In an attempt to explore and develop tools to help learners deepen their understanding of text, this study sought to answer the following question:

*Can ESOL learners’ text understanding be enhanced through metaphor awareness raising?*

The question was theoretically and methodologically addressed from the perspective of two disciplinary areas which informed the study: applied linguistics and education. As well, the rationale for focusing on metaphor and utilising awareness of metaphor as a means of deepening learners’ text understanding lay in a theory derived from CL, that of CMT. Each field provided a theoretical and methodological base for the examination of the research question, in particular for the design of the methods along with the collection and analysis of data. A mixed methods approach was utilised to collect the data. This reliance on empiricist and interpretive methods allowed for comprehensive findings. In this study awareness of metaphor, which was raised by the use of a syllabus based on the MIP, was the channel through which learners became acquainted with the metaphorical nature of language along with the underlying relationships of conceptual metaphor – those of source and target. The implementation of this syllabus also provided the context for gathering data to answer the research question, in particular the
interdependence of the source and target domains. Findings of this investigation demonstrated that the teaching period, which relied on the MIP syllabus for metaphor awareness, played a very important role in helping learners’ deepening their understanding of text. The students’ ability to identify and understand metaphors in texts resulted from their growth of awareness of metaphor which became manifest in their longer turns in conversations, in how what the learners were saying when working on a task contained more metaphors over time, and lastly in their responses to journal entries. These three measures which evidenced the extent to which participants became more aware of metaphors provided a clear indication of how learners, through participatory and collaborative work on the application of the MIP syllabus, developed a deeper understanding of the underpinnings of conceptual metaphor.

Such development of learners’ ability to identify and understand metaphors in text, which in turn led them to deepen their understanding of texts, suggests clearly that the teaching period exerted a positive impact on learners’ learning. As the findings have revealed that the implementation of the MIP syllabus over the teaching period considerably assisted learners in their becoming more aware of the existence of metaphors in texts along with their meanings and underlying relationships, we are now left with the question of how the use of the MIP as a metaphor-awareness-raising tool can contribute to teaching and learning practices; in other words, it is important that explore what teaching, learning and methodological implications can be drawn from this study.

**Implications of this research study**

**Introduction**

This research study, which focused upon the interplay between EAL learners’ understanding of texts and awareness of metaphor, has important implications for curriculum design and implementation in EAL contexts, teaching and learning, along with implications for research methodology. The implications drawn from this study naturally emerge from the significance of the findings. Before I discuss some of the implications, I shall highlight broadly what was learnt from this study.

One of the more significant findings to emerge from this study is that participants benefited greatly from the implementation of the MIP syllabus in such a way that their growth of awareness of metaphor deepened their understanding of texts. With this overall significance of the findings in mind, some implications are worth considering.
Some implications for curriculum design and implementation

It has been pointed out on several occasions in this study that the overarching goal of the original version of the MIP, that which was created by the Pragglejaz, is to provide metaphor scholars with a tool to identify metaphors in discourse. I refer to that MIP as ‘original version’ as the one utilised in this study was slightly modified for teaching purposes. The metaphor awareness curriculum in the classroom was provided by means of this ‘modified’ version of the MIP. Its design and subsequent implementation syllabus clearly went beyond the boundaries of pure metaphor identification. The results of the study indicated that learners benefited from the teaching period in a number of ways: (i) it was reported in the learners’ journal responses that the teaching sessions, i.e. the implementation of the metaphor awareness curriculum, helped them identify metaphors in texts; (ii) in this process of metaphor identification learners appreciated the usefulness of different tools on which they relied, namely the use of their dictionaries along with the freedom to use their intuition in early stages of metaphor identification; (iii) the teaching of the MIP enabled learners to become more aware of metaphors in language; (iv) such growth of awareness became evident in that learners talk in interactions increased progressively over time resulting in longer turns in conversations; (v) of interest was to see that such growth of learners talk occurred on task, i.e. while working collaboratively on different metaphor-related tasks. This, therefore, not only demonstrated that their talk increased, but also the metaphorical nature of their talk showed growth. That is, learners demonstrated an increase in their use of metaphor-related language across time, thus revealing growth in their metalanguage of metaphor; as well, and most importantly, learners’ understanding of text showed a considerable improvement as a result of their growth of awareness of metaphor which was raised by means of the implementation and teaching of the MIP.

What the above shows is how the metaphor-awareness curriculum implemented in the classroom over the four-week teaching period sheds light on different aspects of teaching and learning practices, in particular on developing higher reading comprehension levels. This suggests that the current implementation of the traditional EAL-EAP curriculum in our classrooms would probably need to reconsider the methods and approaches employed in order to develop learners’ language skills, in particular their reading abilities. to integrate the tools utilised in this study into the teaching and learning practices which govern most of our activities within the classroom. It is clear that the current English curriculum implemented in most class rooms around the globe have not shown much enthusiasm about considering
metaphor as a tool to enhance our learners’ learning. Although the notion of metaphor has dramatically changed since the proliferation of research in CL, its full consideration and inception in the English curriculum has not yet occurred.

The application and implementation of a metaphor awareness curriculum oriented towards developing deeper levels of text understanding in our EAL-EAP classrooms provides important implications for the traditional curriculum that is mainly directed by, first of all, a strong focus on lexis and, secondly, a conceptualisation of metaphor as arbitrary. Regarding the strong focus on lexis, it needs to be pointed out that vocabulary teaching and learning in most EAL-EAP classrooms occur in such a way that no reference is made to the conceptual relationships underlying polysemous words. From my own observation and teaching experience, I have never come across a textbook which, for instance, links multiple meanings of a word to a common conceptual domain. On the contrary, words or expressions which carry more than one meaning are usually treated as arbitrary; it is just a word with different meanings. Perhaps, a language instructor might wonder, for example, whether the word ‘close’ in the following sentences share something in common: could you ‘close’ the door?; I’m ‘close’ to completion; He’s a ‘close’ friend. These share the fact that all of them refer to physical distance. The third sentence, however, which is experientially grounded, involves two different domains –that of the physical distance and affection, where affection has become to be understood in terms of physical distance. This relationship is a clear reflection of the result of our early experiences and interactions with the outside world. An explanation like this is rarely found, if ever, in traditional English language textbooks. What this clearly indicates is that metaphorically-related lexis such as phrasal verbs, idioms and a number of figurative words are traditionally treated as though they were isolated entities with no relation whatsoever to other meanings or to our bodily experiences in the world.

To make matters even more complex, traditional English curricula have failed to conceptualise metaphor as an everyday phenomenon and therefore integrate it as such into traditional curricula. The lack of attention to metaphor as an everyday occurrence in most current EAL-EAP textbooks gives a clear indication that metaphor has not fully permeated through and integrated into curriculum design and implementation.

What such a lack of consideration of metaphor in the EAL-EAP curriculum indicates is that metaphors continue to be viewed as literary and poetic devices whose occurrence is only limited to decorative and ornamental instances of language use. This situation, however, seems to contrast the
theoretical arena. As far as metaphor research is concerned, we have witnessed an outburst of research in conceptual metaphor and metaphor awareness which has demonstrated clearly the enormous benefits for teaching and learning. This increasing research preoccupation for investigating the role of metaphor and metaphor awareness in language teaching and learning is not really reflected in traditional EAL-EAP curricula or in how language practitioners conduct their pedagogical practices oriented towards, for instance, the development literacy skills. What has happened? Why has metaphor research, as a solid line of inquiry within CL, failed to materialise its significant findings into a curriculum that integrates metaphor as central to language learning and teaching? What has prevented the notion of conceptual metaphor as an everyday phenomenon, which has been investigated for over three decades now, from penetrating into our classrooms? Although the answer to these questions is not straightforward, it becomes evident that what we are in need of is a model, syllabus or curriculum that considers metaphor and metaphor awareness as central to teaching and learning.

Introducing the MIP in an EAL-EAP curriculum would positively impact the ways in which language teachers deliver their teaching practices. Its successful implementation into the classroom would assist language teachers in the presentation of vocabulary, especially polysemous items, by drawing learners’ attention to the underlying conceptual relations which link different meanings of a word to one another. As well, and most importantly, teachers would be afforded with a tool which will help them move their learners’ understanding of text away from literal meanings. Therefore, it is of utmost important that a metaphor-awareness curriculum based on the MIP be implemented in EAL-EAP classrooms in order to enhance both teachers’ pedagogical practices and learners’ literacy levels.

We will now turn to look at the language teaching implications derived from the findings of this investigation.

Teaching implications

The dynamic nature of language and language learning requires that language instructors constantly adapt their teaching practices to the changing world of language teaching. Although adapting our teaching methodologies to the emerging approaches has become almost imperative, it is also apparent that there are language instructors who are quite resistant to implementing new methodologies in their classrooms. L2 teachers, according to Tyler (2008), very often show hesitation when it comes to exploring new theoretical approaches. This reluctance on the part of teachers does not seem to be attributed only to
their strong adherence to those approaches which have influenced their practices for a long time, but also to the lack of familiarity with the practical pedagogical applications and implications of newly developed theoretical approaches. Both of these reasons might be partly the answer to the question of why the number of significant findings derived from experimental research in CL, in particular metaphor, have failed to fully inform teaching practice. In this vein, Tyler (2008) points out that:

“even the most cogent theoretical analysis is likely to be seen as having little use to L2 researchers and teachers who are unfamiliar with the theoretical framework or unable to make links between theoretical analysis and effective teaching materials” (p. 456)

Whether it is the teachers’ reluctance to implement new approaches in their teaching practices, their lack of familiarity with practical applications and implications of metaphor research, or the researchers’ inability to make theoretical findings more accessible to language practitioners, what remains clear is that we need well-articulated practical orientations as to how theoretical and experimental findings from metaphor research can be fully integrated into our pedagogical practices. Findings from the present study shed light on how EAL-EAP language instructors can enhance their teaching by implementing a metaphor-awareness-raising syllabus based on the MIP. There are at least three practical teaching implications which can be gleaned from the significant findings of the present study.

Firstly, the pervasiveness of metaphor in language and thought has become clearly evident in how different discourses such as politics, religion, education, science, amongst others, have exploited metaphor to describe particular phenomena (Semino, 2008). This demonstrates that metaphor is not only a feature of poetry or literature but a ubiquitous phenomenon which permeates discourse of all kinds. The presence of metaphor in a number of texts require that language instructors develop effective tools to assist their learners in accessing text meaning, which is very often conveyed through the use of metaphorical language. In the present study, the teaching period, which relied on the implementation of the MIP syllabus, proved effective in assisting learners in identifying metaphors in texts. This leads us to the question of how relevant a metaphor identification procedure is to EAP language instructors. Having a tool that helps us identify metaphors more easily is particularly relevant to EAP language instructors who have to deal constantly with a number of academic texts which usually contain a large number of metaphors.

A metaphor identification procedure would enable teachers to lead their students to delve into metaphorically-used words and phrases in texts in order to discover what lies behind them. In this process
of digging into words, phrases and expressions, teachers can also draw students’ attention to underlying relationships between source and target domains which govern most metaphorical expressions. By doing this, learners would eventually come to understand the systematicities underpinning metaphor along with the relationships between, first of all, source and target domains of a metaphor and, secondly, between different metaphors in the same text. In other words, language learners come to appreciate the ways in which our knowledge is rooted in and organised by our bodily actions and perceptual interactions with the world (Lakoff, 1987). Such understanding of the experiential basis of language enables the learner to comprehend how metaphors are exploited in texts to convey meanings which go beyond the literal one and how these metaphorical meanings are based on our primary sensorimotor experiences with our perceived world. Thus, such expressions as ‘climb a mountain’, ‘look how far we’ve come’, look down the valley’, ‘high peaks’, which are metaphorically intended, will then become more accessible to learners who will discover the full metaphorical potential of the expressions. A metaphor identification procedure is then vital to assist EAP learners in their search for deeper meanings when faced with academic texts.

It is also important to highlight that a metaphor identification procedure is relevant to EAP teachers not only to direct students’ attention towards metaphorically-used words in texts, but also because the identification of those words and expressions metaphorically intended can lead learners to deeper understanding of texts. The need for facilitating EAP learners’ access to text meaning requires that EAP language instructors be familiarised with ways of making texts more accessible to students. The four-week teaching period, which relied on the implementation of the MIP as a metaphor-awareness raising tool, demonstrated to have a positive impact on students’ understanding of text. Findings of this investigation revealed that students moved from shallow levels of text comprehension to deeper understanding of texts. This clearly suggests that EAP language teachers can greatly benefit from the implementation and inclusion of the MIP in their teaching practices.

**Research implications**

This investigation, which employed a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, has important implications for research methodology in the area of metaphor awareness and text understanding.

In the present study, the measurement of text understanding was mainly informed by two traditions. One was a traditional measure which predominantly looked at the act of reading as product
(Carrell, 1988) while the other viewed it as a process of meaning making (Roebuck, 1998). The former provided us with a quantifiable indication of learners’ understanding of text while the latter, in the form of a reader response task, contributed to a richer understanding of how students engaged actively in the process of meaning construction. These two measures, which largely fall within the quantitative and qualitative methodological tradition, enabled the researcher to have a much broader and clearer understanding of students’ text comprehension. If text understanding had been measured only from a product and traditional perspective, it would not have been possible to have a clear indication of students’ growth in text understanding. To exemplify this, one of the test items comprised a multiple choice section whose data analysis revealed that students obtained higher scores in the pre-test than in the post-test. Findings like this are not surprisingly unusual when it comes to testing by means of multiple-choice sections. Multiple-choice questions, as Anderson (2000) states, have serious disadvantages in that there may be a number of reasons as to why students respond the way they do. Students’ higher scores in the pre-test could be attributed to, for examples, simple guesses at the questions. The imprecision and ambiguity of multiple-choice measures of text understanding requires that other measures be utilised in order to have a better understanding and indication of learners’ text comprehension. Hence, the inclusion of a reader response task in the test.

The reader response task, which enabled me to look at reading from a meaning-making perspective, provided a complementary and much richer measure of assessing understanding of text. Analysis of the reader response tasks gave us insights into how learners engaged actively in a meaning-making process when dealing with the reading task. This certainly reaffirms some researchers’ position (Saville-Troike) about the nature of text meaning as something not embedded in a string of graphemes in the text but actively constructed.

It becomes central that research into learners’ understanding of text, especially within the disciplinary areas of applied linguistics and education, be conducted in a way that reflects and takes into account learners’ individual and social involvement with the text; hence, allowing for the possibility of examining reading understanding as a process and not so much as a product, as has been the tradition recently.
The significance of the study

The centrality of metaphor awareness as a tool to enhance understanding of texts is of great significance in the present investigation. First of all, one of the limitations of using metaphor awareness as a tool to enhance teaching and learning practices has been its narrow focus on lexis. It was discussed earlier (see 2.10) that various researchers (Boers, 2000; Guo, 2007; Kalyuga and Kalyuga, 2008) have scrutinised the benefits of metaphor awareness in primarily areas of lexical understanding and retention. This study, however, has demonstrated that metaphor awareness can be exploited at levels which go far beyond vocabulary, enabling learners to access deeper text meaning. Secondly, of great significance is to examine the importance of the tool utilised in the process of metaphor awareness raising. The MIP, which was the means whereby learners’ awareness of metaphor was enhanced, has not yet been utilised as a metaphor-awareness teaching tool in other similar studies. From my careful examination of a number of metaphor studies, I can attest that this investigation is the first instance where a tool such as the MIP is used a teaching tool to enhance learners’ awareness of metaphor. The effectiveness of the MIP was not only attested by the actual learners’ growth of awareness of metaphor, but also by the learners themselves. Analysis of the journals written by the learners, as discussed in 6.4, indicated that students clearly acknowledged that the steps of the MIP had helped them in the process of becoming aware of metaphors in text.

Both of the above arguments summarise the main significant aspects of this investigation which, to some extent, relate to the theoretical and methodological contributions of the study. It is also important to note that one of the practical significant aspects of the study is that it has contributed to the improvement of language teachers’ pedagogical practices. The way in which metaphor awareness has been utilised to enhance learners’ literacy levels is clearly a practical reflection of how CL can be brought into the ESL classroom.

Having identified some of the significant aspects of this investigation, we now turn our attention to some of the constrains of the study. Attention to some of the drawbacks may enable other similar studies to improve on certain aspects relating to methodology, design, methods, etc. and therefore to avoid the risk of overlooking some important considerations which may yield more powerful results.
Limitations of the study

Firstly, one of the methods utilised to gather data was the text comprehension test administered on two occasions, before and after the teaching period occurred. On both occasions the same test was given to participants. Having utilised the same test before and after the teaching intervention period may raise a question regarding the validity of the findings pertaining to the reading test as it could be thought that the increase in learners’ text understanding may have been influenced by their familiarity with the text. However, it is important to highlight that no reference or mention whatsoever was made to the reading test during the four-week teaching period. Participants were given the pre-test and no comments nor feedback on their test performance was given until the very end of the teaching period, once they had taken the post-test. Only then were the participants given feedback on their pre and post-test. It is, therefore, very unlikely that learners’ growth of text understanding may have been influenced by possible familiarity with the reading test. Besides, it was a four-week teaching intervention period. Given the amount academic tasks and assignments which EAP students have to comply with regularly, it is doubtful that participants may have recalled clearly the content of reading text and the test questions after four weeks. In order to avoid similar issues and contentious questions regarding the use of the same of instrument and its possible effect on the outcome, it is recommended that different tests be utilised if a similar research project is undertaken.

Secondly, gathering data for this research study depended exclusively on accessing the right participants. When it came to recruiting participants for the study, the teacher-researcher faced some difficulty accessing places where potential subjects could be found. After dealing with rejection from a few places, access to participants was granted at Deakin University English Language Institute (DUELI) to which I am deeply grateful. Advanced EAP students were offered free extra ‘Critical Thinking’ classes which were run by the researcher. Once enough participants had signed up, the researcher began delivering the lessons. However, the number of participants began to drop dramatically during the first week. This naturally prevented the lessons from running smoothly, and the remainder of the participants had to be informed of the cancellation of the course due to insufficient numbers. Another call for recruiting participants was made at a later time. This time the invitation was, once again, extended to advanced EAP students at DUELI and also to first-year international Masters of TESOL students at the School of Education, Deakin University. Thanks to the Course Coordinator’ (Zosia Golebiowski) permission and the students’ willingness to participate, a total number of 25 participants were gathered. This group, which
remained stable throughout the teaching period, was a fundamental contribution to the study without which I couldn’t have achieved such significant findings. However, for the sake of the application of appropriate statistical tests on the data it is suggested that a cohort of at least 30 participants be obtained should a similar study be conducted. I would therefore recommend that careful consideration be given to where, how and how many participants will be recruited. Findings would be more powerful if a larger group of participants had been recruited.

The above-mentioned issues are closely intertwined to the findings which are gleaned from analysis of the data. Having the right methods for data collection and the appropriate number of participants will always be central to any experimental research.

**Concluding remarks on the study**

Everybody acknowledges, in one way or another, that English has become a dominant language. Even if resistance to the adoption of a global language is sought, the fact that English has become the language of commerce, trade, advertising, and most importantly, the language of education can’t be denied. Such a massive proliferation of English as the language of education, and therefore the medium of instruction, has required that students entering English-medium educational institutions be fully equipped with the academic skills necessary for success at tertiary level. Such skills as writing, reading, critical thinking, oral presentation and media literacy are some of the central academic attributes which a student should possess before entering tertiary institutions (e.g. Flint, 2010; Kucer, 1985; Roebuck, 1998). The unfortunate reality, according to Hermida (ibid), is that most university students, especially first-year ones, show great deficiencies in academic reading skills due to the different nature of texts to which students are exposed in high school and university. Such deficiencies become increasingly greater when such academic skills are to be acquired, shown and appropriately utilised by learners whose first language is not English. What this suggests is that university students, especially those whose language background is other than English, need to be afforded with effective readings skills which enable them to succeed in their multiple and challenging literacy activities at university life.

One viable route to achieving that is by assisting learners in moving beyond the superficial levels of literal text meaning. Meaning, especially text meaning, is not obtained from the reading and interpretation of individual words Findings from the present investigation demonstrate that raising learners’ awareness of metaphor turned out to be, what Hermida (2009) calls, a deep approach to reading. Participants greatly
benefited from the teaching intervention period which aimed at enhancing their understanding of texts through the implementation of a metaphor-awareness syllabus based on the MIP. In view of the significant findings of the research it is expected that metaphor begins to be seriously considered at the level of curriculum design. As soon as that occurs, language instructors will begin to perceive the relevance of metaphor in language teaching and learning.

As a language instructor and applied linguist whose instruction was predominantly given in Chile, I can’t exclude myself and the context in which I was formed from how this investigation could contribute to the current literacy practices in Chile. One of the major issues which has caused some controversy in Chile is the considerable emphasis on L2 literacy levels, especially on reading comprehension. Such emphasis, which originates from the students’ inability to fully comprehend texts in the target language, has required that language teachers develop effective tools to equip their learners with the right skills to access text meaning fully.

I strongly believe that the recognition and inception of metaphor and metaphor awareness as a tool to enhance teaching and learning practices in the Chilean context would provide language teachers with a practical and effective tool to promote higher levels of literacy. However, in order for that recognition to happen, language teachers must begin to familiarise themselves with the overall theoretical principles which underpin the notion of conceptual metaphor and metaphor awareness. In other words, it is imperative that teachers start to explore what might be an unknown territory to them, that of CL. Such exploration will enable teachers to discover the multiple ways in which their pedagogical practices can be benefited from bringing the field of CL into their classrooms.

To conclude, the implementation of a metaphor-awareness syllabus based on the steps of the MIP would considerably benefit learners in their search for deeper text meaning. Thus, language teachers, tutors, curriculum designers, applied linguists and educators are strongly encouraged to delve into how the implementation of the MIP as a tool for metaphor-awareness raising can shed light on the development and improvement of literacy practices.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Sign-up sheet
Deakin University
Sign-up sheet for ‘Critical Thinking and Reading Sessions’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
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<th>E-mail address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Reading comprehension test

Reading Comprehension Test

Name:________________________________Nationality:_____________Score: _____/27 marks

Read the text following text and answer the questions:

Half full or half empty?

In the end, after all the talks, the lobbying and the haggling over words, the G8 summit at Gleneagles came down to a battle of words. Just how best should the work over the last three days at this Scottish golf course and equestrian centre be characterised?

Was, asked some, the cup half full or half empty? Most agreed it was a good deal on aid - $25 billion more for Africa by 2010. Debt was not bad – some 14 African countries will not have to pay any of the billions debt they owe the big international banks like the International Monetary Fund. And on trade, well, the summit agreed that African countries should no longer be forced to liberalise their markets in return for aid.

“A mountain has been climbed," declared the U2 rock star Bono, who alongside his comrade in alms Bob Geldof, has been lurking on the fringes of the Summit. But, he said, and it was a big “but” that was echoed by the army of charity workers and aid lobbyists here. “A mountain has been climbed only to reveal the higher peaks on the other side,” continued Bono.

Not wanting to sound too negative, he continued : “But let’s also look down the valley from where we’ve come.” So what of the “but” and those “higher peaks”? The extra $25 billion won’t come on stream until 2010 – not soon enough, say some.

The debt relief doesn’t go far enough, say others – the write-offs should be bigger and more widespread. And for trade, even the prime minister conceded that he had failed to make progress. He had wanted to fix a date to scrap the damaging European and American Agricultural subsidies that flood African markets with cheap foreign goods.
Mr. Blair said he wanted to set a date of 2010 and expected it would be agreed at trade talks in Hong Kong later this year. Well, perhaps, Dr. Kumi Naidoo, from the anti-poverty lobby group G-Cap, said after “the roar” produced by Live 8, the G8 had uttered “a whisper”. In private, the non-governmental organisations were more disappointed. They had urged Geldof to say: “The people have spoken, but the politicians have not listened.” But Geldof would not play ball. This, he said, had been the most important summit there had ever been for Africa. The prime minister agreed: “We won’t make poverty history, but we have shown how it can be done and show the political will do it.”

As for the other main item on the agenda, climate change, there was widespread pessimism. The prime minister insisted there had been greater agreement than before that humans are to blame for global warming, and that there was now a pathway to a new dialogue.” But the experts said the Americans had not made any concessions on the science of climate change, and the promises of new money to invest on non-carbon technologies had failed to appear. Mr. Blair conceded modestly: “What this is the possibility of re-establishing a consensus.” But together with Africa, he insisted: “Politics is about getting things done step by step, this is progress, and we should be proud of it.”

The bottom line is this, on Africa, the G8 made progress that, if implemented, will be substantive and meaningful, particularly on the issues of aid and debt relief.

On trade, the buck was passed onto the trade talks in Hong Kong later this year. The least progress was made on combating climate change, but then there wasn’t a big concert in London for that, was there?

I. Lexical meaning in context: From questions 1-8, guess the meaning of the words underlined in the text and write down your interpretations in the lines provided. Do NOT use your dictionary. (8 marks)

1. Battle: _________________________________________________________________

2. Mountain: ___________________________________________________________

3. Peaks: _______________________________________________________________

4. Valley: _______________________________________________________________

5. Write-offs: ___________________________________________________________
II. Multiple choice questions: Choose the correct alternative. Read the text again, if needed. (3 marks)

1. By 2010, some African countries…
   a) will have a larger debt
   b) will have their debt paid off
   c) will need to borrow billions from international banks

2. Hong Kong is the place where….
   a) the next Summit will be held
   b) an anti-poverty meeting with Dr. Kumi Naidoo will take place
   c) the exact date of the 25 billion relief for 2010 would be fixed

3. The overall attitude towards the main topic of discussion at the Summit was…
   a) positive about what humans have done
   b) conservative about what politicians’ varied positions were
   c) negative about the role humans have played in its growth

III. Short-answer questions: Write short answers to the following questions. (6 marks)

1. What was meant by the following statement in the text: “Was, asked some, the cup half full or half empty? Most agreed it was a good deal on aid”
2. In the text, Dr. Kumi Naidoo, from the anti-poverty lobby group G-Cap, said: “after ‘the roar’ produced by Live 8, the G8 had uttered ‘a whisper’”. Do these words, roar and whisper, refer to something or negative?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

3. Was the overall outcome of the Summit satisfactory or unsatisfactory? Find evidence in the text to support your answer.

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

IV. Reader response task: ‘Based on your interpretations and/or reactions to the text, what’s the overall message conveyed in the text? Write your views or interpretation of what is talked about in the texts. (10 marks)

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________
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Appendix 3: Journal entry

Learning Journal Entry

Name: _____________________________________________ Nationality: ____________________________

In the following questions, write down any ideas, thoughts, feelings, learning experiences that you have at
the moment. Don’t worry about grammar or spelling as the important thing is what you write.

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?
Appendix 4: Group discussion task

Metaphorical or literal?

Names: ________________________________________ Nationality: _____________________

Here are some expressions. Say whether these expressions are intended as literal or metaphorical. If you think any is metaphorical say what the comparison is or what is being compared to what.

1. Oranges are fruit
   
   Metaphorical
   
   Yes ☐   No ☐
   
   If so, what is being compared to? What relationships are established in the metaphor?

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

2. Our relationship is a voyage to the bottom of the sea
   
   Metaphorical
   
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   
   If so, what is being compared to? What relationships are established in the metaphor?

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

3. She flipped her lid

   __________________________________________________________
4. He really couldn't swallow her argument

Metaphorical
Yes ☐ No ☐
If so, what is being compared to? What relationships are established in the metaphor?

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

5. I didn't buy the reasons he gave

Metaphorical
Yes ☐ No ☐
If so, what is being compared to? What relationships are established in the metaphor?

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

6. He's a pain in the neck

Metaphorical
Yes ☐ No ☐
If so, what is being compared to? What relationships are established in the metaphor?

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

7. My car is a lemon
8. The lawyer is a vampire

Metaphorical
Yes ☐ No ☐
If so, what is being compared to? What relationships are established in the metaphor?
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

9. Prices are going up

Metaphorical
Yes ☐ No ☐
If so, what is being compared to? What relationships are established in the metaphor?
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

10. I need to make an important decision

Metaphorical
Yes ☐ No ☐
If so, what is being compared to? What relationships are established in the metaphor?
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

11. The battle of cancer
12. Stop attacking my arguments

Metaphorical

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, what is being compared to? What relationships are established in the metaphor?

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

Discuss a metaphor that you know in your first language and explain it to the group:

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
Appendix 5: Application of MIP to reading passage

Application of MIP steps (Group discussion)

Extract from Sonia Gandhi stakes claim for top job with denunciation of Vajpayee

Read the following extract from a text and follow each of the steps of the MIP (Identify certain parts of the speech, match their concrete meaning with the contextual meaning, see if there's any repetition, recurrence). Discuss your findings and the following questions with the group.

1. Discuss each of the metaphors in this extract
2. Discuss what they are referring to
3. Does the conventional meaning of, for example, ‘mantle’ apply to the context of the text?
4. Is there any conceptual metaphor behind the metaphorical words that you find?

Sonia Gandhi stakes claim for top job with denunciation of Vajpayee. For years, Sonia Gandhi has struggled to convince Indians that she is fit to wear the mantle of the political dynasty into which she married, let alone to become premier. Her opponents have not allowed the world to forget that she was born in Italy, or that—despite 35 years in India—she has yet to conquer her thick foreign accent when speaking Hindi. They portray her as aloof, out of touch with the vast nation once ruled by her husband, Rajiv, who was assassinated 12 years ago, and her formidable mother in-law, Indira Gandhi, who was cut down by her own bodyguards in 1984. But India’s political pundits gave Sonia Gandhi unusually enthusiastic reviews yesterday after her blistering performance in a no-confidence vote in India’s parliament.
Appendix 6: Reflective discussion

Reflective discussion

You have learnt about metaphor and the MIP throughout this course. Reflect on what you have learnt and discuss the following questions in groups.

1. What are some important concepts or ideas that you discovered or learnt over the last four weeks?

2. What are your current views of metaphor?

3. How do you see the MIP? Difficult? Useful?

4. Are you more aware of metaphors now?

5. Do you think you could better understand a text containing metaphors?
Appendix 7: Transcripts of learners’ discussions – Group 1, Time 1

Group 1: Time 1

Coding (S: student; SS: students; T: teacher)

1  T:  Yes. You need to have a discussion on what theses sentences mean and what the relationship is.
2  S01:  What is:: swallow?
3  S02:  =swallow is when you eating something and you (.)
4  S01:  need a establish a relationship (.) a metaphor
5  T:  You’ve already done one, two and three?
6  S03:  Yeap.
7  T:  Ok. So what is the meaning of this sentence? ((Teacher points to sentence four))
8  S01:  Vo:yage to the bottom of the sea and relationship is something that ?
9  S02:  What is the relationship between this one:: and this one?
10  S01:  a relationship (.) is
11  What is the relationship?
12  …to the bottom of the sea (.) is maybe
13  S03:  the relationship is m::: very complex
14  Can we do the other one?
15  Relationship, maybe we [do it later]
16  SS:  [do it later]
17
18
S01: Ok
S02: I didn’t buy her arguments
S03: What’s the meaning?
S02: Pardon?
S01: What’s the meaning?
S02: [meaning]
S03: what is being compared to?
S03: [compared to]
S02: What is the word (.) compare the sentence?
S03: how to start?
S02: Right?
S01: the relationship?
S03: >yes<
S02: this two sentence
S03: I can’t understand this question
S03: What’s being compared to?
T: listen to me for a second ((teacher draws everyone’s attention))
Mm.: what if you see something like: (.) the battle of cancer
This is (.) metaphorical
Cancer (.) the illness (.) is being conceptualised as war
When you read those ((cough)) sentences
Think of what the comparison or relationship is

Ok? =

S02: = ['battle of cancer'] is a war`

S01: ['it is a war'] =

T: =so :: what is the comparison in the sentence?

See what features are taken from one concept to understand (.) the other =

S01: = > ok <

So (.) so (.) the first one is about why a ['voyage to the bottom'] of the sea is compared with=

S03: ['a trip to :: (.) sea']

S01: = a relationship

S02: >'yes '<

S03: to the bottom of the sea

"Our relationship (.) to the bottom of the sea?"

(27.5)

S01: so ? what relationship establish the erm:: metaphor

(7.2)

"ask teacher "((clears throat))

(18.64)

S03: no .

S02: mm:: yeah

S03: what relationship in the metaphor ?

(43.80)

S01: the: relationship (.) the metaphor
what's relationships establish?

What's meaning? =

Students use the L1 8.25 from recording

I understand the question. I don't know how to answer it]

yeah

((clears throat))

You know what it means but you don't know how to work

I know the meaning but I don't know how answer it

we need to expand?

what?

We need to explain meaning

relationship

ok

= oh God

(8.24)

c'mon c'mon =

= What's the relationship.

(30.17)

er::

(12.85)

Ahh
Yes. What is being compared.

What is (.) what is common between our relationship and a voyage?

S03: > common between our relationship and voyage < ?

S03: $ deeply $

go a long way

ah: the bottom of the sea is the: deeply =

S02: = [deeply]

S01: I know the bottom of the sea (.)

What are the (.) ?

S03: our relationship is [voyage ]

S02: [voyage] =

S03: = like a voyage to the bottom of the sea

Because the bottom of the sea is (.) deep (.) m:

I think this sentence means that the relationship is deeply

and that (.) long time (.) long way

S01: ah:: ↑

S02: long way (.) [ long time]

S03: [long way] long time

S01: a relationship (.) can go further

and can go deeply and a (.) go deeply and a (.)

T: what’s your conclusion?

S02: I think that a sea is like a feeling of people (.)

to the bottom of the sea (.) m:
I know meaning in my language but can't express

S01: $ ah $ ↑

come on (,) translate (,) translate

S02: er:

(.35)

S03: m: like (,) intense emotion

A relationship is (,) intense emotion (,) to the bottom of the sea

(.47)

S01: what's common between swallow and argue ?

T: what is the conclusion for number two, then?

S01: m: voyage to the bottom of the sea is being compared to with our relationship

and (,) the bottom is a ( ) it can go deeply

an: d it can go a long way

T: they can go a long way?

S01: yeap=

S03: = (,) intense emotion

T: What do you mean?

S03: it mean that the voyage to the bottom of the sea is (,) represent intense emotion in

Your relationship (,) m:

T: ok

try making a connection between a relationship and a voyage to the bottom of the sea (,)

see how one thing is connected with the other (,)

how is one concept helping us understand another ?
S01: so?
S03: some problems in a relationship?
S02: What?
S03: maybe the voyage to the bottom of the sea is represent that we have problem in the relationship.
S02: [problems]
S03: yeap. problems in your relationship.
m: go to the bottom. voyage to the bottom of the sea.

S03: next one?
S02: ok
S01: he didn't really swallow her argument.
I think argument is being compared to the swallow.
S03: I think swallow is ( ) m:
that's the meaning.
S01: you mean (.)
S01: Turn back?
S03: take it back =
you mean somebody maybe say this is my argument.
S01: an:d speak ( )
but swallow is like (.) I mean =

S03: =swallow is m: like (.) accept

S02: accept?

S03: yeap

S02: o: r (.) keep it [ back ]?

S01: [yeap]

S03: yeap (.) this [ one ]

S01: [>I know<]

(0.32)

S01: take it back

S02: ( )

(0.45)

S03: m: I think the argument is being compared with water or food

I thin::k (.) swallow (.)

S01: What is food (.) in this sentence?

S03: some kind of (.)

compared to swallow

S01: I not think the compare is refer to food or water

I think connection with the (.) eating (.) action

You think it's being compared to food or water?

S02: I'm agree with you

S02: m: no food or water

I think like you ((student is referring to S01))
I think the comparison is the action, eating.

When you eat any food, you take all the food and go down, you take the food.

(0.46)

Ok, do the number five?

I think the argument is being compared to the buy?

Which one are you doing?

Number five

Number five?

Yeap

I didn't buy the reasons he gave

Metaphorical or literal?

Metaphorical =

=Yes, metaphorical

Was there money involved?

Was it a transaction?

NO

What is the metaphor?

What is the comparison?

Er, number five?

Yes

I don't buy the reasons he gave.
I think it means disagree
and (.) that you not want the arguments =

S01: =I think it mean that I don't take the arguments (.)
or that (.) you don’t accept the argument

S03: how about the number four?

T: is number four metaphorical?

S01: er: I think the number four is similar for the number five

m:: it mean that the person don’t take the argument

but I think first that it is (.) it was relation to food or water but (.)

we talk about that and think now that it is: (.) er:: [ < take or accept > ]

S03: [ accept the reasons ]

(0.38)

S01: yes ↑

SS: yes ↓

S01: next one? =

S02: =yes

SS: heh heh

S02: number seven

S01: m:

S03: lemon?

my car is a lemon

I think lemon is being compared to my car

an:: d (.)
S01: but (.) what is the relation?
S01: metaphorical or literal? =
S02: = my car is a [ lemon ] ?
S02: [ metaphorical ]
S01: m: (.) I know the meaning (.)
S01: It's not good quality and
S02: = not good quality?
S01: I think it's a brand
S01: Lemon is a brand (.) maybe
S02: (0.23)
S01: yeap (.) that means (.)
S02: it not good quality
S01: yes (.) it's not good quality
S01: And you pay more money
S02: (0.17)
S02: $ the lawyer is a vampire $ ((student moves onto the next sentence))
SS: heh heh
S01: I think the vampire wants always blood=
S03: = blood
S03: Yes (.) blood
S02: so: metaphorical ?
S01: Yes
Of course

What do you think?

S02: metaphorical

S01: the vampire just want blood
and the lawyer just want money

SS: heh heh

S01: the vampire is just want to catch anyone to (.)

S02: to bite (. right?  

S01: yes (.) he always try to bite someone

And that is bad

Probably the lawyer try to bite anyone too =

S03: =m: maybe the lawyer try to just make the (.) money from the person

(0.27)

S01: so (. the battle of cancer

the battle of cancer is being compared with battle=

=they are [ fighting ]

S03: [battle ]

S01: a battle (.)

They are fighting with a (. disease

S02: who fighting ?

S03: people (.)

They are fighting with the disease

S01: people have cancer
and they (.) fight with the disease
because the disease is no good
S02: no::=
disease is not good
(0.17)
S03: you want to do the other one?
S01: which one?
S03: the number (. ) m: nine =
S01: =oh ↑
The number nine (. )
I forget this one
Prices are going up
I think [ that ]
S02: [prices are go up means that it is more expensive (. ) m: ]
I think that (. ) down mean not more expensive
and go up mean that price is more expensive
S01: yes (. ) up is the price
and mean more money they must to pay (. ) m: =
= s::o if the price is up is more expensive
Because they go more high
An:: d (. )
I don't know
What do you think?
S02: the same (.)

Think that the price is more expensive

Because it is up

S01: m: (.) stop attacking my argument

m: (.)

argument compared with (.) > attacking <

T: which one are you doing?

S01: the last one

T: ok

S01: the comparison between argument and the attack

T: What's the relationship? =

S02: =I think that (.) when (.) each time we are have an argument we have (.) must to win the another person in the discussion

((SS speak to each other in Chinese)) 33:55

S03: $ I don't think so $

S02: what happen?

((1:12)

S01: < come on >

We have to do the last

S02: yes (.) the metaphor in (.) that you know in your first language

T: what's your metaphor? ((the teacher asks the whole group))

S03: what?
because the last thing you have to do is to think of a metaphor that you use in your language.
After that, explain it to the group. Is that OK?

S03: Yeap

T: life is a dream

S02: What?

S03: life is a dream

T: is that a Chinese metaphor?

S01: Yeap

T: what does that metaphor mean?

S03: life is dream

because people always don't know what will happen the next time

T: what is your metaphor? (Teacher asks another student in the group)

S02: life is a river

> I think it mean < that a river has new waters

S01: Yeap

My metaphor is life is a baby's face

S02: What?
S01: <life is a baby's face>

S03: and what does it mean?

S01: well the baby face change always all the time

If you see a baby's face it is small today

And the next day it is different

S03: understand

The life change every day
Appendix 8: Transcripts of learners’ discussions – Group 1, Time 2

Group 1: Time 2

1 T: Yes. You need to have a discussion on what these sentences mean and what the relationship is.
2 S01: What is:: swallow?
3 S02: =swallow is when you eating something and you (.)
4 S01: need a establish a relationship (.) a metaphor
5 T: You've already done one, two and three?
6 S03: Yeap.
7 T: Ok. So what is the meaning of this sentence? (Teacher points to sentence four))
8 S01: Vo:yage to the bottom of the sea and relationship is something that ?
9 S02: What is the relationship between this one:: and this one?
10 S01: a relationship (.) is
11 What is the relationship?
12 …to the bottom of the sea (.) is maybe
13 S03: the relationship is m::: very complex
14 Can we do the other one?
15 Relationship, maybe we [do it later]
16 SS: [do it later]
17 S01: Ok
18 S02: I didn’t buy her arguments
S03: What’s the meaning?

S03: What’s being compared to?

S02: Pardon?

S01: What’s the meaning?

S02: [meaning]

S01: what is being compared to?

S03: [compared to]

S02: What is the word (.) compare the sentence?

S03: how to start?

S02: Right?

S01: the relationship?

S03: >yes<

S02: this two sentence

S03: I can’t understand this question

S03: What’s being compared to?

T: listen to me for a second ((teacher draws everyone’s attention))

Mm: what if you see something like: (.) the battle of cancer

This is (.) metaphorical

Cancer (.) the illness (.) is being conceptualised as war

When you read those ((cough)) sentences

Think of what the comparison or relationship is

Ok? =
S02: battle of cancer is a war

S01: it is a war

T: what is the comparison in the sentence?

S01: > ok <

S03: So the first one is about why a voyage to the bottom of the sea is compared with

S01: a relationship

S02: yes <

S03: to the bottom of the sea

Our relationship to the bottom of the sea?

S01: so what relationship establish the metaphor

S03: what's relationship establish?

S03: What's meaning?
Students use the L1 8.25 from recording

S01: = I understand the question (.) I don't kn (h)ow to [ ans (h) wer it (h) ]

S03: [ yeah ]

S02: ((clears throat))

You know what it means

but you don't know how to work

S01: yeap

I know the meaning but I don't know (.) how answer it

S02: hhh =

S02: m: (;) we need to expand ?

S03: what?

S02: We need to explain (;) m: [ meaning ]

S03: [ relationship]

S02: ok

S03: = oh God

(8.24)

S01: c'mon c'mon =

=What's the relationship .

(30.17)

S03: er::

(12.85)

S01: Ahh

Yes. What is being compared .
What is our relationship and a voyage common between? 

> common between our relationship and voyage? 

$ deeply $ 

go a long way

ah: the bottom of the sea is the: deep deeply = 

I know the bottom of the sea ()

What are the (.)?

our relationship is [voyage ]

[voyage] = 

= like a voyage to the bottom of the sea

Because the bottom of the sea is deep deep (.) m:

I think this sentence means that the relationship is deeply and that (.) long time (.) long way

ah:: ↑

long way (.) [long time]

[long way] long time

a relationship (.) can go further and can go deeply and a (.) go deeply and a (.)

what’s your conclusion?

I think that a sea is like a feeling of people (.)

to the bottom of the sea (.) m:

I know meaning in my language but can’t express
S01: $ ah $ ↑

come on (.) translate (.) translate

translate translate

S02: er::

(.35)

S03: m: like (.) intense emotion

A relationship is (.) intense emotion (.) to the bottom of the sea

(.47)

S01: what's common between swallow and argue ?

T: what is the conclusion for number two, then?

S01: m: voyage to the bottom of the sea is being compared to with our relationship

and (.) the bottom is a ( ) it can go deeply

an: d it can go a long way

T: they can go a long way?

S01: yeap=

S03: = (.) intense emotion

T: What do you mean?

S03: it mean that the voyage to the bottom of the sea is (.) represent intense emotion in

Your relationship (.) m:

T: ok

try making a connection between a relationship and a voyage to the bottom of the sea (.)

see how one thing is connected with the other (.)

how is one concept helping us understand another ?

(.32)
S01: so?
S03: some problems in a relationship?
S02: What?
S03: maybe the voyage to the bottom of the sea is represent that we have problem in the relationship.
S02: [problems]
S03: yeah (. ) problems in your relationship (. )
S01: he didn't really swallow her argument (. )
S03: I think swallow is ( ) m:
S01: you mean (. )
S03: take it back =
S01: =you mean somebody maybe say this is my argument
S01: and speak ( )
S03: but swallow is like (. ) I mean =
S03: swallow is m: like (. ) accept
S02: accept?
S03: yeap
S02: o: r ( . ) keep it [ back ]?
S01: [yeap]
S03: yeap ( . ) this [ one ]
S01: [>i know<]
(0.32)
S01: take it back
S02: ( )
(0.45)
S03: m: I think the argument is being compared with water or food
S03: I thin::k ( . ) swallow ( . )
S01: What is food ( . ) in this sentence?
S03: some kind of ( . )
S03: compared to swallow
S01: I not think the compare is refer to food or water
S01: I think connection with the ( . ) eating ( . ) action
S01: You think it's being compared to food or water?
S02: I'm agree with you
S01: m: no food or water
S02: I think like you ((student is referring to S01))
S03: I think the comparison is the ( . ) the action ( . ) m: eating
S03: m: when you eat any food (.) you (.) you take all the food

and (.) go down (.) you take the food

(0.46)

S02: ok (.) m: do the number five ?

S03: I think the argument is being compared to the buy =

S02: compared to buy?

T: which one are you doing?

S02: number five

T: number five?

S02: yeap

T: I didn’t buy the reasons he gave

Metaphorical or literal ?

S03: metaphorical =

S03: =yes (.) metaphorical

T: was there money involved ?

was it a transaction ?

SS: NO ↓

T: what is the metaphor ?

What is the comparison ?

S03: er:: number five ?

T: yes

S03: m: I don’t buy the reasons he gave (.)

I think it means disagree
and (.) that you not want the arguments =

S01: =I think it mean that I don’t take the arguments (.)

or that (.) you don’t accept the argument

S03: how about the number four?

T: is number four metaphorical?

S01: er: I think the number four is similar for the number five

m:: it mean that the person don’t take the argument

but I think first that it is (.) it was relation to food or water but (.)

we talk about that and think now that it is: (.) er:: [ < take or accept > ]

S03: [ accept the reasons ]

(0.38)

S01: yes ↑

SS: yes ↓

S01: next one? =

S02: =yes

SS: heh heh

S02: number seven

S01: m:

S03: lemon?

my car is a lemon

I think lemon is being compared to my car

an:: d (.)

S01: but (.) what is the relation?
metaphorical or literal? =
= my car is a [ lemon ]?
S02: [ metaphorical ]
S01: (. ) I know the meaning (. )
It's not good quality and
some people don't want to spend money =
S02: =not good quality?
S01: I think it's a brand
Lemon is a brand (. ) maybe
(0.23)
S01: yeap (. ) that means (. )
S02: it not good quality
S01: yes (. ) it's not good quality
And you pay more money
(0.17)
S02: $ the lawyer is a vampire $ ((student moves onto the next sentence))
SS: heh heh
S01: I think the vampire wants always blood=
S03: =blood
Yes (. ) blood
S02: so: metaphorical ?
S01: Yes
Of course
What do you think?

S02: metaphorical

S01: the vampire just want blood

and the lawyer just want money

SS: heh heh

S01: the vampire is just want to catch anyone to (.)

S02: to bite (.) right?

S01: yes (.), he always try to bite someone

And that is bad

Probably the lawyer try to bite anyone too =

S03: =m: maybe the lawyer try to just make the (.), money from the person

S01: so (.), the battle of cancer

the battle of cancer is being compared with battle=

=they are [ fighting ]

S03: [battle ]

S01: a battle (.)

They are fighting with a (.), disease

S02: who fighting?

S03: people (.)

They are fighting with the disease

S01: people have cancer

and they (.), fight with the disease
m: (.) because the disease is no good

S02:  no::=
=disease is not good

(0.17)

S03:  you want to do the other one?

S01:  which one?

S03:  the number (.) m: nine =

S01:  =oh ↑

The number nine (.)

I forget this one

Prices are going up

I think [ that ]

S02:  [prices are go up means that it is more expensive (.) m: ]

I think that (.) down mean not more expensive

and go up mean that price is more expensive

S01:  yes (.) up is the price

and mean more money they must to pay (.) m: =

= s::o if the price is up is more expensive

Because they go more high

An:: d (.)

I don’t know

What do you think?

S02:  the same (.)

282
I think that the price is more expensive

Because it is up

(0.18)

m: (. stop attacking my argument

m: (.)

argument compared with (. > attacking <

T: which one are you doing?

S01: the last one

T: ok

S01: the comparison between argument and the attack

T: What's the relationship? =

S02: =I think that (. when (. each time we are have an argument we have (. must to win the another

person in the discussion

((SS speak to each other in Chinese)) 33:55

(0.45)

S03: $ I don't think so $

S02: what happen?

(1:12)

S01: < come on >

We have to do the last

S02: yes (. the metaphor in (. that you know in your first language

T: what's your metaphor? ((the teacher asks the whole group))

S03: what?
because the last thing you have to do is to think of a metaphor that you use in your language.

your first language.

After that explain it to the group.

Is that OK?

Yeap

m:  ah:  life is a dream

what?

=life is a dream

is that a Chinese metaphor?

yeap

what does that metaphor mean?

m:  life is dream

because people always don't know what will happen the next time

and they don't know what the future is like a dream

what is your metaphor?  ((Teacher asks another student in the group))

life is a river

> I think it mean <  a river has new waters

an::d if you are in place in the river you can see new waters come =

= I think life is a river

because something new is happen every day like new waters

understand?

yeap

My metaphor is life is a baby's face

what?
S01: <life is a baby's face>

S03: and what means?

S01: well the baby face change always all the time

If you see a baby's face it is small today

And the next day it is different

S03: understand

The life change every day
Appendix 9: Transcripts of learners’ discussions – Group 1, Time 3

Group 1: Time 3

1  T:  Yes. You need to have a discussion on what these sentences mean and what the relationship is.
2  S01:  What is: swallow?
3    What is it compared?=
4  S02:  =swallow is when you eating something and you (.)
5  S01:  need a establish a relationship (.) a metaphor
6  T:  You’ve already done one, two and three?
7  S03:  Yeap.
8  T:  Ok. So what is the meaning of this sentence? ((Teacher points to sentence four))
9  S01:  Vo;yage to the bottom of the sea and relationship is something that ?
10 S02:  What is the relationship between this one:: and this one?
11 S01:  a relationship (.) is
12    What is the relationship?
13    …to the bottom of the sea (.) is maybe
14  S03:  the relationship is m::: very complex
15  S01:  Can we do the other one?
16  Relationship, maybe we [do it later]
17  SS:  [do it later]
18
19  S01:  Ok
S02: I didn’t buy her arguments
S03: What’s the meaning?
S02: What’s being compared to?
S02: Pardon?
S01: What’s the meaning?
S02: [meaning]
S01: what is being compared to?
S03: [compared to]
S02: What is the word (.) compare the sentence?
S03: how to start?
S02: Ho (h) w to wo (h) rk?
S02: Right?
S01: the relationship?
S03: >yes<
S02: this two sentence
S03: I can’t understand this question
S03: What’s being compared to?
T: listen to me for a second ((teacher draws everyone’s attention))
Mm:: what if you see something like: (.) the battle of cancer
This is (. ) metaphorical
Cancer (. ) the illness (. ) is being conceptualised as war
When you read those ((cough)) sentences
Think of what the comparison or relationship is
Ok? =

S02: = [ battle of cancer ] is a war

S01: = [ it is a war ] =

T: = so :: what is the comparison in the sentence ?

See what features are taken from one concept to understand (. ) the other =

S01: = > ok <

So (. ) so (. ) the first one is about why a [ voyage to the bottom ] of the sea is compared with=

S03: [ a trip to :: ( . ) sea ]

S01: = a relationship

S02: = yes <

S03: to the bottom of the sea

Our relationship ( . ) to the bottom of the sea ?

(27.5)

S01: so ? what relationship establish the erm :: metaphor

(7.2)

" ask teacher "((clears throat))

(18.64)

S03: no .

S02: mm:: yeap

S03: what relationship in the metaphor ?

(43.80)

S01: the: relationship ( . ) the metaphor

S03: what's relationships establish?
What's meaning? =

Students use the L1 8.25 from recording

S01: = I understand the question (.) I don’t kn (h)ow how to [ ans (h) wer it (h) ]
S03: [ yeah ]
S02: ((clears throat))

You know what it means bu::t you don’t know how to work

S01: yeap
I know the meaning but I don’t know (.) how answer it
S02: hhh =
S02: m: (.) we need to expand ?
S03: what?
S02: We need to explain (.) m: [ meaning ]
S03: [ relationship]
S02: ok
S03: = oh God
S02: (8.24)
S01: c’mom c’mon =
=What’s the relationship .
S03: er::
S02: (12.85)
S01: Ahh
S03: Yes. What is being compared .
What is common between our relationship and a voyage?

S03: deeply go a long way

ah: the bottom of the sea is the deep deeply=

S02: = [deeply]

S01: I know the bottom of the sea.

What are the long time long way?

S03: our relationship is [voyage]

S02: [voyage] =

S03: = like a voyage to the bottom of the sea

Because the bottom of the sea is deep m:

I think this sentence means that the relationship is deeply and that long time long way

S01: ah:: ↑

S02: long way [long time]

S03: [long way] long time

S01: a relationship can go further

and can go deeply and a go deeply and a

T: what’s your conclusion?

S02: I think that a sea is like a feeling of people.

to the bottom of the sea m:

I know meaning in my language but can’t express
S01: $ ah $ ↑
S02: er::
(.35)
S03: m: like (.) intense emotion
A relationship is (.) intense emotion (.) to the bottom of the sea
(.47)
S01: what’s common between swallow and argue?
T: what is the conclusion for number two, then?
S01: m: voyage to the bottom of the sea is being compared to with our relationship
and (.) the bottom is a ( ) it can go deeply
an: d it can go a long way
T: they can go a long way?
S01: yeap=
S03: = (.) intense emotion
T: What do you mean?
S03: it mean that the voyage to the bottom of the sea is (.) represent intense emotion in
Your relationship (.) m:
T: ok
try making a connection between a relationship and a voyage to the bottom of the sea (.)
see how one thing is connected with the other (.)
how is one concept helping us understand another?
(.32)
S01: so?

S03: some problems in a relationship?

S02: What?

S03: maybe the voyage to the bottom of the sea is represent that we have problem in the relationship.

S03: because is a voyage to the bottom of the sea.

S02: [problems]

S03: yeah problems in your relationship.

S03: m: go to the bottom voyage to the bottom of the sea.

S03: next one?

S02: ok

S01: he didn’t really swallow her argument.

S01: I think argument is being compared to the swallow.

S03: I think swallow is [meaning].

S03: that’s the meaning.

S01: you mean.

S01: Turn back?

S03: take it back =

S01: =you mean somebody maybe say this is my argument.

S03: but swallow is like I mean =
S03: =swallow is m: like (. ) accept

S02: accept?

S03: yeap

S02: o: r (. ) keep it [ back ]?

S01: [yeap]

S03: yeap (. ) this [ one ]

S01: [>I know<]

(0.32)

S01: take it back

S02: ( )

(0.45)

S03: m: I think the argument is being compared with water or food

I thin::k (. ) swallow (. )

S01: What is food (. ) in this sentence?

S03: some kind of (. )

compared to swallow

S01: I not think the compare is refer to food or water

I think connection with the (. ) eating (. ) action

You think it's being compared to food or water?

S02: I'm agree with you

m: no food or water

S01: I think like you ((student is referring to S01))

I think the comparison is the (. ) the action (. ) m: eating
S03: m: when you eat any food (.) you (.) you take all the food
and (. ) go down (.) you take the food
(0.46)
S02: ok (. ) m: do the number five ?
S03: I think the argument is being compared to the buy =
S02: =compared to buy?
T: which one are you doing?
S02: number five
T: number five?
S02: yeap
T: I didn’t buy the reasons he gave
Metaphorical or literal ?
S03: metaphorical =
S03: =yes (. ) metaphorical
T: was there money involved ?
was it a transaction ?
SS: NO ↓
T: what is the metaphor ?
What is the comparison ?
S03: er:: number five ?
T: yes
S03: m: I don’t buy the reasons he gave (. )
I think it means disagree
and (.) that you not want the arguments =

S01: = I think it mean that I don’t take the arguments (.)

or that (.) you don’t accept the argument

S03: how about the number four?

T: is number four metaphorical?

S01: er: I think the number four is similar for the number five

m:: it mean that the person don’t take the argument

but I think first that it is (.) it was relation to food or water but (.)

we talk about that and think now that it is: (.) er:: [ < take or accept > ]

S03: [ accept the reasons ]

(0.38)

S01: yes ↑

SS: yes ↓

S01: next one? =

S02: = yes

SS: heh heh

S02: number seven

S01: m:

S03: lemon?

my car is a lemon

I think lemon is being compared to my car

an:: d (.)

S01: but (.) what is the relation?
metaphorical or literal? =

= my car is a [ lemon ] ?

S02:  [ metaphorical ]

S01:  m: (.) I know the meaning (.)

It’s not good quality an: d

some people don’t want to spend money =

S02:  =not good quality?

S01:  I think it’s a brand

Lemon is a brand (.) maybe

(0.23)

S01:  yeap (.) that means (.)

S02:  it not good quality

S01:  yes (.) it’s not good quality

And you pay more money

(0.17)

S02:  $ the lawyer is a vampire $ ((student moves onto the next sentence))

SS:  heh heh

S01:  I think the vampire wants always blood=

S03:  =blood

Yes (.) blood

S02:  so: metaphorical ?

S01:  Yes

Of course
What do you think?

S02: metaphorical

S01: the vampire just want blood

and the lawyer just want money

SS: heh heh

S01: the vampire is just want to catch anyone to (.)

S02: to bite (.right?)

S01: yes (.he always try to bite someone

And that is bad

Probably the lawyer try to bite anyone too =

S03: =m: maybe the lawyer try to just make the (. money from the person

(0.27)

S01: so (. the battle of cancer

the battle of cancer is being compared with battle=

=they are [ fighting ]

S03: [battle ]

S01: a battle (.)

They are fighting with a (. disease

S02: who fighting?

S03: people (.)

They are fighting with the disease

S01: people have cancer

and they (. fight with the disease
m: (.) because the disease is no good

S02: no::=

=disease is not good

(0.17)

S03: you want to do the other one?

S01: which one?

S03: the number (.) m: nine =

S01: =oh ↑

The number nine (.)

I forget this one

Prices are going up

I think [ that ]

S02: [prices are go up means that it is more expensive (.) m: ]

I think that (.) down mean not more expensive

and go up mean that price is more expensive

S01: yes (.) up is the price

and mean more money they must to pay (.) m: =

= s::o if the price is up is more expensive

Because they go more high

An:: d (.)

I don’t know

What do you think?

S02: the same (.)
Think that the price is more expensive
Because it is up

S01: m: (.) stop attacking my argument
m: (.)
argument compared with (.) > attacking <

T: which one are you doing?

S01: the last one
T: ok

S01: the comparison between argument and the attack
T: What's the relationship? =

S02: =I think that (.) when (.) each time we are have an argument we have (.) must to win the another person in the discussion

((SS speak to each other in Chinese)) 33:55

S03: $ I don’t think so $

S02: what happen?
(1:12)

S01: < come on >
We have to do the last

S02: yes (.) the metaphor in (.) that you know in your first language
T: what’s your metaphor? ((the teacher asks the whole group))

S03: what?
because the last thing you have to do is to think of a metaphor that you use in your language (.).

your first language (.)

After that (. ) explain it to the group

Is that OK?

Yeap ↓

m: : ah: (.) life is a dream

what? =

=life is a dream

is that a Chinese metaphor?

yeap ↓

what does that metaphor mean?

m: life is dream

because people (. ) always don’t know what will happen the next time

and they don’t know what the future is (. ) like a dream

what is your metaphor? (Teacher asks another student in the group)

life is a river

> I think it mean < that (. ) a river has new waters

and if you are in place in the river you can see new waters come =

= I think life is a river

because something new is happen every day like new waters

understand?

yeap ↓

My metaphor is life is a baby’s face

what ?
S01: <life is a baby's face>

S03: and what means?

S01: well the baby face change always all the time

If you see a baby's face it is small today

And the next day it is different

S03: understand

The life change every day
Appendix 10: Transcripts of learners’ discussions – Group 2, Time 1

Group 2: Time 1

1 S04: ok (.) let's do the first one=
2 =what do you think (.) is the meaning ?
3 I think it’s not [ metaphorical ]
4 S06: < I think > (.) [ just like that ]
5 S05: Yeap ↓
6 An orange is a fruit
7 An: d apple is fruit
8 S::o no metaphorical (.) m:: that's what I think (.)
9 S04: ok (.) $ easy $
10 S:o ↑ I think we should do the other one
11 Our relationship is a voyage to the bottom of the sea
12 m:: I don’t understand this one
13 do you [ know the meaning ] ?
14 S05: [ I think we have to (.) ]
15 m: I (.) am ask the teacher ((student raises his hand to call the teacher over))
16 T: do you have any questions?
17 S04: a::h (.) we don’t understand the number two
18 What is it being compared to?
19 T: you’ve got two elements (.) two parts in this sentence (.)
You have this which is a relationship and this which is a voyage to the bottom of the sea.

Try to think of the connection between these two parts.

T: That's what you have to do, OK?

S06: Yeap.

S04: Well, I think the relationship is that the relationship is not good going down.

S5: It's going to the bottom of the sea and that is not good.

At the same time, you said that the sea is dangerous.

S05: But the bottom of the sea is very deep.

And I think it can be like an intense like an intense relationship.

S04: Ok, we are going do the number three.

S05: [she flipped her lid]

S04: Yeap, correct.

S06: I think literal.

S04: Do you think it's literal?
why?

Well, I don't know the meaning of flip her lid.

I need a dictionary now.

You have a dictionary?

S06: yeap

S04: e:r (.) flip (.) m:

(0.18)

S04: > look <

S05: ok

m:

so what's the meaning in this sentence?

S04: wait (.) I need to look the other word (.) m: lid

You know the meaning?

Wait

(0.27)

S06: I think this number three is literal (.) e:r no [ metaphorical ]

S05: [ don't know ]

S04: m: ↑ she flipped her lid?

< I think > (.) it's literal

m: she flip her lid?

S05: literal?

S04: think so

S05: ok (.)
S04: m: do number four?
S06: number four (.) he really couldn’t swallow [ her argument ]=
S05: 
S06: = I think swallow is comparing argument
but **swallow** is the verb (.) this is the subject (.) the verb an: d the rest
s:o I think we have to::
we need a verb
S05: a verb ?
S06: he really couldn’t **swallow** her argument
I think (.) m:: I don’ t know
What is **swallow** ?
S04: swallow mean when you eat and the food go inside you: r (.) your stomach =
S06: a::h ↑ understand
s:o he really couldn’t swallow her arguments may mean that he didn’t $ eat $ her argument=
SS: = heh heh heh
(0.17)
S04: ok (.) I think that maybe it mean that the person didn’t (.) m:: understand his argument =
S06: or maybe that he didn’t accept her argument
or maybe that **he didn’t like** the argument
S05: ok (.) an: d do number five
S06: o:: r do the same
S04: we have to finish **the swallow**
m:: e:rr my opinion is that **he didn’t accept** her argument
when you swallow a food (.) you like it
and you accept it (.) understand ?

S06: I think the same (.)
I'm agree (.) he didn't accept the (.) argument

S05: so the number five now?

S04: number fiver (.)
< I didn't buy the reasons he gave >

m:: what do you think ?
well (.) I think [ it's like the number four ]

S05: [buy is swallow in four ]
When you go to the shop for to buy something (.) I think you (.) like m: accept something=

S06: = but maybe you like it
so the person maybe like the argument
m: (.) or accept it?
well (.) maybe the same thing

S04: I think it when you accept something
Buy the reason is accept something (.) ok?
Let's do the number six ?

S06: number six is (.) he is a pain in the neck

Pain in the neck

S04: literal or metaphorical ?
I [ think it's metaphorical ]

S06: [ he is a pain in the neck ]
maybe literal .

what is being compared to ?

pain and [ neck ] ?

S05: [yeap ]

Pain in the neck ?

maybe something not nice

a pain is not nice

o: r what do you think ?

to S04: when you have a pain ( . ) ouch is never nice

s: o the person is a pain in the neck

because is not nice =

S05: = not very nice

$ You are a pain in the neck $

SS: heh heh heh

S04: come on ↓

You are

Ok ( . ) let's do the other one ( . ) number seven

My car is a lemon

What ?

$ my car is a lemon $ =

S06: = yellow

I don’t know the mean ( . ) m: e:r this one

You know the mean ( . ) this one ?
Literal or metaphorical

S04: metaphorical

I think it's meaning metaphorical

I think not the colour (.) yellow

S05: it's maybe the brand (.) you know?

Like a Ford or Toyota

Maybe lemon is $ the brand $

S04: No ::

I think the car is very cheap (.) maybe ↑

The lemons is very cheap so:

(0.34)

S04: don't know (.) a:h

Let's do the other number ?

The number eight ?

The lawyer is a vampire

SS: heh heh heh

S05: $ a vampire $ ?

a vampire like blood in the night

[ m: a lwayer? ]

S04: [ a lawyer is bad ]

I mean is bad because he only want the (.) money of the people

S06: maybe (.) a:h the lawyer want to do something bad to the customer
or (.) < maybe > she m: he want to cost a lot of money of the customer (.) the person

S05: yeap (.) maybe a lot of money =

S06: = ok (.) m: why (.) let's do the other one

S04: m:: number nine

The: (.)

No ↓ (. ) prices are going up

I think the prices (.) are going up is [ m: =

S06: = literal

Because the prices are more expensive

m: if the bread is 2 dollars then is four dollars (. ) e::r

the price are going up

[ understand ] ?

S05: [ prices is moving ]

Well (. ) it's more expensive

S06: yeap (.) I think this one is easy

Ok (.) next one ?

I need to make an important decision

This is number ten

S04: number 10 ?

I think literal

Because it's a decision

And a decision is literal

S06: what is being compared to?
S05: I think nothing
S06: ok
Number eleven?
S04: the battle of [cancer]
S05: [cancer] =
= I think it’s metaphorical
S04: I [think so] (.) too
S06: [me too]
m: the battle of cancer
what is a battle?
S04: when someone fight
m: when someone is angry (.) I think
S05: or maybe like the war
$star wars$
SS: heh heh heh
S06: I think the relationship is when the person (.) m: that have cancer must to fight the cancer
S04: yeap (.) m: the battle of cancer
S05: so: cancer is being compared to the battle
S06: that’s right ↓
I think the relationship is that the person that have cancer must always to fight the cancer
and kill it (.) understand?
S04: I understand the comparison
S06: Number twelve now?
S06:  ok (.)

Stop attacking < my arguments >

S04:  I think m: very similar (. ) the other one

attack is always in a fight

S06:  of course

You not attack your friend

(0.27)

S06:  we must to think in a metaphor in: our language

S04:  yes

(0.18)

S04:  you know the: life is a dream ?

S06:  life is a dream ?

What is that ? =

= Chinese ?

S04:  of course ( . ) in Chinese

S06:  an: d what it means ?

S04:  I think it means that ( . )

(0.12)

S05:  you don’t know ?

S04:  I think it means that ( . ) m: dreams are different all the days

Understand ?

S06:  life is a dream ?

S04:  so: life is change all the days like dreams
Appendix 11: Transcripts of learners’ discussions – Group 2, Time 2

Group 2: Time 2

1  S19:  so I don’t know how many metaphorical words in this text we have
2  S17:  well, we have to identify them
3  And also we have to use the steps the teacher said
4  This one, in the instructions
5  S20:  yeap, use the MIP and all the [ steps ]
6  S19:  [yeap ]
7  S18:  I can’t find any metaphor word in the text
8  I understand the text
9  There are words new for me
10  But I don’t find metaphors
11  S20:  we need to: kind of analyse them
12  S17:  No?
13  I think I can find some words
14  S19:  I think thick is a metaphor
15  I think the concrete meaning of thick is like (.)
16  You know for example if you buy a thick book
17  Li:ke a lot of pages
18  Or probably clothes I can say thick I am very cold
19  S18:  a thick accent?
20  What’s the meaning of thick in the dictionary?
S20: it's maybe the meaning you know
That's maybe the concrete meaning
You said an example about the: book=
S19: =yes
S17: er:m distance, large amount, distance, large amount, m:
   Even stupid in British English
   I don't know what the meaning is for thick accent
S20: thick means stupid?
 Wow, I don't believe it
   But I think that's not the concrete meaning
S19: maybe it's like an accent that is not [ understandable ]
S17: [yeap maybe ]
S18: maybe an accent that is non native
   Like an accent that is from somebody of a different country
S17: yeap like a foreign accent
S20: thick foreign accent ?
 S:o I think we have to think about the source and target
S18: well, the text say thick foreign accent
If it's foreign accent I wonder why the text say thick
S19: what's the source domain?
Something thick can be nice, warm and comfortable
I’m thinking about clothes

For example, thick can also be like not nice

If you have to carry a thick book when you travel

but I don’t understand how this meaning is applied to this context

I think it’s like a rough accent

another metaphorical word

what’s a rough accent?

hehe hehe hehe

(0.22)

do we have any other word?

I think cut down is a metaphorical word

I can imagine that cut down is like when someone cut a tree

And the tree fall down

So they cut down the tree

so that’s your source domain

Well, this is a phrasal verb

And phrasal verbs are most of the time metaphorical

I agree with you

Maybe that can be the [source domain] of the meaning

[source or concrete]

I know one meaning of cut down

You know when you, for example, too many fat things

And you need to cut down, like reduce that
S17: well, that's not the meaning here

S19: I think that the meaning is probably close to your idea
Like cut the tree and the tree fall down
This give me the idea that the person was killed

S18: did you identify more metaphorical words?
S17: no
I understand the rest of the text
S19: me too
Only some words that I don't know
But I also understand it

S20: and do you understand all the metaphors?
S19: I think so

S17: so any more words?
S19: er:m
I don't think so
S18: maybe that one (.)
Like m: conquer
S20: conquer? Is it metaphor or literal?
Like conquer is related to a group of like (. the British when conquer
S19: yeap, that's right
I thought about that one
But I forgot $ my example $

S17:  s:o conquer?
What's the domain?
I mean source and target
Or the meaning in the context
S18:  I think this word is metaphorical
Did you find it in the [ dictionary ]?
S19:  [I'm looking]
S18:  ok
S19:  here I have it
It says that er:m
Ok, the first meaning here is …
To take control or possession of foreign land [ or =
S18:  = [ that's what I think (. ) thought
It's like when people, like when people create colonies maybe
S20:  er:m the first meaning is the concrete meaning?
Leonardo said that the concrete meaning is more basic
But sometimes it's not the first [ meaning
S19:  yeap, the first meaning is not <necessarily > the literal or basic
S17:  yeap, that's right
Now I think the word is metaphorical too
SS:  hehe hehe hehe
S18: why you understand now?
S17: because you discuss it
and start realising that it was metaphorical
S20: well, I thought it was metaphor since the beginning
S17: wow, that’s good
S18: ok
S19: s:o I think that conquer here means to take possession too
The source domain is giving the idea that (.) take control of something
Er:m something concrete like a land
But, for example, in the context it’s (.) =
S17: = it’s the thick accent
We talk about this one before
S:o it’s conquer the thick accent
This is the complete [ phrase ]
S19: [sentence]
So conquer is like =
S18: =it’s like take possession of something
In this case her accent
S20: s:o we have two metaphors in one thing
Conquer and thick are two metaphors
S19: so the basic meaning or the meaning of the source domain is like (.)
You know when you put something or move something from here to this side
S18: like transfer something?
when you transfer money [from one account to] other account

[that's the source and]

Er:m when we take the <characteristics> from one thing to another domain

so the meaning is transfer from the source [domain to the target domain]

[so it's like the same meaning]

maybe it means that she has like a very difficult accent to understand

and she has to control or take possession of that

or other possibility is that her accent is like=

=I know maybe like (.) it sounds like a man

even if it's like a man

She would have to: m: control or conquer that

hehe hehe hehe

because it is a thick accent

So it could be that she sound like a man

er:m I don't think it's about the way the people sound

Understand?

Like man or woman

if it's accent, then it's about how people sound

Maybe difficult [to understand] or maybe too fast, don't know

[that's what I think]

I'm just talking about another possibility

what's the opposite of thick?
S19:  er:m (.)
I can't think about one
I can show you with my hands what is the opposite
S18:  I know that
I can do it too
I need the word
Appendix 12: Transcripts of learners’ discussions – Group 2, Time 3

Group 2: Time 3

1  S18: ok, so we have to talk about what we’ve done in this classes?
2  S17: yeap, it’s like=
3  S18: =is it like a reflection?
4  S17: an:d these are the questions?
5  Do we have to answer each of the questions?
6  Or just we have t comment about this
7  S19: yeap, but we don’t have to li: ke [ answer the questions or w r i t e ]
8  S20: [have you done a reflection before ]
9  I think a reflection is more like talking about the learning process
10 S18: everything that we learnt ?
11 An:d all the things that we did with the steps
12 S17: think so
13 (0.11)
14 S20: yeap, s:o these questions are not for answering, understand?
15 It’s like <elaboration >
16 Reflection, we need to reflect about the questions
17 S17: s:o what?
18 Why do we have to reflect about this?
19 I know reflection is part of the learning
But what else?

S19: we have to talk about them

You never did a reflection task?

When I do something, I reflect about it to see if it good or bad something like that

S18: I know what is that

So let's start now

(0.16)

S20: my opinion is that the MIP was very important [ to understand metaphors ]

S17: [ for identify the metaphors]

It's good to understand the text

I think that's the main objective

S20: yeap, because if we understand the metaphor but don't understand the text

S19: I think all the steps are important for identify the: metaphors

Before I had a lot of troubles to see the metaphors [ in the texts]

S17: [ me too ]

S19: it seem that the metaphors er:m

Like (,) you have to know how to understand them

S18: well, you have to know how to m: the interpretation of the meaning

Do you understand this?

S20: I can give a metaphor meaning to the word

and you maybe give a literal meaning

S19: I know the interpretation can change

But now we know what is a metaphor
S17: so yeah, I think the steps are very important too

What step did you like?

S19: er:m $ I didn't like any steps $

But I think they were useful

Especially when I had to find relations between the metaphors

I mean one metaphor is related with the other

Or maybe one word is related to another

And they together form the same metaphor

S17: yeap, the same metaphor has different forms

Well, not forms but like er:m don't know, maybe it has different interpretations

S20: yeap, it's probably different [ meanings ]

S17: [ interpretations ]

S19: like different words talk about the same metaphor

That's what I think

S17: it's something like that

S18: so let's talk about this

S18: I think the steps are easy but very good

Because, from my opinion, they help in understand the [ text ]

S19: [ yeap ]

S18: and also it's the meaning of the metaphor

S20: yeap, good steps for understanding
sometimes I think that is difficult to understand the meaning of the metaphor

but it was good to understand the two things er:m the source and what's the [other one ]

but it was good to understand the two things er:m the source and what's the [other one ]

[and]

tyep

the source and target is very good for [ understand the meaning ] of the metaphor

[it helped me understand ]

And also be (.,) it was good for me to be more aware of the metaphors

And also the characteristics of one domain for another domain

I remember Leonardo said that some elements from one are take into another

It's probably like mixing two things

no, it's not like mixing

You're not mixing the elements

You're actually using elements of one for another

Is it like replacing ?

maybe not

I like to identify metaphors in one of the steps

I think it was good to do that
S18: sometimes I thought that some were metaphors but they were not
And sometimes I thought that some were not metaphors and they were

SS: hehe hehe hehe

S18: s:o when I compared my understanding with the dictionary
I found that some were metaphors and some were not metaphors

S17: yeap =

S18: =s:o I think that comparing was good

Er:m dictionary and text
I think that was good for me

S19: yeap, because when you have an idea about the metaphor
And then you like see or compare in the dictionary
You see that it's li:ke [ different meaning or maybe the same]

S18: [the dictionary say something different ]

(0.18)

S19: from my opinion I think that this help me to [ understand the text with ] the metaphors

S20: [yeap, and more aware too]

S18: me too but I still think that er:m it should useful with most of the texts
Like I don't know if you can use it with this text or all of the texts

S20: it would be ideal

I think if we learn to use the steps well
We can use them with any other text

S17: that's a good question

S18: I think that you can use it with this one
And (,) also like generalise to another texts

S20: I think we could use the MIP for any text and metaphors =
S19: = because it's like a method
It's like a hammer
You can't only hit nails but anything
SS: hehe hehe hehe
S17: I think it's a good example
S19: I think we can try to see the source and target domain in any metaphor maybe
S17: yeap, if you have um (,) a metaphor you can maybe see the source and target
Well not see it but find it
S18: I think I have a different opinion [about the] metaphors
S20: [m e t o o ]
S17: why?
S18: because er:m it's like something I always thought it was only in the books
S17: yeap, when I thought about metaphor I think about something like intellectual people use when they write something formal
S20: I always thought about metaphor like something difficult
But now I see that metaphors are not very difficult
I think metaphors are in: (. ) many places
And I hope I can understand them $ with the MIP $
S19: yeap, but now I also believe that metaphors are simple
S17: simple?
S18: maybe they are not simple now
I found them difficult in the beginning
S20: maybe it's still a bit difficult but my opinion is that I will see metaphors more.

S19: I mean, in the sense that we can find them in many places.

S20: I remember the other day.

S19: I saw an advertisement on a bus.

S20: Which said something like 15 dollars is not what smokers cough up.

S17: I’ve seen it on buses.

S18: =I don’t (.). I haven’t seen that.

S19: and there was an image of a man with a tissue with blood.

S20: that’s good example, yeap.

S17: I think so.

S19: Maybe one is literal and the other m: metaphor.

S20: So can we apply the source and target, basic or concrete?

S19: well, I was saying that I think I can (.). erm: find more metaphors =

S17: = and maybe you understand them too.

S18: I would like to: >read another text <

S20: I’m sure if you follow the steps and the MIP.
It could help you to understand more. But a text with more metaphors

maybe not more

But a text that have metaphors

maybe you will understand it too

I think I’m going to write the procedure and leave in my pocket.

S:o when I find a text

I will understand all the metaphors in the text

Hehe hehe hehe

It can be good idea

I think I will be looking for metaphors everywhere

When I read the university books

And when I read the newspaper or any [other thing]

I really like the MIP

Because I could also see that many simple words have like more than one meaning

or even when you’re reading a book and find a metaphor

You will need to use the mip, the source and target

And all that things

yes, of course

Whatever that you want to read

Maybe you will find a metaphor
S17: well, in summary I think it was a good idea [to] to know this steps

S18: [yes]

Yeap, because we can understand more the metaphors and the metaphor meaning

S17: and also understand that we, or even me, I am more conscious about the metaphor

An: d it was useful to know the source and target

S18: and we can try to apply the basic and [concrete meanings]

S20: [the d o m a i n s too]

Yeap, the basic and concrete, I mean the concrete and abstract were very good for understanding the metaphor

An: d the elements of the source and target are interesting for understanding

S17: and I think we can continue use this for another texts

S19: ° yes °

S17: because another texts can have also mo:re like these metaphors

S20: maybe we will the metaphors in everywhere

More metaphors and more meanings are used in the texts

S18: yeap, we always can find literal and metaphors in any text

S17: you're crazy=

S18: =why?

It's a nice words
And they also are very useful for identifying the metaphors

S19: well, they are really for identifying the metaphors

S17: no?

S19: they are really to understand the relation between one domain and the other side=

S18: "one domain and the other side"

S20: come on! The source and target are for maybe understanding not identifying

$ Don't ask questions now $?

S19: = remember what we said before

The elements from one domain to another domain

Leonardo said that

S20: the question is (. ) do you understand metaphors and texts?

I think that's the objective of the MIP

m: and that we can identify and use the steps

S18: it was a bit confusing er:m

S20: until now?

S18: it was

Now I understand them well

S20: s: o why do you talk about the past?

S18: maybe er:m (. ) yeap because it's a reflection

and when you reflect you talk about everything

S20: what do you mean everything?

S18: li:ke the past, the present, the future and $ everything $

S17: I remember that
well, that is useful to understand the metaphor

what is a metaphor?
you don't [ know ] the meaning of metaphor?

[what ]
because I thought that metaphor was something else
Now I know that metaphor is something else

so you don't think about metaphor the same to before?
I mean your opinion or er:mm the paper says the views

of course, not

Now, maybe metaphor is my friend
Metaphor is not my enemy um::
You see what I'm doing ↑
$ I am using a metaphor $

we all use metaphors all the time
This is what I think now
More aware of them

your enemy? Maybe $ he is also a vampire $
I wonder if I use this metaphor, maybe my friends [ don't understand ]

[will find hard an:d ]

hehe hehe

< The enemy metaphor>
253 (0.9)
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Appendix 13: Transcripts of learners’ discussions – Group 3, Time 1

Group 3: Time 1

1. S08: I think it’s literal
2. because an apple or an orange is fruits
3. S09: I’m agree that an orange (.) number one is literal
4. S07: don’t what is metaphorical
5. What’s that?
6. S09: look (.) I find it in the dictionary
7. metaphorical (.)
8. (0.19)
9. S07: I think I can understand now
10. So: it mean anothers meaning ?
11. S09: something like [ that ]
12. S08: [ right ]
13. S07: so: let’s do the other ?
14. Number two?
15. S09: yes (.) number two
16. This is: our relationship is a: vo (.) voyage to the bottom of the sea
17. S08: what is being compared to ?
18. That’s the question
19. S09: i don’t know (.) er: the meaning of this word
20. S08: what ?
S09: the meaning of voyage
You know?
S07: I find it [here]
S08: [what]
S09: what is the meaning?
S07: it's a (.) wait
It's a type of journey
S09: a journey?
Like travelling?
S07: that's right =
S09: =ok
S08: s: o what is being compared?
S09: I think e: r it's a bad relationship =
S07: = yeap (.) not working
maybe this word have a positive and negative meaning
S09: s: o we must think in something positive now?
S07: I think so (.) maybe
S08: so this word has two meanings
S07: yeap (.) < maybe positive maybe negative >
the negative we have one (.)
the positive I $ don't know$
S08: maybe the positive mean that the relationship is working
The negative (.) the relationship is not working
S07: An: d the positive working
S08: erm:: maybe it mean [ thaa: t (.)
S09: [ don’t know
S07: I don’t think in the positive meaning
Because bottom mean down
S08: s: o the relationship is: no very good (.)
S07: I think the same (.)
S08: It has a positive meaning or not ?
S08: a positive meaning ?
S08: maybe (. ) the relationship is (. ) maybe:
S07: I think we do the other one (.) em: if we think in a positive meaning we do that
S08: em: the other one ?
S08: (0.19)
S07: erm: I don’t know (. ) meaning of this words (.)
S08: I don’t know (.)
S08: Use the dictionary
S07: I’m looking the words (.)
S08: (0.15)
S08: ok (. ) it’s here
can you read it ?
S08: yeap
S07: I understand the meaning
This is flip

Do you find it?

yeap (.) I find it here

This is the meaning

so now we must to think in the meaning of the sentence

she flipped her lid

maybe it's the meaning literal (.)

like erm:

like she has some lid (.) her eyes and flip it

or maybe her eyes are dirty like something

understand?

yeap (.) but I think it the meaning is something more

something more?

Like what?

don't know (.)

Maybe it's only her eyes dirty

or maybe something more

I think it something like a lid (.) she flip m: lid

ok I think we are going to do the next one

He really couldn’t swallow [ her argument ]

[ > argument < ]
S09: well (.) what is the sentence compared to?

S08: I mean (.) is it metaphorical or literal?

S08: maybe (.) he really couldn't swallow her argument "

Swallow is like (.) eat?

S09: yeap (.) when the food like:

S08: yeap (.) I know

S07: swallow ?

What is it being compared with?

I think we must to think in the sentence (.) this sentence

S08: of course ↓

I think the swallow is compared to the argument

S07: the: swallow is like going down (.) m::

Understand ?

I think it's like (.) when you swallow some food you like the food

S08: s: o it's like he like her argument ?

S07: I think that yes (.)

but also he take it (.) he take the argument

S07: s: o it's fine for him

S09: m: ↑

S09: s: o I think it's like he agree with the argument

S08: a: nd they will have the same idea or argument

S08: yes (.) yes (.) yes
They have the same opinion and argument because he take m: the argument

S09:  yeap (.) s : o the number five ?

S07:  ok

(0.25)

S09:  s : o metaphorical or literal ?

S08:  what is being compared to ?

That is the first question

S07:  I think it literal

S08:  why ?

Literal erm: I think is when the (.) that sentence has just one meaning

I mean (.) not just one meaning

S09:  no ↓

I think that if it’s even literal it can have (.) like more meaning

I mean < not just one> meaning

S08:  I think it’s [ metaphorical ] =

S09:  = I think literal

SS:  heh heh heh

S07:  $ the most people win $

S08:  $ majority $

S07:  I think it literal an: d (.)

because I can understand the meaning

S07:  something (.) sorry < sometimes > when I don’t understand the metaphorical
S08: well (.) I said metaphorical

Because I think it similar and the other one (.) buy the reasons he gave

I really think that: erm:

Buy means that: this is being compared to the reasons (.) I think

S09: so you say it’s literal

S07: yes (.) I think so

It’s very clear (.) I think

S09: so I think it not metaphorical

and maybe the word buy could be metaphorical

S09: of course

That’s what I think =

= that word is doing the sentence metaphorical

S07: erm: I think it’s not the sentence metaphorical

I think it’s only the word (.) not the sentence (.) I mean not all the sentence

S09: it’s all the sentence that is < metaphorical >

because you buy m: food for example when you go to the supermarket

but you not give no money arguments

S07: ok (.) now I think it’s probably the word

S08: < come on >

We say that it’s metaphorical (.) you $ must to buy it $

SS: heh heh heh

S07: I think you’re right=

= you erm: like not buy the argument
Because you don’t give any money

S08: s: o what is buy compared to?

I think the person deny the argument=

S07: = yeap

S08: is that agree or disagree?

S09: disagree

S07: disagree to the argument maybe
erm: buy?

You buy something and [ take something ]

S09: [ and go home ]

S07: s: o it’s metaphorical (.) then

S09: yeap =

= let’s do another?

S07: the number six

(0.27)

S07: I remember that I hear this sentence or phrase when I talking with a friend (.) a friend Australian

an :d I think it’s maybe metaphorical

S08: I think it maybe metaphorical but erm:

S07: but ? =

S08: = but I think it’s only one word metaphorical

m: it’s maybe this word (.) pain

S09: but if the word is maybe metaphor I think it’s the all the sentence

because the word is in the sentence
S08: ok (.) I understand that
but what the meaning ?
S07: he is a:
S09: he is a problem
S08: yeap (.) he is a: problem people
S07: a problem person
S08: yeap (.) trouble
S07: "he compared to problem person"
S08: he ?
S07: yeap (.) he's a pain the neck it means that he is the problem person
S08: o: h yeap (.)
the compared is he
S07: o : r maybe the pain in the neck is compared to: a:h a trouble maker
"he is a pain in the neck "
S09: ok (.) let's leave it
I think that's the meaning
My car is a lemon (( students read out the following sentence)
S07: maybe the colour
S08: m:
S07: it's yellow
S08: maybe the colour and the shape
lawn ? compare to ? =

S07: = colour

What is the relationship ?

a :: h erm:

S08: the relationship ?

erm: the car colour is yellow , like a lemon

S07: s : o the colour of the car is yellow

S08: "yeap () it's yellow "

Ok () erm: the other one ?

S07: the lawyer is a vampire

S08: uh:: ↑

$ Scary $

SS: heh heh heh

S08: it means scary

S09: scary ?

S08: yeap

S09: vampire

S08: it means a man who:: ()

scary

S09: maybe he charge too expensive fo: r () customers

S08: ah:

S07: the [ law =

S08: [ an then
S07: = the lawyers fee is too expensive
S09: vampire is compared to the ability of the lawyer am: [ make money ]
S08: [ exactly ]
T: s:o you’re saying that the lawyer charges a lot money ?
S08: yeap
I think is someone so scary erm::
T: so ugly th [a: t
S08: [ not ugly
T: s:o he looks like a vampire
S08: $ no: $
(0.28)
S09: s : o vampire compared to: (.) charge a lot of money
S08: yes
I think erm:
S08: I think so
S09: what relationship is in the metaphor ?
S08: the lawyer is: expensive to pay
S07: the lawyer's fee
S08: yea: p
to the customer (.)
S08: expensive to the (.) to the customer
S09: > no no <
Clients not the customers
the lawyer is too expensive to the clients

to his to her clients =

= to their clients

$ his or her $ ?

because we can say many lawyers s:o their

heh heh heh

ok (.) prices are going up=

= no (.) no

no ↑

I need to make an important decision

no ↑

the battle of cancer

cancer is compared to a battle

what’s the relationship established in the metaphor ?

erm : we must use different ways to attack cancer

and we have to defend our body from the damage of cancer

< we must use different ways to attack cancer and defend our body from the damage of cancer > ((

student writes out S09’s understanding of the metaphor))

the other one ?

ok
"stop attacking my arguments."

I think is the same erm: (.) not the same but similar the other one

which one?

the cancer uhm: the battle of cancer

It's metaphorical

I think so too

I think it means also interrupt

S: o it's not metaphor?

Yes or no?

I think so

Attack is compared to interrupt

I don't think the relationship is between attack and interrupt

I think it's a different comparison

what?

maybe disagree (.)

maybe the person that is attacking m: disagree with the arguments or the other person

I know the meaning of attack

But I don't know the other meanings $ in English $

So it means > disagree <

Yeap (.) disagree I think

refuse

yeap (.) maybe refuse the arguments

maybe that's the other meaning of attack in English
I'm just going to use my dictionary. Maybe somebody who disagree with my argument. [ I don't think interrupt. ]

The person is maybe somebody who still continues to interrupt and refuse my argument. I don't think.

I think we finish.

We have to do this. Come up with a metaphor that you know in your first language.

I don't know.

Time is money.

Heh heh heh.

Ka are you agree with Mike's metaphor?

We say time is money in every country.

I think in china we say also time is gold.

Good. Time is gold.

Ok. Explain.

Let me think.

Erm: you know. Gold is very expensive not like iron so I think it's a very value. Erm:

High value.

And time is the same. I think we always need more time.

Yeap. For write the essay.

Heh heh heh.
What about you?

S08: I think nobody knows the meaning.

I want to explain but it's very difficult to explain um:

S09: try=

S08: my face is like a moon

For example, you know that the moon is not m:

My skin is different from your skin

And my skin has different things

When I eat a lot of chocolate or nuts it makes me skin like this ( student has got some pimples on her face )

S09: sorry I can think about another silence is gold

I think this one is in Chinese and English ermm:

Well I don't know in English

Silence is gold

S07: and what it means?

S09: sorry I have another one in Chinese find a needle in the sea

S08: m: I understand

S07: the meaning of that is erm: something very difficult

S09: yeap

S07: oh my god too many metaphors

SS: heh heh heh
S08: I think the Chinese have too many metaphors
        Confucius is very important right?
S07: who?
S08: Confucius
S07: sorry I don’t understand
Appendix 14: Transcripts of learners’ discussions – Group 3, Time 2

Group 3: Time 2

1. S09: s:o this is the paragraph we have to analyse?
2. S07: yes
3. S08: yeap, It’s an extract
4. S09: it’s a paragraph
5. Enough for the application of .()
6. S07: I think the text is very short (.)
7. But not easy to look at the metaphors or the literal language
8. S09: so, we have to read the text and find metaphors using the steps or the procedure
9. ((student is referring to the MIP))
10. S07: that’s right
11. We need to apply all the steps to the: [this text]
12. S08: [extract]
13. S07: I think it’s not too difficult
14. S09: yes, that’s right
15. Maybe we could do it individual to see how many metaphors do you find and we find
16. S07: I think it would be better if we do it together
17. It is important that we can agree
18. If we do it together we can [ discuss ]
S09: we can work alone
And then discuss it together
S08: but it's important that we discuss the meaning of the metaphor
Because my ideas and your ideas are very important for having a general idea
S09: that's a good idea
Of course we have to discuss all together
It's group work
S07: I found some metaphors in the paragraph
S09: how many did you find?
S08: I think I found about four
S07: four?
S08: yes
Why?
Not enough?
S07: I have six
S09: I’m < counting the metaphors > I think I have
S08: I have two
S07: so that means that I don’t see metaphors
SS: hehe hehe hehe
S09: I think it means that we interpret metaphors in a different way
Or maybe we understand the metaphors from (.) like a literal point of view
We could have the same metaphors but different meanings
S08: yeap, maybe it’s only about interpretation
I think that the mip is more helpful for telling us how to find the metaphors
S07: don’t understand
S09: for example we can have six or seven metaphors all of us
But we can have different like (.) <interpretations> of the metaphors
S08: of course
And that couldn’t be incorrect
S09: maybe a metaphor for me is not a metaphor for you but is a metaphor for me
S:o discussion is very important

S07: I think the only metaphors is opponent and conquer
S08: I got four
S07: and me six
I also have opponent and conquer
S08: me too
I also have struggle, fit, wear,
S09: I have struggle, fit, wear, thick, cut down
M: sop I have seven I think
S07: I have fit, struggle and cut down
This is my first impression about the words

S09: so here it says that we have to follow the steps of the (.) <MIP >, identify the part of
speech, match with their concrete meaning with the contextual meaning and yeap
S07: I think we can look for the meanings in the dictionary
And then we discuss all this together

S08: [ ok
S08: [ that's ok
(1.11)

((students look up their words in the dictionaries which they will discuss together once they have finished))

S07: I think the meaning of struggle is not a metaphor
The first meaning of the dictionary that gives the dictionary is a difficult experience or something difficult to do
I thought that the meaning or the concrete meaning was like a fight
S08: maybe we need to look at the context
What's before and after the word?
Struggle what? Ok, her accent?
S07: s:o is it metaphorical?
S08: maybe just literal
S09: I think so
But that's the meaning of the dictionary
S:o it's not metaphorical
Because I think in the text the word is talking about a difficult (.) like something difficult for Gandhi
Maybe the struggle is about try to be accepted by people
S07: struggle for me is li:ke a problem
S:o maybe it's not metaphorical in this context
S08: er:m I think, thought that meaning was metaphorical
is the word an noun or a verb in the paragraph?

it's a (. ) verb

so the word is literal

If I compare the word with the context in the paragraph=

e yap

She struggled to convince (.)

She had or experience difficulty

yeap, the difficulty is the problem she has

S:o again it's not metaphor

yeap, probably that's the meaning

don't forget that we also need look at the part of speech

Also we have to try (. ) try to discuss the two (. ) er:m

What are the names?

The target an:d the (. )

source and target domains

s:o we need to talk about these two domains

And also m: we need to identify how are these applied

that's right

And see the metaphorical [ meaning or literal meaning ]

[source and target do:mains]

what's the meaning of domain by the way?

Do you know?
S07: yeap
I think the same thing
When I hear the word struggle or opponent I relationship with a war
S09: yeap, it’s useful to think about the concrete and abstract
And the also discuss the source and target
S07: maybe that’s the origin of the word
Well not the word but the use or the meaning of the word
S09: another word that I found is fit
I think is metaphorical
And the meaning of the dictionary is relate to healthy or in good condition
S08: I go to the gym to be fit

But the context in the text is different

S07: that's what I say before

We must look the context of the word and follow the steps

S09: yeap

I think the source domain is the physical condition

When we think about exercise, gym, and things like that

It's that meaning that we must to applicable to this context

The context is about be fit to wear the mantle

S08: I think fit means be ready, good condition, healthy

But not literally (.) metaphorical

S07: yeap, I think the sourcer domain gives an idea for the other

M: think it's metaphor too

S09: s:o here we have two domains

In my opinion one domain is concrete and the other abstract

The concrete is about the physical condition, exercise, gym and stuff like that

And the other is about be politically, emotionally, psychologically ready for the position

maybe

S08: another word is wear

Well, this word is a verb

and I think we have to connect it with the noun mantle, wear the mantle

S07: in the beginning didn’t know the meaning of that word, mantle

S09: Now I think I know

S:o fit to wear the: mantle
Kind of interesting, you think?

what's the meaning of the mantle?

I think it's like a: something you wear

I found it in the dictionary

And it's the responsibility someone takes in an important position

so wear the mantle is like wear the responsibility

that's what we have to do

We have to discuss the meaning of wear

When you wear something is because you put something on your body

yeap

You put on a jacket

And you wear the jacket

° a mantle °

so I think wear the mantle means that someone put on [the responsibility]

[the work and]

ok

And the other word?

which one?

I also have conquer

I think the meaning of conquer is metaphorical in the text

The context is that she conquer her accent

m: I < I think conquer> is: related war, battle, and fight
This is probably the real, m: not the real but the literal meaning

This is in my opinion

S07: conquer her accent?

Er:m, I see

Maybe the meaning of the source domain is like gain control?

S09: maybe conquer her accent?

I think she probably has to dominate

You know when soldiers conquer a country

They dominate and posses the land

S08: I think the literal or concrete meaning is like taking possession of something

For example when someone conquer a country or land

They take possession of everything

And as you say gain control of people, land, and other stuff

S07: so the source domain is gain control of a land

And the target domain is gain control of her accent?

S09: I understand this like (.)

When people try to speak with a more native English accent

S:o what’s really the source and target domain?

S07: "one is concrete and the other one abstract " =

S09: maybe the source and target is the literal conquer of land into the metaphorical conquer of accent

I can see two domains here
is not a metaphor ]

[ I think literal the sentence ]

yeap

Number three say

Does the conventional meaning apply to the context?

I think yes

what's the <conventional> meaning ?

remember is the [ not the abstract, like m:]

[the meaning is familiar]

remember

the other word? =

=conquer

conquer

Conquer is maybe like a war or a colony

You know when persons colony a country=

=I'm looking in the dictionary

"conquer"

do you see the [ movie ]

[I found it]

Conquer is take control or possession of fo (.) foreign land

I tell you that it's like colony a country

what type of word is ?

I mean in the text
S01: a verb

S03: maybe this is like the other one

Like the example [ before in the text ]

S01: [I remember the wear ]

S03: yeap

We must to see the phrase or the sentence

S01: er:m

Conquer (.) what ?

S02: it say that to conquer her thick foreign accent

S01: conquer her thick ?

What is sick ? thick ?

S02: this is thick

This dictionary for example

S01: ok m: ↑

S03: a verb and conquer the accent

I am sure that the word is metaphor here

Because it say that control a land

S02: [understand but ]

Maybe she want be a leader in other country

And she must conquer a land

S03: maybe

But read the text
It say that his accent =
= her accent has to conquer she

S02: s: o the convention meaning not apply
S03: conventional meaning ? =
S02: =yeap
S02: no apply here
Because it's land the convention
and here in the text talking about her sick accent =
>thick accent <
S03: s: o what's the target and source [ do: ( ) ]
S01: [domain]
So the source is control of land
Like the land is mine now
A :nd the target is ?
S03: the target is the accent
The sick accent
SS: hehe hehe hehe
S03: thick accent
S01: s :o source control land and target accent
What is the metaphor then?
S03: the qualities o :r what’s the word Leonardo say ?
S01: fea : ( ) features
S03: what features can we see from source? =
control, possess, mine, < domi: (. ) domination? >

ok

Is these features apply for this context?
The accent

this is ready?

think yes

the another sentence or word

I have thick

I can look this one

ok

the mean is here

It say that having a large distance between two side

what?

like (. ) this is thick

tall?

nop

Look in Chinese

thick accent?

maybe a thick dictionary
299 but a thick accent?

300 S03: ok

301 I got it

302
Appendix 15: Transcripts of learners’ discussions – Group 3, Time 3

Group 3: Time 3

1. maybe the procedure was a bit confused for me
2. S07: confuse?
3. S09: yeap (.) it was confuse because (.)
4. Well I understand it now
5. But maybe in the beginning it was a little er:m hard
6. S08: I think it is easy but very good because I can understand the metaphors better
7. S07: but (.) what about in the text?
8. S08: in the text?
9. S07: can you find the metaphors in the text now?
10. S08: I think I can understand the metaphors more and (.) =
11. S09: =me too (.) the metaphors are more er:m
12. I think I can see the like (.) connection in one target and source
13. S08: yeap, that was useful
14. The relation between the source and target an:d
15. What was the word?
16. S07: what word?
17. S08: source and target what?
18. S09: domain
19. S08: yeap, that’s the word
S09: the source and target domain was very interesting for see what I can take from one side to understand the metaphor in the other side
Also the source and target is good for identify the things that is metaphorical
S08: yeap, that’s what I think
Remember when we had to m: the intuition for identify the metaphors in the text?
S08: yeap, of course=
S07: I didn’t know the meaning of intuition in English
$ So I had to find that word in the dictionary first $ 
SS: hehe hehe hehe
S08: so you wanted to see if the word is a metaphor?
S07: $ yeap $ 
S09: so, what do you think about this procedure to understand the texts?
Do you think is good?
S08: I think it is good an: and very useful maybe if you follow everything
Because I think some parts are more interesting than another
S07: which one do you think is more interesting?
S08: I think the intuition part and when you compare the meaning of the dictionary and the meaning in the text
S09: I think is more interesting when you try to find some relationship or what was the word?
Er:m maybe the repetition of the metaphor
S08: or find some like (.) the same conceptual metaphors in the text
Because I remember that in the text there were different words that talk about the same metaphor
You know what I mean?
S07: yeap
I don't remember any example now but yeap, I remember some metaphors=

=ok, maybe all that words about mountain, going up and up were different words that have the same metaphor

Is that ok?

S08: I think so

S08: I think the procedure will be good for another texts too

Now I believe that the metaphors is many texts

I know that in my language we use a lot the metaphors

But I didn’t know that in English is the same

S07: now when I will read something I will think about the metaphors

SS: hehe hehe hehe

S07: I think I will see the metaphors in all the texts

S09: yea, but it was very good I think

And do you remember the target and the other one?

I think that can help also

Because we talk about one thing [ using other elements]

S08: [ the other domain ]

So, we use two domains in the metaphor

S09: I know that now

S07: I remember when I did the test

Do you remember the [ reading test ] the first day?

S08: [of course ]

That was oh my god!
I think it was so hard because of the metaphors
also I didn't know so many words in the text
And many metaphors that I didn't understand in the text
But the procedure I think was good for understanding the metaphors
I think so too

S09: do you er:m (.) can you see identify more metaphors now?
I mean after the procedure, can you see more metaphors in the text?

S07: I understood that the metaphors are in different places
I think I can see metaphors in texts, in books and many other places
Before I think that metaphor was more like (.) =

S08: =like the metaphors we had to learn in poetry at school
This is what I thought that metaphors were
I had the same idea
I always thought that metaphors were that things that you found in like (.) Shakespeare texts

S08: I remember when I had to say poems at school
hehe hehe hehe
maybe I used a lot of metaphors when I say those poems
$ I don't remember $

S09: honestly I think I can get more ideas from the text with the steps of the thing
I mean the procedure
It's interesting to use the intuition for the identifying the metaphors
And also to see how the meaning change when you see the dictionary
S07: I think that's good too

Because I use the dictionary a lot

And I wanted to use the dictionary when I was reading the text the first day

S08: yeap

(0.34)

S07: now we see that the dictionary is not good always

I mean the meaning of the dictionary is kind of special

We need to look for the right meaning

S08: yeap, because we could look for the incorrect meaning

For example the word mountain in the text

S09: we know the meaning of that word

But what is the meaning in the [ text ]?

S07: [yeap]

Sometimes it is very difficult to say what is the meaning in the text

Because the dictionary in those cases is confusing

When you want the meaning of a metaphor

S09: s:o sometimes it look easy

Because the word can be know for us but not the metaphor meaning

S07: what?

S09: yeap, like the example I give you

The mountain

Do you know the word mountain?

S07: of course

367
S09: did you know the meaning in the text?
S07: not really
S09: that's what I'm saying
S08: but the method that Leonardo teach us is good for this
      It's good for identify the metaphors and the things like
      Like the secret meanings
SS: hehe hehe hehe
S09: maybe you mean like the source and target
S08: exactly
S07: that's when you can know the relation between one word and the other
S09: yeap, the meanings from one domain to another domain
S07: wow
S07: You learned something
S09: $ yeap $
Appendix 16: Responses to journal entries - first instance (T1)

Journal entries – Time 1 (JE- T1)

S01 (Jo)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

*I think it’s difficult to say, maybe a bit confused so far. I don’t understand the metaphor very good.*

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

*I think I can know what is a metaphor and maybe see the metaphor in the text but the mip is maybe a little confusing. I think is easy but I can’t connection with the text.*

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

*mmm… I think metaphor sometimes is very difficult to understand because the meaning is not the same you have in the dictionary.*

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

*Nop. I think metaphors are complicate and don’t make understand texts. I would like to understand metaphors and texts.*
Journal entries – Time 1 (JE- T1)

S02 (Tom)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

mmm... it was easy in the beginning but when I have to use the application in the text I can’t. I liked when I had to use my intuition for identify the metaphors in the text. It’s good that we can use our knowledge.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

Difficult because it still don’t understand the MIP very well, but I think it is maybe the... when I compare the meaning of the word in the text with the meaning in the dictionary, sometimes I use the dictionary too much.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

In the beginning I thought that metaphors were very difficult specially in english but now I think that they are not very difficult because I am beginning to understand some metaphors in the text.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Maybe I am beginning to understand the metaphors more, maybe they will help me to understand the texts more. But now I think metaphors are not very difficult
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

*I think the mip is very important because it help you to looking for the metaphors in the text. It is a little difficult for me because I think that the metaphors are very difficult*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

*When I was going to use my knowledge for looking metaphors in the text, I think that was good. Sometimes I think that metaphors are difficult but when I analyse the metaphors, sometimes I see that it is not very difficult, so my knowledge help me analyse the metaphors.*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

*I think metaphors are more in different places, not in the formal texts only but in other kind of things, maybe like books, newspapers, and texts that we are going to use in the university. In the past I thought that metaphors was only in the poems.*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

*Not very much now*
Journal entries -Time 1 (JE-T1)
S04 (Michelle)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

when the teacher gave me the paper for that I can identify the metaphors in the text I thought that I am going to die, hehehe... it was difficult, the metaphor are difficult but the first class with the MIP was cool because I can understand something

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I think all of them was useful to understand the metaphors. My opinion is that now I can identify more metaphors in something, maybe the metaphor and the meaning of the metaphor.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

Maybe a little. Don’t know. I don’t know the meaning of the question!! Views?

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Maybe I can understand metaphors a little more but maybe in the future I will can understand the text with the metaphors.
Journal entries -Time 1 (JE-T1)
S05 (Paul)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

it is confusing and I think I can’t understand the metaphor in the paragraph that we have to read… the test was too hard for me. I think I understood 10 %.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I don’t know, maybe one of the aspect was when I was reading the text again and looking for metaphors, and then later compare the meaning with the meaning of the dictionary.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

It’s confusing still I think and I hope that I can understand more metaphors in another class. But I think that the metaphors could help me understand many things in the texts or any kind of texts.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Maybe the metaphors could help me to understand the metaphorical meaning in another classes.
Journal entries -Time 1 (JE-T1)
S06 (Jason)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

Before the MIP I find useful the things that the teacher say about the conceptual metaphor and source and target. I think that help me more for understand a metaphor, but the MIP was good because it was very clear.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I think all the steps are very good for understanding the meaning of the metaphor. The teacher said that there are more steps so I hope that they are usefull too.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

So, before the mip I thought that the metaphors was only like... I could find them only in the books about literature or maybe like the poems I had to learn in primary or senior school. I think they are more familiar than my old opinion.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

I think I can understand the texts a little more than in the beginning. The three steps that we studied are very useful and I think the meaning of the text is starting to be more clear for me.
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

*I hope that I will understand more the next class. Bye*

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

*I hope I will understand more the next class. It looks easy, I mean the steps of the mip, but I can’t find the way for applying that on the text, don’t know.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

*Not very much, I think metaphors and meaning is difficult for understanding.*

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

*Nop.*
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

*I don’t understand the name conceptual metaphor and the other names like... sources and I forgot the other one, but I think the things we discuss today about the MIP was very useful because I could read the text again.*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

*I think that when I read the text for the second time I could realise that there was metaphors really in the text, then Leonardo and according to the procedure I could use the dictionary to check the meaning.*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

*I think metaphors are very useful because the try to express the meaning in a different way.*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

*Maybe I need to read the text again and study all the steps before I say if I can understand more or not.*
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

* I think the most important thing for me is when I have to use my institution for looking for metaphors. That is important because everyone have the idea of the metaphor, may be wrong idea but something.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

* Like I said before I think it was when I used my intuition for finding metaphors in the text. So far I think I can identify some and compare the meaning with the dictionary. Sometimes the meaning is not the same but I have a general idea.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

* I can say that metaphors are more common than I was thinking before. I thought always that metaphors were more like those things that you read in books.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

* I think that If I compare the way I read the text for the first time and when I read it for the second time, I think I understood more the second time because I was more conscious about the words that probably were metaphors.
Journal entries -Time 1 (JE-T1)
S10 (Robert)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

I’m not quite sure about which aspect because I’m just being more familiar with all the things. I am hoping to understand more when I really practice more the steps.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I think I am becoming more aware simply because I have read the text for the second time and because I had the time to try to identify metaphors by myself.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

Because I’m not very sure about the steps and which one is helping to understand metaphors more, I think that I still have the same opinion about the metaphors.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

I think that because I am a little more aware about the metaphors, I maybe understand more metaphors.
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

Still don’t understand it very much, maybe next class. The metaphor is confusing and I think I can’t understand the metaphor in the paragraph that we have to read... the test was too hard for me, I think I understood 10 %

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

I’m not sure if I’m more aware of metaphors now, but I think metaphors are difficult.

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

No change to now, because metaphors is very difficult to understand

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

My opinion is that my reading is not better at the moment, maybe I need to wait and see if we do the test again in another classes and probably I can understand more
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

Maybe it’s a simple thing, but for me it was good to read the text again because I saw that many words are metaphor, when I was reading the text for the first time I didn’t see this, I just said ‘oh, this is a very difficult text’.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I think that all are good. When I read the text again, I notice that could identify metaphors, or maybe words that are metaphors, and also when I had to use my knowledge for identify. That was good.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I can identify metaphors, I mean words that are maybe metaphors.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

I don’t know but I think I will understand metaphors and the text with the metaphors if study the mip more deeply.
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

I still don't understand it, metaphor and the MIP very much

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

More aware? I think all of them, when I read the text for the second time, use my understanding for seeing the metaphors, and when I used the dictionary

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think that metaphors are more natural, and more common.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

A little more.
Journal entries - Time 1 (JE-T1)
S14 (Serena)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

Maybe nothing, I'm still trying to understand the relation between the steps and understand the text. I want to understand the text and I don’t know how this mip can help me to do that.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I think it was a bit confusing.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think metaphors can be nice but the meaning is difficult to understand.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Not in this moment. The steps, maybe I need to study them more deeper for understanding the texts more.
Journal entries - Time 1 (JE-T1)
S15 (Nick)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

I think the MIP can be very good but I feel very confused in the beginning and I still feel confused. I would like to know more about it.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I think all the steps help me to become more aware about the metaphors, but I think that more steps can help me more. I am waiting for the others.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think that metaphors can be very helpful for understanding difficult meanings.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Not very much
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

*I think it was everything, all the steps I mean the three has helped me to understand at least the meaning of the word metaphor, I am not sure if I can identify more metaphors now but hopefully in the future.*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

*All the steps are really good for my understanding. My understanding is very general but I think the when I looked for the words in the dictionary was good because I compared the meaning and also when I used my intuition to look for the metaphors.*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

*I think metaphors are important in every kind of language. I need to study them more to have a more specific idea.*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

*Maybe not now, but I think that they will help me in the future.*
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

_The metaphors is very difficult and maybe a bit confused for me. I don’t understand the metaphors very well._

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

_I found the meanings in the dictionary and found that some of the meanings was not the same to my understanding._

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

_I think that metaphors are more interesting, in the past I thought that they were difficult, not I think they are not very difficult and interesting._

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

_I think I can understand metaphors a little more but I am not sure I can understand more the texts._
Journal entries - Time 1 (JE-T1)
S18 (Jack)

1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

_The metaphors in the text are very difficult but I think they can be important for me because they could help me to understand other meanings and maybe the text._

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

_I’m very excited about this process. I want to learn more about this. I think all the steps can help me a lot in my understanding of the meaning._

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

_I think all the metaphors have a lot of meaning and we need some strategies to find those meanings. The mip can be one strategy to find those meanings._

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

_I hope they can help me understand my poems._
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

*I don’t understand the name conceptual metaphor and the other names like... sources and I forgot the other one, but I think the things we discuss today about the MIP was very important and very useful because I could understand a bit more. I think that this important because the metaphors are important for understanding other things*

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

*Don’t know*

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

*I think it will take me a long time to understand the metaphors in the texts*

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

*Because I think metaphors are very difficult, I think they will not help me understand the text that I want to read or that I have to read.*
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

The MIP is a good technique for identifying the metaphors in the text but in my case I think that the intuition part of the MIP was more useful, I think the others are like slow to follow and common sense.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

The intuition part was good because I could see that I also have an idea about the metaphors and how I can identify the metaphors. I think this made me more aware about the metaphors.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think I am more aware about the metaphors since I start to use my intuition in the exercise in the beginning.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

I think the metaphors will help me understand texts more, but I have to work harder to understand what is a metaphor.
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

*I think the MIP is important for me to understand texts, and I think I have to start using this steps for me to see if they work in the texts*

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

*I think all the steps help me to be more aware about the metaphors because when I looked a word in the dictionary I noticed that the meaning was the same or in some cases was different*

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

*I think metaphors are very important to understand all kind of speeches and texts*

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

*I need to practise for seeing if they can help me to understand more texts*
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

I really like the steps and the MIP. I think it can help me to make my understanding more broader, my understanding of metaphor.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I think all the steps can be very helpful for understanding the meaning of the metaphors. In particular, I think it was useful for me looking for the part of the speech because I realise that most words use as metaphors are nouns or adjective, and maybe verbs.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think that metaphors are profound because it’s like there’s a lot hiding behind the word and you have to be able to discover that.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

They have helped me to understand the meaning of words but not texts, maybe if I read a text next class, I’ll see.
Journal entries - Time 1 (JE-T1)
S23 (Mike)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

I don’t know, I feel a little strange about the MIP because I would like to know more but I think I scared a little because it could be more difficult.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

Maybe all of them help me for understanding and more aware of the metaphors but I think I could be more aware in the other classes. I think the dictionary help me for identifying the metaphors and know the meaning, be more aware of the meaning.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

Metaphors I think are more important for me, and I think that the meaning of the metaphors I can understand it more after the steps.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Mmm, I don’t know because I think I have use the steps in a text, maybe we are going to do this in the next class.
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

The MIP was very important because it can help me understand the meaning of the metaphors more than before.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

In the beginning I didn’t know the meaning of the intuition so I didn’t know how to do that, but then when I find it in the dictionary I thought I was good for understanding the metaphor with my knowledge.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think metaphors are not very difficult now and I could understand the meaning more easy with the MIP.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Leonardo say that we are going to work in a text the next class so I hope I will understand it now.
Journal entries - Time 1 (JE-T1)
S25 (Ali)

1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

*When I think about my learning or my awareness about metaphor, I don’t know. Maybe next class or later I can notice more metaphors.*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

*Don’t know what help me because I still don’t understand*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

*They don’t change, I don’t like metaphors*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**
Appendix 17: Responses to journal entries -second instance (T2)

Journal entries -Time 2 (JE-T2)
S01 (Jo)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

I think that metaphors are not very difficult, they are very interesting and discover the meaning you can get of it. The MIP help me to understand the relationships in the metaphors and discover the meanings.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

Maybe all the steps were very good for me understanding the meanings, and also the dictionary, the intuition, the connection, and all that. When I see a word now I think if it is a metaphor.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

My opinion about metaphors is that it is interesting, I am more aware of the metaphors and I think that we can understand more things if we understand the metaphors.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

When I read the text for the second time, it was like a different text because I could understand more, and get the more meaning. My idea about the metaphors is maybe very different than my idea in the beginning because now I can see that metaphors are very useful and not difficult. Also I can understand that metaphors help me to understand many other things like, other words or maybe other text.
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

All the things were important, since the beginning. But now I can understand more because the MIP is more... like I understand it more.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

The MIP was a interesting thing for understand and be more aware about the metaphors, maybe all the steps was important, the identify the parts, nouns and that, intuition, the context meaning, and all that.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think that metaphors we can find them in all texts and we need a little time to understand them and find the relationship in the metaphor

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Yes, they help me understand the source and target of the metaphors. I think this relationship is important for get the meaning
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**  
   
   *The mip was important because I can understand the metaphors now and when I read the text I think I can obtain the meaning more, maybe more than in the past.*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**  
   
   *All the steps was very useful for understanding, the looking for the nouns and adjectives, the knowledge of intuition, the relationships in the context, and all that was important. I think I am more aware about the metaphors because the mip help me for that.*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**  
   
   *My views about the metaphors are more clear because in the past I thought that metaphors were very difficult but now I think the are ok, specially because of we have the mip for understanding.*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**  
   
   *yes, they help me the understanding of the text, it was and what a relieve when I understood that difficult text*
Journal entries - Time 2 (JE-T2)
S04 (Michelle)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

I can say that now the mip is very good, for the identify the metaphors and for the understanding the text, so I like it and I think is very good.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

Everything and all the things was important but the thing that I like more was when I compare the meaning with the context in the text, that was good because I saw that my meaning was not the same for the text in some case.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think that I am more aware about the metaphors and think that the metaphors are not so difficult or strange, because that’s what I thought, I want to find more metaphors in the text now

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

They have help me for understand the text, I think that the main objective for me is for understand the metaphor but is more important for understand the text and I think I can understand it more
Journal entries -Time 2 (JE-T2)

S05 (Paul)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

It’s not very confusing like I feel in the beginning so the mip is important for understanding but I think I can need more practice

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I think it was all but interesting when I use the dictionary for the basic and concrete meaning, sometimes the words are different when you use the dictionary

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

The change in my views is that I feel that metaphors is not difficult, I think we need to be patient to look for the meaning and do the mip

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Yes, I can understand the text more now, was good the mip
Journal entries -Time 2 (JE-T2)
S06 (Jason)

1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

   *In general the mip was very good. I like it and I think it could be very good for reading other texts/**

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

   *I like the intuition exercise, the compare task, and the basic meaning thing, all this things were very good for me understand the process of the metaphor*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

   *I think that the words that I see now I think they are metaphor because I can think more critical now*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

   *I think a little more but the mip was useful*
Journal entries -Time 2 (JE-T2)
S07 (Sue)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

Some classes ago I thought that the mip could not help but now I think it has helped for understand the meaning of the metaphors and also I think is helping to understand the text.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

All. It was everything that is good for me understand the meaning and be more aware about the metaphors, maybe the first one, when I look for the words in the text, then when I use my intuition, when I compare the meaning, everything.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

The metaphors are more important for me now. I think they are in the texts and we have to learn them to understand the meaning.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

not very well, but definitely mucho more than the beginning, when I read the text in the first class.
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

Now I understand the words and all that with the metaphors, the mip is very good for and I think for all the students, I think I would like to know more about them.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I am more aware about the metaphors because I understand most steps from the mip. I think it was important for me the comparison, when I have to think about the context meaning and others. I think metaphors we can find it in many texts and I will see them more easy.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

English was always a little difficult for me so I never thought that I can understand metaphors in english, but now I can say that the metaphors is in everything and probably in pictures and stuff like that.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Yes
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

*For me it was important that I see that the mip can help me with the texts.*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

*I think everything help me be more aware about metaphors, the context comparison, the concrete meaning, the source, the dictionary, and everything.*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

*The metaphors are very important in language and in all languages, now I can see that there are many metaphors in my language and that many in english too.*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

*I think that I read more slowly because I am looking for metaphors all the time, but I can understand more the meaning.*
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

   *I like the idea that we have something for understand the metaphors. The mip is important for my learning.*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

   *Maybe in the beginning found that not many aspects were important but now I think that is important to think about metaphors more that’s why I am more aware.*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

   *The metaphors are good and interesting for even understand the culture of one country, because in my country we have a lot metaphors.*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

   *Texts have many metaphors and the text that we read in the class were with many metaphors, and I think I understand more*
Journal entries - Time 2 (JE-T2)

S11 (Kevin)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

My opinion about the mip is that I need it for understanding the text difficult that I have to read.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

More aware of the metaphors... maybe the beginning and all of this because I thin that metaphors are more important, that we can see them everywhere in the texts

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think that now I can understand the metaphors more, I thought that the metaphor were difficult but now I think that you have to understand them and the relation in the metaphor and its good because I guess I also can understand more words in the text and maybe another text too

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Yes, more understand the texts and the metaphors
Journal entries - Time 2 (JE-T2)
S12 (Rich)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

I want to learn more about the mip and I would like to use in another ways and texts. I think all the mip is important.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

Maybe the three that could be more useful for me is: look for the words, the part of the speech, use your intuition, and the comparison with the context. This help me more aware about the metaphors.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think the they are more like containing some other meanings and we have to take them to understand the metaphor, is not difficult but the mip can help us.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

I think so, but I would like to use more texts, and find metaphors for understand the text
Journal entries -Time 2 (JE-T2)

S13

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

*I think the mip is very profound and we need more time and more practice for understand all. But I find interesting and good.*

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

*I can find more metaphors in the text because I am more aware about them, and the steps help me for this, all the steps.*

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

*In my opinion the metaphors is important for understanding and thinking about more deeper things, like other meanings.*

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

*Yes, I can understand more texts but I need more time*
Journal entries - Time 2 (JE-T2)
S14 (Serena)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

I think I understand more than before because I learn all the mip but I feel happy because I know I can understand more metaphors

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

More aware because I used the steps for learning more about the text that we have to read. I am more aware and the metaphors are more friendly for me now.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the Second time?

Metaphors are more friendly for me and I don’t think they are any more difficult.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

I never thought that I could understand the meaning of words like mountain or battle, some words in the text, I think that maybe I couldn’t think about the metaphor in this words, but now I can understand the words in the text that is or have a metaphor meaning.
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

I remember that in the beginning I felt very confused about the metaphors and the mip, but I feel much better now because they are not very difficult.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

Specifically I think I used more the dictionary for compare the meaning with the text, I was more aware that sometimes the meaning was a metaphor because the dictionary help me.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I like metaphors now because they can express many ideas about something, sometimes it can be something difficult but the metaphors help you understand.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

I think so, when I read the texts I think that I was using the steps and they help me to get the meaning.
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

   *The mip is important tool for seeing the meaning of the metaphor and for understanding the text, its really good*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

   *All the aspects helped me for understand. I think that I am more aware about the metaphors because the intuition, the comparison, the concrete and source and target are very good things for understanding what there is in a metaphor*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

   *It's interesting for me to talk about the metaphor because I think that I think a bit different now about the metaphors. Maybe the good thing about this technique is that I have more skills about reading and maybe about writing too*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

   *I understand more the text that Leonardo gave us for read so the mip is good and I recommend.*
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

*I think the mip can be very good but I think it was not clear in the beginning. Maybe I didn’t give much attention to the stuff but I think it can be good for understanding the words in the text.*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

*Many aspects help me to understand and for be more aware about the metaphors. The part of the speech, the comparison, the dictionary, and all that*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

*The metaphors is more present in the language of people, not only in the books or in the poems because I thought that before.*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

*I think a little more understanding.*
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

All the mip is very important because I not only can understand the poems that I like but also the texts and any other texts that has probably metaphors.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

The mip is interesting, maybe in the beginning I didn’t like it because I thought was too simple but now I think that my skills can be much more better than before because I could be able to understand more.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

My opinion about the metaphors is change a lot because in the beginning I thought I only understood metaphors in the poetry but now I think that metaphors is in more many places than poetry.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

They are helping me to understand more the different texts, in my house I practice for understanding metaphors, I try to read the newspaper and find some metaphors.
Journal entries - Time 2 (JE-T2)
S19 (Sally)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

It was difficult for me understand the mip since the beginning but now I can say that is very good and useful because it help me be more aware and understand texts.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

It was difficult in the beginning but now think that most of these things help for understand and be more aware about the metaphors. I think I am more aware about the things that is metaphors.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I thought that metaphor could not help me to do so many things like understanding other words and language in general because we can learn more things about language if we study metaphors.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

I can understand texts more, but it was difficult but now is more easy for me I think.
**Journal entries - Time 2 (JE-T2)**

S20 (Rey)

1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

   *In general the mip was very good for realising that the metaphors are very interesting and that we can identify them to understand the meaning of them.*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

   *I think all the parts were very good for understanding and for be more aware about the metaphors. I am more aware about the metaphors because the comparison, the dictionary, the nouns identificating were very good steps.*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the Second time?**

   *My views and opinions about metaphors are different because I think the metaphors are more easy for understand and that they can help me learn new things, new meanings, and new texts.*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

   *Yes, they help me to understand the texts more deeply*
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

maybe the mip can help me for understanding the language of a country and much more than that, for example I can probably understand the customs, or the way people believe about something, I think that my knowledge about things can be different with understanding metaphors.

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

All the aspects were very helping for me to get the meaning of the metaphors and to be more aware about the metaphors, I think the metaphors are more clear for me because I am more aware.

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

The metaphors I can find them in different places so my views is that metaphors are very important in every thing for communicating and speaking about special things.

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

Yes, I think that the exercises that I did was very good for to see that I can understand more.
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

When I practice more the mip I find that this is more helpful for understanding the meaning of the metaphors, I think is a very good thing for understanding the texts.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

Probably some of the step that was more important for me was the first ones when I had to identify the words, then look for the meaning in the dictionary and one of the last when I had to compare the meaning with the dictionary and the context.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think more optimistic about the metaphors because when I began to work with the metaphors I thought that they were more boring and difficult to understand. I think they can give us a lot of meaning.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Yes, they can help to understand the texts but I would like to practice more for learning this better.
Journal entries -Time 2 (JE-T2)
S23 (Mike)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

The mip was a bit difficult for me in the beginning but now I feel that I can understand more and that the meaning of the metaphor are more ok with me. The mip is a very good thing for me to identify more things in the texts

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I am more aware about the metaphors but in the beginning I was not very aware, I can say that now I can see more metaphors and that the steps, maybe all the steps can help me to do that. My awareness is I think higher than that class when I did the tests in the first time. I think that I can think more about metaphors and when I read something I am more aware about something if it’s a metaphor

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think I can see metaphors as something good, not difficult, and something that can help me to read more difficult texts for me to understand.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

When I read the text in the second time, I felt really happy because I could understand more than the first time
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

This process of the mip help me for identify metaphors and understand the meanings of the metaphors

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

It was a bit difficult for me in the beginning but now I feel that I can get much more from the texts and this is because I am more aware about the metaphors. The steps has help me understand this.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I see metaphors like something that can help me reveal the meanings that I can not understand when I don’t know the metaphors (I hope that you understand my ideas), is like looking for something deep in the word

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

It’s very interesting to feel that the texts are more easy to understand since I understood the steps
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

In the beginning I didn’t like the metaphors but I think that now I can like them more and more because I realise that the metaphors are not very difficult, when I read the text the first day I had a headache, I didn’t like that.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I understand the metaphors more, and this is good for me because my opinion is not the same and I can see the meaning of the metaphors in the words when I identify them.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the Second time?

My views change because in the past I thought that they were boring and difficult, but now I think that they can be good for understanding the language.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Yes, more than in the beginning.
Appendix 18: Responses to journal entries – third instance (T3)

Journal entries -Time 3 (JE-T3)
S01 (Jo)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

*When I think about the process of the mip, I think I can learn much more and understand more the texts that I will have to read on the future. I like and I would like it for practice more.*

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

*All was very important, even the conversations with the teacher, sometimes I didn’t understand very much and Leonardo help me with that, all the steps was very good for that, and for learning the metaphors. I think I am more and more aware about the metaphors because I can understand more.*

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

*I think metaphors are more interesting, they are not only interesting but also very deep because they can help deep my thinking about language and meaning of the metaphors.*

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

*Yes, they help me to understand more the texts, I think I can read more and understand more*
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

The mip change my opinion about language and about the metaphors because before I think that metaphors I couldn’t understand them but now the mip can relieve me more

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

I am more aware about the metaphors now and more than before because the steps help me be more aware, I think I can identify more metaphors and I can understand the meaning of the metaphors

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

Maybe my views are not the same, they change for good because I think metaphors are very good, I can understand the source and target and other things that I am more aware.

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

Since the beginning they help me more deep my knowledge about the text, and that’s very good,
Journal entries -Time 3 (JE-T3)
S03 (Sam)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

*In the process I like the mip, it was a good strategy for understanding something that looks difficult, metaphors I thought they were difficult but I think they are accessible*

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

*I liked all the aspects of the mip because they could give something for understanding the texts, and also be more aware about the relationship between one thing and another to understand the metaphor*

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

*I can understand metaphors more than before, and they are more clear for me because I am more aware about the metaphors.*

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

*I feel that I learned a lot in this process and that everyday I had a chance to learn something new about the metaphors, this learning makes me more aware of the metaphors because they also help me for remembering the words more easily*
S04 (Michelle)

1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

   The mip was a good idea for study because I have learned much more than maybe reading a lot about metaphors and how to understand them.

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

   Now, after all this time I think that all the aspect help me for understanding and for be more aware about the metaphors, I like this because I can understand the meanings more clear too. My aware of metaphor I think is more because now I can understand that metaphor is in all languages in the world, maybe before I thought that the metaphors were in my language, but not in english and another languages in maybe the same way

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

   My aware is more higher than before because I can read more and understand more the texts that have a metaphors

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

   Each time I study the mip, I think I learned more and understand more when I read the metaphors in the texts
Journal entries – Time 3 (JE- T3)

S05 (Paul)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

For me it is very interesting analyse my process because I can see that I have learn a lot because the mip is clear now, in the beginning it wasn’t very celar for me but now I think is more interesting because I can see my learning progress

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

Maybe all the steps are helping me to understand. It was good to learn this procedure because I can understand the metaphors and can know more about the meanings, I am more aware because I can think more about the words and metaphors when I read

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

Now I think that metaphors is something that we should learn in school because they are in our language, and in any kind of language so it should be in our school classes

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

A lot, I think that if compare my feeling with metaphors in the beginning and now, now I am more aware and more understand the metaphors
Journal entries – Time 3 (JE- T3)

S06 (Jason)

1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

   *The mip was a very good tool for improving my learning and my knowledge about the metaphors in the texts*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

   *It was useful for me all the things, the first when I looked for the words, then when I use the dictionary, and all the others*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

   *My views are very different now because I think of metaphors like things which can give a lot of meaning. I like them now because I can understand them because of the mip and the steps.*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

   *In this process of learning I can say that more understanding I have because I can know more metaphors when I read the texts and can understand more*
Journal entries - Time 3 (JE-T3)
S07 (Sue)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

My opinion is probably different now, because in the first class I thought that I will not come again, then I thought that the metaphors could help but now I think that I would like to know more about the mip, I think is very good

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

All the things can help me more aware of the metaphors, I think I can identify more metaphors, I can understand more meaning, and I can read more text

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think I am going to study more metaphors when I have time because they can help sometimes for reading the text and understanding the language that has metaphors

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

A lot
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

*I think it was a looong process for me because in the beginning I thought that it was a difficult thing, then not very difficult and now I think it’s more easy and think that the mip is very useful.*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

*Maybe all the things and process of the mip was good for me and for my, be more aware about the metaphors.*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

*I can understand now that metaphors is not in the difficult reading like poems, or literature like Shakepere and other books, but the metaphor is in all language.*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

*I guess I can understand more different texts, but only this text or the others that we use for practices, but also other texts, any others.*
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

I feel very happy because the mip is like a possible solution for some problems with my reading because in some texts I can’t understand the meaning, but the mip can be a good solution, it could learn more.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I like all of them, but especially the when I have to find the connections with the other metaphors or words that are related. I think I could find that some metaphors talk about the same thing in the text, and there is a connection.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I will look for metaphors in other things like in the street, in the newspaper, books, and when I speak with my friends because the metaphors are in all these places.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

I can get more the texts because I am more aware about the metaphors and I can also understand more.
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

_The mip was very important for me because it can help me for understand something that is very, maybe in the past, difficult for me, but now can understand and the mip helps._

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

_I think I have had different experiences about this because in the beginning was like, didn’t find it useful, but then thought that was more useful, and now I think that is very good, so that’s why all the steps I think are very good for being more aware about the metaphors._

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

_My experience is about thinking that metaphors now is more better for understanding the texts and the meanings, so it’s good._

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

_The texts are more easy for me to understand some difficult meanings, so I think yes._
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

*We could use the mip in all the classes!! maybe it’s not possible but it could be good for use it in school or other classes, because is very good for expanding the understanding.*

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

*Yes, I am more aware about the metaphor, and the stages of the mip make me think about the metaphors and about the meanings, so the stages in general help me a lot. My awareness is much more than in the beginning, maybe in the beginning I didn’t have any awareness. When my friends in the group told me every time that something was a metaphor or not, I thought about that for the second time and that helped me for being more aware about the metaphors*

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

*My views about the metaphors are more different from the beginning, I think that metaphors are better for students and for the understanding of the texts. I can say now that the metaphors are like I am more aware about them, and I can see them more in the language now, more than before*

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

*Now it’s more. My process I think is interesting because my experience in the beginning was that I couldn’t understand some things about the mip but now I understand and more aware about the meanings of the metaphor, so I’m also understanding more about the texts*
Journal entries - Time 3 (JE-T3)
S12 (Rich)

1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

   *I would like to use the mip for other uses and other texts*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

   *All the things about the mip was interesting for me and maybe for my classmates too, I like the intuition activity, the dictionary, when we compare the meanings, etc.*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

   *I think that when I understood the metaphors and the mip I thought that I could discover something about the meanings, so now I can discover the meaning and this makes me more aware about the metaphors.*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better**?
I think I would like to practice more but I think yes, the mip helps me more for understanding the texts.
Journal entries - Time 3 (JE-T3)

S13 (Jess)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

*Leonardo can maybe tell us more about the mip because I think is very useful and can use it in the future*

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

*Its difficult to say what aspect specially, but I think for me was when I look for the parts speech, use the dictionary, the meaning in context, and also the words useful for the relationship, like source and target*

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

*I think my thinking and understanding is better than in the beginning so I’m happy to say that I know more.*

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

*This time I could understand more than before, and more than the classes. I didn’t know that we were going to read the same text today but I understood more this time. I think that my awareness has been great for helping to get this e*
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

When I think about the mip now I think that I could studied more for knowing more, the mip was very interesting and I think I had to study more. I understand it but I think I could studied more. I also understand more the metaphors and the connections between one metaphor with other metaphor

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I guess I feel more aware about the metaphors because the mip and the steps, all the steps help me to do that and to make me more aware about this. Maybe, my intuition, the dictionary and the relationships between the metaphors help me to be more aware about the metaphors.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

My thinking about the metaphors is more positive than the first and the second time, so I feel very positive about that.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

I think so, and also I learn more english, so I improve my understanding of the text, my thinking about language and I also learn new words and I think I can improve my english.
Journal entries - Time 3 (JE-T3)
S15 (Nick)

1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

It is a very good process and experience for me thinking about the mip because in the beginning was a little difficult, but then little by little I felt more comfortable, and now I feel good because I can understand more.

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

Maybe all the steps were very good for improving my awareness and my understanding.

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

The metaphors and the mip is like changing my view and my feeling about the metaphor, so I think that I feel more relaxed about the metaphors because in the past I felt more confused and difficult about the metaphors, but not now.

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

The mip, and the meanings that we learn about the metaphors are helpful for more understanding.
Journal entries - Time 3 (JE-T3)
S16 (Fred)

1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

My reflection about the mip and the steps is very encouraging because it makes me to think about the meaning of the word and also makes me to be more aware about the connections between words.

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

I can’t say anything bad about this time learning here, it was all good for me and maybe for all the classmates. This time here made me feel more aware about the metaphors and the real meaning in language.

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

I think about the metaphors as tools for learning and improving the language skills.

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

I think the bad thing is that it take some time for finding the metaphors and do all the steps, but finally it help for understanding better.
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

*I think the mip is a fantastic way for learning new things about texts and about meanings of words.*

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

*The one that I like and maybe help me more was when I found the connections between the metaphors and I found that more metaphors talked about the same thing.*

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

*The mip was an interesting thing for understand and be more aware about metaphors, maybe all the steps was important, the identify the parts, nouns and that, intuition, the context meaning, and all that.*

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

*In my case because of my awareness I think that I can see further, I mean I can probably find that one thing is in connection with other, maybe in the text. I can see that different things can be related but at the same time they can talk about the same metaphor, this is a new experience and tells me that I have learn a lot here.*
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

*My experience about the mip is good and I never experience this for reading the texts in a different way, that is better for us*

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

*Sometimes the dictionary was not good for understanding the meaning but in general I think it was good not for getting the meaning but for comparing the meanings with my knowledge*

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

*The metaphors is important because we find them in all places, texts, and books so this is different from my old opinion because I thought that it was only in books. I can understand that when you are aware of something you can understand it much more deeper, because this is my experience with the metaphor*

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

*I’m going to practice more by using the mip and applying this for other texts to understand more*
Journal entries -Time 3 (JE-T3)
S19 (Sally)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

Sometimes it is difficult still because some words are difficult, but I can understand the general meaning of the metaphors, and this is because the mip.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

Maybe all, in the beginning was confusing but now is useful, the intuition, part of the speech, comparison and everything makes me more aware about the metaphors.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

I think the metaphors are like... I can see them in my language now and that is a lot.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

I like the mip because I feel that it make me more understandable of the texts.
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

This is a reflection about my experience and I think that my experience is very good with the mip because I can understand more now and I feel more confident when I use the mip

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I think I can say all the names of the steps but I think all the steps were very good for me

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

The metaphors are more easy for me to understand, and more present in all the things I say and listen.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

The text that I read in the second time was better in understanding for me, I think it helps for understanding
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

The mip is important for all people, not only for students but even for people that doesn’t got to university because the metaphors are in everywhere

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

More aware and more like, don’t know how to say this but I think I can identify more metaphors, so I think this is also aware

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

My views about metaphors are good because like, metaphors can help for improving my learning and my understanding

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Yes, very much
Journal entries - Time 3 (JE-T3)
S22 (Sev)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

The mip is important for all people, not only for students but even people that doesn’t go to university because the metaphors are in everywhere

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I think all was very helpful for my understanding and my aware because I feel more aware about the metaphors and what they mean

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

My views are very like, maybe different because I thought that metaphors were difficult and confusing because you find them in the poems but is not difficult, they help us for understand

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Yes, and I would like to use this mip for understanding all other texts, it’s good for learning new words and new meanings of the words. I’m understanding that metaphor has different roles, and for me it’s helping for understand the texts, but I would like to think that it’s going to help with big texts
1. **What was important for you about the MIP?**

*My reflection about the mip and the important steps is that I can understand more but in the beginning I felt it was more boring or something like that, but is nice.*

2. **Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?**

*My reflection about aware or if I am aware is that yes, I am aware about the metaphors, the mip is good for identifying and for understanding also, that is very important, because identifying is not understanding.*

3. **How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?**

*I can say that metaphors are common than I was thinking before. I thought always that metaphors were more like those things that you read in books.*

4. **Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?**

*For my text understanding, mmm... I don’t know and I don’t think that metaphor or my awareness can help me for improving my reading, maybe for my vocabulary and for understand the metaphors in the words, but... don’t know, maybe if I try to understand it more, maybe*
Journal entries - Time 3 (JE-T3)
S24 (Sun)

1. What was important for you about the MIP?

I have a strange feeling because I think is important but I’m asking if is useful for everything, I don’t know

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

I can get more aware when I read the text twice or more times, and this is because the mip and the steps are like, I am thinking about the steps when I read

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

Metaphors have something special that makes you find something special in all things

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

Yes, I can understand more and read more things more easily
1. What was important for you about the MIP?

My process and experience is interesting for telling and writing because I had different experiences happened. One was that I didn’t like the mip, then I like it more, and now I think I like it more because it is good for improving my comprehension.

2. Which aspects of the MIP helped you become more aware of metaphors?

All the aspects basically. My reflection about aware or if I’m aware is that yes, I’m aware about the metaphors, the mip is good for identifying and for understanding also, that is very important, because identifying is not understanding.

3. How your views about metaphors have changed since they were introduced for the first time?

My views experience three maybe process, one I didn’t like it, then I like it, and now I like it more, so it’s different views.

4. Have metaphors helped you understand texts better?

I maybe have to practice more or understand more, but definitely is more understanding than in the beginning.
## Appendix 19: Responses to reader-response task (pre-test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>The text only talks about a problem in poor countries that the G8 have to solve as soon as possible to deal with the poverty and the climate change in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>The text is like very difficult for me and I think I don’t understand all the text. The text is about a meeting or summit which happen in Africa and the meeting is for solving the problem about the poor people in Africa. The singer of U2 was in the meeting too. The poverty problem is very serious and I think people should try to find other ways for solving the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03</td>
<td>It's a text that have many metaphors and a little difficult to understand in the beginning. ...but I think that I read it more than one time I can understand a little more. For me the text talk about the meeting in Africa that is for find some answers and solutions for the problem of the poor people. This is big problem for many countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>I think the text is about Africa because Africa is a very poor country and they must to find something for not having so much poor people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>My reaction about the text is not very positive now because I found it very difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>The text is interesting for me because it talk about an important problem in the world that is poverty and I want to study economics, I think maybe distribution of resources. I think it was a good idea for the meeting and think about different way for fixing this problem. It is also important because important people like Bono have influence in the meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>Probably what the G8 did was not the best solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>I think the reading discusses a very important problem that everyone should have to pay more attention. The problem of poverty is even an issue in advanced countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>No response was written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>The main idea of the text is that poor countries have to stop the borrow of money from rich countries and develop countries should also contaminate less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>I don't know really what is the main point in the reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>It is good that Bono singer went to the meeting because he’s a very important figure in the music industry. I heard about Bono when I was 15 and now I like U2 music a lot, especially U2 music. I went to one concert one day. The text is not about music but it's important that some music figures go to that summit. Maybe Bono can do some concerts to get money for the poor countries and find more solution to problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>Difficult reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>No response was written</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maybe I don’t like the text very much because sometimes the words are difficult but I understand that the meeting has the objective for finding solutions for poverty in some poor countries... I saw a documentary because I like them, and the documentary was about some of the most poor countries in the world, when I was reading the text I reminded me when I went for travel to the Philippines and I saw some poor towns and poor people. Maybe the government should do some more effective things for this.

The text talks about one big problem around the world. The problem is poverty and the distribution of resources. This is even bigger. Most of the countries have this problem of distribution in the world.

I don’t know really well what is the main issue in the text, probably is just poverty and problems in global warming.

In my country we have a similar problem, some people are very rich and some people are very poor so this problem of poor people and poor places is very common in my country.

I don’t know how to write this, sorry.

This reading is about why people are poor and what we can do to help them and the other issue is about the global warming of the planet.

Many countries have the same problem that Africa, poor people and companies that pollute a lot.

Not have time to write sorry.

I feel very confused, the text makes me think about my feelings about the poor countries. Some language I don’t understand in the text but the text is about Bono and other politicians that try to discuss some solutions for the poor countries.

My thinking about the text is very confused now. May be because the text is not like the text we read in my class.
### Appendix 20: Responses to reader-response task (post-test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>No response written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>The text that discuss the global warming problem says that the meeting didn’t achieve the objective, in other words that it was very pessimistic. The other problem, the one about the 14 African countries was very positive. For that, Bono says that he is looking down the... (I can’t remember). In my opinion, for the global warming it is important that everyone are aware that ourselves are damaging the world, with the food we eat, the chemicals, pesticides, and things like that. Does it make sense that politicians or famous people get together about this problem? Don’t think so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03</td>
<td>I don’t know how to talk about the text now because now I can understand more and the vocabulary is more simple for me now. The G8 made a lot of progress because they relieved the 14 countries for not paying the huge debts. Other people have other opinions but in general was good. Probably if they did the same thing in other countries like Philippines, South America, maybe we could have less poor countries. Actually, it wouldn’t be a very good idea probably because a lot of people in these countries are in corruption. So what’s the point in doing a similar thing? I think it’s not the best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>Maybe the main problem in the text is that more develop countries could or should people poor countries but they don’t do it. This is probably what the G8 is trying to do to help the African countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>I think that what happens in the text is a very good idea because different important people lead the summit to discuss solutions for avoiding poverty in some African countries. That’s maybe the reason why they got the solution for 14 African countries for not paying the money to the big international banks. For that reason Bono said that they have climb a mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>I am not sure about what can I say about this story now because I can think of other similar situations like the one in my own country. Maybe the G8 should come to my country and find a solution to this situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>I can’t write much, ran out of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>The text talk about two topics. One is the anti-poverty program for African countries and the other is the problem with global warming. One topic I think was very successful because they relieved some African countries from not paying the debt and the other topic they thought it was very pessimistic because the it’s people’s fault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>No response was written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>I feel pretty good now about the text because maybe the metaphors let me see the meaning in the text. Before I didn’t understand many meanings about words but I think I can guess very well now. That part of the story about the 14 countries from Africa that don’t have to pay the money is very good and is a challenge that the people who attended the meeting have overcome. I think that climate change is major issue and we have to take some responsibility. School plays a very important role in educating children about this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>No response written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>I understand that the issue of global warming and poverty have to be solve as soon as possible. This is not however a problem about the lack of resources in countries, the problem of poverty, but maybe a problem of distribution and corruption. This is what takes countries and societies to great problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It's important to understand that the G8 is only VIP, but now I am just thinking that why is Bono in the meeting. Does a rock star have to in an important meeting like this? Is it because his money and his popularity around the world? I think he could help countries to create campaigns to reduce the poverty. If this will be a good solution or not, we will see.

Although Bono says that a mountain was climbed which means that something was achieved, he also said that it was only the higher peaks that had to be relieved. This means that there were other problems maybe on the other side of the mountain that other members of the G8 had not seen.

I don’t understand why people like Bono or other politicians went to that meeting to talk about the global warming problem. That problem is a problem from many areas, like sciences, engineering, teaching, etc.

I don’t understand why poor people and industries and companies that cause all the global warming try to do something about solving the problem by themselves. It is important that other people try to help them but they can do a lot of work.

Probably every time poor countries have problems with huge debts and simply the poverty they should look for real political and economical assistance that, for example, help them to create more employment opportunities and exploit their own resources.

My thoughts about the G8 and the meeting is that they simply do it, in one hand, to promote their fame and political influence, and not necessary for helping poor societies. I think that if that is the situation it should be different, and important figures like Bono should do things that last in time.

There are many important points in this reading in my opinion. The first point is about how the G8 helps the poor countries to stop being poor and the second is about the politics of the global warming. This is because everyone is part of this problem.

The situation in the text is interesting but at the same time I disagree with the result of the meeting. My reason is that relieving the poor countries from the debts doesn’t not help them in the future.'

How can a poor country solve the issue of poverty? I don’t know because sometimes this problem is connected with politicians and the bad decisions they make. For example, there is a lot of corruption and this is a major problem that makes poverty even worse.

The problem of global warming can be solved by the same companies because they contribute to it. For example they could move again from the centre of the cities to other far places and pay higher taxes.
### Appendix 21: Reading test students’ scores (pre and post-test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Lexical (pre)</th>
<th>MC (pre)</th>
<th>SA (pre)</th>
<th>Total (pre)</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Lexical (post)</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>S01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S02</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S04</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S06</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S07</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>S23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>S24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean    | 7.44         |          |
| Difference | -2.8        | 2.8    |
| SD      | 1            |          |
| N       | 25           |          |

```
Appendix 22: Learners’ number of turns over the three audio-recorded instances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number of Turns</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>2648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.84</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>50.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.938120608</td>
<td>11.41242013</td>
<td>17.98768097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 23: Number of clauses in learners’ turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clauses</td>
<td>Clauses</td>
<td>Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>33.68</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td>66.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.20901306</td>
<td>9.162059448</td>
<td>13.18054121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 24: Overview of learners’ turns and clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turns</td>
<td>Clauses</td>
<td>Turns</td>
<td>Clauses</td>
<td>Turns</td>
<td>Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>25.84</td>
<td>33.68</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td>50.16</td>
<td>66.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.938120608</td>
<td>12.20901306</td>
<td>11.41242013</td>
<td>9.162059448</td>
<td>17.98768097</td>
<td>13.18054121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 25: Pseudonym and numerical coding of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student number</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>Jo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>Tom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>Jason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>Sue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Loren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>Jess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>Serena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>Nick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>Fred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>Sally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>Rey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>Sev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>Mike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>Ali</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>