

The Comparative Study of American and Iranian English Seniors' Metaphorical Competence

By

¹Ahmad Sharifzadeh, ²Azizeh Chalak, ²Hossein Heidari Tabrizi

¹Department of Foreign Languages, Khorasgan (Isfahan) Branch, Islamic

Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

²Islamic Azad University, Khorasgan Branch, Isfahan, Iran

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the factors affecting native and nonnative seniors' competence both in comprehension and production of English metaphorical expressions. The subjects included 112 EFL seniors from three universities in Tehran (72 seniors who took part in the course Using Metaphorical Expressions in EFL Contexts as the Experimental Group and 40 seniors as the Control Group) and 30 American seniors of English as the Comparison Group. The lesson plans containing activities that aimed to teach metaphorical expressions, their meanings, and the logic behind them were developed and implemented in two-hour sessions, 12 consecutive weeks. Having been administered the OPT to guarantee homogeneity between and among nonnatives, the pretest and posttest of metaphorical competence were developed and administered to assess the receptive and the productive metaphorical abilities. The data were analyzed considering the amount of metaphorical language produced and comprehended in the pretest and posttest using the t-test and ANOVA. The results revealed that natives and nonnatives differed noticeably both in comprehending and producing metaphorical expressions.

Keywords: *Conceptual metaphors, EFL seniors, Iranian EFL learners, Metaphorical competence, Grammatical competence.*

1. Introduction

Language is a means of communication and people use it to accomplish such functions as communicating their thoughts and ideas by applying existing semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic guidelines. To clarify meaning, speakers and hearers or writers and readers should be able to interact. In the process of communication, language users are expected to have a good mastery of those guidelines. In this regard, the role of metaphors and metaphorical expressions in communication should not be overlooked. Lakoff and Johnson (1980b) define metaphor as a process by which people conceive of one thing in terms of another. Metaphors pave the way for understanding something abstract in terms of something more tangible. They are not solely poetic in nature but rather determine usage in human language. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980a), the ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which human beings both think and act, is basically metaphorical in nature, but this conceptual system is not something people are normally aware of. "Since communication is based on the same conceptual system that we use in thinking and acting, language is a significant source of evidence for what that system is like" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980a, p.3).

Metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible precisely because there are metaphors in a person's conceptual system (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980a). The conceptual system is a model of reality upon which every aspect of human behavior is based. People's social organizations, religious beliefs, figurative arts, and language are rooted in it. Analysis of any of these aspects of human behavior would shed some light on the structure of the conceptual system. However, the analysis of language is particularly informative since language is primary means of communication. In the recent decades, research on the forms, structures, and functions of metaphor has advanced. Writers have many times argued that the bulk of these research findings have serious implications for second language teaching/learning (e.g., Alexander, 1983; Dirven, 1985; Littlemore, 2005; Low, 1988), but it is time-consuming for metaphor to make significant headway into the mainstream pedagogical practice and the design of teaching materials (Kellerman, 2001). Time-consuming process of permeating metaphor into the mainstream of language teaching does not have crystal clear reasons. Although one cause may be their unclear and non-rule-governed nature to treat, second/foreign language learners' faculty in producing and comprehending

metaphors superficially seem to be peripheral, and it is being increasingly patent that the more EFL learners appreciate language, thought, and cognition, the more they find themselves faced with arduous task of trying to define, explain, and understand metaphors.

2. Literature Review

When you clarify something by comparing and contrasting with something else, you are applying figurative language. Figurative language is possibly found in poets' works where the writing appeals to the senses, makes you look at the world differently, heightens your senses, and compares two things in such a way that you find the comparison interesting or even a bit surprising. Figurative language usually through comparison, association, and/or resemblance transfers meanings and is used to describe one thing in terms of another. There are a variety of figures of speech in English, such as allegory, alliteration, allusion, antithesis, cliché, climax, epigram, exclamation, hyperbole, idiom, interrogation, irony, metonymy, onomatopoeia, personification, simile, and synecdoche, to name a few, as in all other languages worldwide.

Traditionally, metaphor is not considered to be an exception to the figures of speech. Such languages as Arabic, Balochi, Gilaki, Kurdish, Persian, Turkish, and so forth spoken in different parts of Iran are not exceptions, though they do not exactly correspond to their English coequals. This paper focused on metaphors which convey a transfer of meaning inside the language and expression and state a fact or draw a verbal picture by the use of comparison. Lakoff and Johnson (1981a) classify conceptual metaphors as container, ontological, orientational, and structural metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1981b) pointed out that metaphor is a way of thinking or a matter of mind not just a matter of words, that is, metaphor is a matter of thought and cognition rather than mere linguistic expressions. This view received a great deal of attention and it gave a large amount of influence on the study of metaphors ever since. Gibbs (1994) demonstrated that human cognition is deeply poetic. He further mentioned that figurative language is ubiquitous in our daily speech and writing and added that figurative schemes of thought come from our ordinary and conceptual understanding of experience. Grady (1997) and his proponents proposed the idea of primary and complex metaphors.

Surveys on awareness and competence are not completely separable because surveys on awareness also examine competence. Majority of the research on metaphorical competence in the world has been carried out with children (Cameron, 2003; Gardner, 1974; Winner, Rosenstiel & Gardner, 1976) and with learners of English as a Second Language (ESL) (Boers, 2000, 2001; Charteris-Black, 2002; Deignan, Gabryś & Solska, 1997; Littlemore, 2001). The research done on metaphor in applied linguistics encompasses two main types of metaphorical awareness and metaphorical competence. Both types were studied worldwide, mainly by the Western researchers. A number of studies aimed to investigate ESL students' comprehension and production of metaphorical expressions concentrating on the awareness or identification, originality and/or aptness of metaphor/metaphorical expressions (Boers, 2000, 2001; Cameron, 2003; Carter, 2004; Charteris-Black, 2002; Deignan et al., 1997; Littlemore, 2001; Low, 1988, to name but a few).

Low (1988) endorsed that all ESL learners are to develop some skills related to metaphor. He urged that learning 'one-off' example is not always helpful, further discussed approaches and areas in which learners should develop some metaphor related skills (e.g., the ability to interpret and construct plausible meanings using metaphorical knowledge of the boundary of metaphor and awareness of some features of metaphor), and proposed activities for language lessons. Deignan et al. (1997) further focused on the significance of addressing metaphors in language lessons. They examined cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities to facilitate comprehension of English metaphorical expressions using Polish as L1 and English as their L2 and claimed that the same conceptual metaphors in different languages are realized through different linguistic expressions, concluding that L2 learners usually find it difficult to use metaphors appropriately.

Littlemore (2001) discussed a number of psychological processes dealing with metaphor interpretation and examined metaphorical competence and the relationship of metaphorical competence to L2 learning and teaching. According to Littlemore (2001, p.461), “metaphorical competence is composed of (a) originality of metaphor production, (b) fluency of metaphor interpretation, (c) ability to find meaning in metaphor, and (d) speed in finding meaning in metaphor.” She examined whether or not metaphorical competence is a unitary concept, identified cognitive traits that may help it develop, and investigated its relationship with communicative language ability (Littlemore, 2001). She investigated and measured the four above-mentioned aspects of metaphorical competence. She cites Pollio and Smith (1980), who recognized the first three components, that is, originality, fluency, and ability to find meaning in metaphor as distinct aspects of the overall construct.

3. Methodology

Subjects

The purposive, convenient sampling procedure was used in this study, purposive in the sense that only English seniors were recruited, and convenient in the sense that the subjects were easily accessible ones which were intended to be representative of the whole population as diverse as possible. It should be mentioned that ethical issues such as confidentiality, originality of research, and morality were observed. The subjects were made assure that their personal information would be kept confidential and only treated data without referring to their names would be published. They were informed of the fact that they were selected to take part in this research and the obtained data would be used merely for the sake of research. The subjects in this study were in three groups including the EG, CG, and Comparison Group. It is necessary to mention that the seniors voluntarily participated in this study.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of the Subjects with Regard to Their Type of Participation and Sub-field

Group Name	Frequency	Percentage	Linguistics	Literature	TEFL	Translation
EG	72	50.70	18	18	17	19
CG	40	28.16	10	10	10	10
Comparison Group	30	21.12	10	10	10	-
Total	142	100.0	38	38	37	29

Females outnumbered males in this study with a slight difference (80:62). From the total subjects, 61 seniors were native speakers of Persian (42.95%), 51 subjects (35.92%) were Iranians with non-Persian native languages, and 30 subjects (21.13%) were English native speakers. Here, the EG, CG, and Comparison Group will consecutively be discussed in detail.

The first group of subjects was the EG who were Iranian EFL seniors in four sub-fields. A total number of 72 seniors were voluntarily selected from three universities in the capital city of Tehran, Iran. Their age varied from 22 to 26. After selecting the sample, to ascertain that learners in this group are homogenous, an OPT, was administered. They were also given both the pretest and posttest (Sharifzadeh, 2013) of metaphorical competence at the beginning and end of the course *Using Metaphorical Expressions in EFL Contexts*.

The second group of subjects was 40 seniors of English as the CG, voluntarily selected from the same three universities. The number of seniors in each sub-field was 10. Their age range was the same as the EG. After selecting the CG, to make certain that the language proficiency of the CG is homogenous with the EG, the OPT was administered. They were tested and compared to the EG to see whether or not metaphorical competence develops after receiving the treatment by the EG. Additionally, they were compared to the Comparison Group (natives) to see if there is any difference in metaphorical competence based on the pretest, a test of metaphorical competence.

And the third and last group of subjects was a group of 30 natives, as the Comparison Group, with age range of 22 to 26 and average age of 24.32. The number of female and male subjects was 13 and 17 (i.e., 43.33% and 56.67% respectively). After asking them to take part with the cooperation of one of the researchers' fellow friends in the U.S.A, the researchers kept in touch with them via email. They were not given the OPT because to the best of researchers' knowledge, this test has no discriminatory power to distinguish high proficient and less proficient native English seniors. They were given the pretest of metaphorical competence when the course of the EG started. They were tested and compared to the EG to see whether or not metaphorical competence develops after receiving the treatment by the EG. Additionally, they were compared to the CG to see if there was any difference in metaphorical competence based on the pretest, a test of metaphorical competence. It should be mentioned that there was not any native Translation senior participating in this study.

Instructional Materials

The book *Idioms Organiser* by Jon Wright (1999), edited by Jimmie Hill and Morgan Lewis, and illustrated by Bill Stott was used for the instruction. This book takes a broad view of idioms derived from the 12 conceptual metaphors. In this book, there are lots of common idioms for learners to practice and the huge area of idiomatic usage where words are used with nonliteral (metaphorical) meanings. This book organized the most important idioms in English in four sections including (a) areas of metaphor, (b) individual metaphors (c) topics, and (d) key words. The logic behind selection of this book was to expose the subjects to a number of 12 conceptual metaphors which cover major areas of English, out of which more than 200 metaphors and idioms were derived.

Measuring Instruments

In this study, the OPT along with the researcher-made pretest and posttest of metaphorical competence were used to evaluate Iranian EFL seniors in contrast to American seniors majoring in English. Metaphorical competence in this study was investigated using two types of tests: comprehensive and productive tests. The 50 comprehension and 50 production items were all embedded in sentences in the pretest and posttest. In addition, the OPT was administered to measure the level of the subjects' general English knowledge and examined the homogeneity between and among the EG and CG. The time allocated for each multiple-choice and production item was 45 seconds (75 minutes per each test) so that all subjects could try all the items, as a power test. The scoring procedure was an objective type, that is, the rater's own judgment had no effect on the score.

The first test was the OPT (devised by Allen, 2004), to assess the subjects' degree of homogeneity prior to the study. The OPT has two sections: Section One was on grammar with 100 multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank questions, and Section Two was on testing seniors' listening comprehension with 100 questions. For the present study, the subjects were only given the first part which was on grammar because this part was paper-and-pencil test, the same as the pretest and posttest for merely evaluating seniors' grammatical knowledge as an index of their linguistic knowledge. The OPT is a reliable and valid standardized test.

The second test was the researcher-made pretest, contrived especially to evaluate the subjects' metaphorical knowledge, both in comprehending and producing metaphorical language. This test took in two parts: The first part pertained to the comprehension of metaphorical language and the second part was associated with production of metaphorical expressions. All of the items were derived from the book *Idioms Organiser* which was instructed during the course. The first part of the test required the subjects to choose and complete some incomplete metaphorical sentences from among prepared choices. The second part required the subjects to read some incomplete statements and fill in the blanks and write the answers in the answer sheet, using suitable metaphorical language to test their English metaphorical knowledge in production. The number of the items devised from each of four sections of the book was equal in production and comprehension section. From almost every unit of the book, one item was devised and assigned to the pretest so that every other unit has a production item and a comprehension item

respectively. The total reliability of the test was calculated through the use of Spearman Brown Prophecy Formula. The reliability of the pretest was calculated through the use of split-half method with the assumption that all the items were parallel in two halves to avoid administering the same test to the same group twice in order to eliminate the risk of practice effect and also to avoid developing two parallel tests for the sake of a single test in sake of saving time and effort in developing, administering, and scoring process. To estimate reliability, odd and even numbered items were assigned to each half and administered to 30 seniors. The estimated total reliability for the pretest was proved to be 0.75. To prepare a test of sound face and content validity was taken the time. It should be reminded that the pretest was a discrete point test, an ideal form of test for diagnostic purposes.

The third test was an achievement test, the researcher-made posttest, administered after the instruction to measure the subjects' metaphorical competence, both in comprehending and producing metaphorical language and comprehending some conceptual metaphors of the TL. The test encompassed two components, the same as the pretest: The first was on comprehending metaphorical language and the second was related to the production of metaphorical language. The number of the items devised from each of four sections of the book was equal in production and comprehension section. From almost every unit of the book, one item is devised and assigned to the posttest so that every other unit has a production item and a comprehension item respectively. It should be pointed out that the choice of production and comprehension items from each unit is reversed with respect to their type in the pretest. The total reliability of the test was calculated in the same way as in the pretest. The estimated reliability for the posttest was proved to be 0.78. In order for preparing a test of sound face and content validity, the researcher did his level best. It should be remembered that the pretest was a discrete point test type, which examines only one linguistic trait (here, metaphorical competence).

Data Collection Procedure

Having been administered the OPT to determine the level of linguistic knowledge of nonnative subjects (the EG and CG) and to guarantee the homogeneity of the subjects, prior to the instruction, one session was allocated for introduction of the course, objectives, procedures, testing, administering the pretest and so forth as well as one other session for finalizing research, administering the posttest, after instruction. The Iranian subjects were tested for the sake of homogeneity, in advance, with their grammatical competence in focus by the OPT.

Prior to the implementation of the lessons, both native and nonnative seniors were given the pretest to check their metaphorical competence in terms of both comprehension and production of metaphorical language in predetermined metaphorical expressions to be taught during the implementation. This test included figurative and metaphorical language.

After administering the OPT and pretest, lesson plans were developed for the sake of instruction. These lesson plans contained activities that aim to teach metaphorical expressions, their meanings, and the logic behind them in order to enhance learners' metaphorical perceptions in the TL. As for the instruction and treatment of metaphors and idioms in this study, the subjects were initially given some idea of what metaphorical expressions, conceptual metaphors, idioms are, and how applicable are such conceptual metaphors and many idioms deriving out of them. The aim of the course was to study figurative language especially metaphors in both spoken and written language. Each lesson plan was carried out in a two-hour period once a week with a ten minute break in the middle. In this study, the book was presented to the EG, 72 subjects, intermittently during 12 weeks of instruction in the course *Using Metaphorical Expressions in EFL Contexts*, a course specifically designed for seniors majoring in English linguistics, Literature, TEFL, and Translation.

Finally, in addition to the EG, a group of 40 other nonnative seniors, as the CG, was tested for their knowledge of metaphorical expressions by the posttest. They were tested and compared to the EG to see whether or not metaphorical competence develops after several years of English learning. Each group was

separately tested for their metaphorical competence. Moreover, in order to have a criterion for the normal metaphorical competence of native speakers, a group of 30 native seniors was administered both the pretest and posttest. The average score of the native seniors both in the pretest and posttest of metaphorical competence was compared to that of the nonnatives to see whether or not nonnatives were as metaphorically competent as natives.

Data Analysis Procedure

To analyze the obtained data, points of each subject in the pretest and posttest were checked and counted question by question. That is, the correct answer of any subject to any question in the pretest and posttest was scored one point. This operation was carried out for each subject's pretest and posttest answers. Then the whole score of every subject was calculated by adding up the number of correct responses to the items in the pretest and posttest. It should be mentioned that the pretest and posttest had their own answer keys which made it possible to score items objectively. The subjects' scores were calculated by counting the correct answers and giving one point for each correct answer. That is, a subject who answered all the items correctly would get the whole score. It should be reminded that all the data was quantitative and primary.

The data obtained from the pretest and posttest were subjected to statistical analysis to explore the probable effect of the treatment, applying matched t-test and ANOVA. Also, the data obtained from the EG and CG (nonnatives) and Comparison Group (native) were statistically analyzed, applying one-way ANOVA and t-test, to examine whether or not English seniors at different sub-fields of English develop conceptual fluency and metaphorical competence after several years of studying English academically. T-test is used to compare the means of two samples when the nominal variable is a dichotomy and the test becomes only one for the difference between two means. The nominal variable must have only two values, such as *male* and *female* in this study. It is recommended to use the t-test if the research always involves comparing just two means because it is more familiar to more people.

4. Results and Discussions

This was a study gathering preliminary data on some metaphorical use by a small group of subjects (natives in contrast to nonnatives). As a predominately quantitative study, it did not start with hard and fast hypotheses to test, and did not claim to make universally applicable findings about metaphorical use. However, it has solutions to some questions that could be investigated in this section. The question was more difficult to answer except in general terms since it would discuss both native and nonnative subjects' metaphorical knowledge not only in terms of production but also in terms of comprehension with regard to the findings derived from the pretest and posttest. The data (Table 2 to Table 5), however, allow for some tentative findings about the research question. Independent sample t-test was used to compare the means of the two groups (native and nonnative seniors) in comprehension and production of metaphorical language before and after the EG receives the treatment.

Table 2: Natives and Nonnatives' Performance in the Pretest Comprehension and Production Sections

Test Type	Group	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error of Mean
Comprehension Section of the Pretest	Natives	30	43.20	2.413	0.440
	Nonnatives	112	13.79	2.439	0.230
Production Section of the Pretest	Natives	30	38.17	2.755	0.503
	Nonnatives	112	10.03	2.710	0.256
The Pretest Total Score	Natives	30	81.37	3.732	0.681
	Nonnatives	112	23.82	3.785	0.358

The comparison of the means also was significant in both scores of the production section of the pretest and the comprehension section of the pretest (-50.341 and - 58.779, respectively).

Table 3: Independent Samples Test in the Pretest Comprehension and Production Sections

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	Upper
The Pretest Total	Equal variances assumed	0.070	0.792	-74.037	140	0.000	-57.445	0.776	-58.979	-55.911	
	Equal variances not assumed			-74.652	46.268	0.000	-57.445	0.770	-58.994	-55.897	
The Pretest Production	Equal variances assumed	0.089	0.766	-50.341	140	0.000	-28.140	0.559	-29.245	-27.035	
	Equal variances not assumed			-49.853	45.177	0.000	-28.140	0.564	-29.277	-27.003	
The Pretest Comprehension	Equal variances assumed	0.022	0.884	-58.779	140	0.000	-29.405	0.500	-30.394	-28.416	
	Equal variances not assumed			-59.151	46.146	0.000	-29.405	0.497	-30.406	-28.405	

Levene's test for equality of variances suggested that the variances of the pretest total are equal, therefore the results of the first row of the table of independent samples test (Table 3) should be used. The comparison of natives' and nonnatives' performance in the pretest (Sig. = 0.000, t = -74.03) suggest that, as metaphorical language is concerned, native seniors of English perform better than nonnative seniors of English. As Table 2 and Table 3 show, the mean score of natives in the production section of the pretest was much more than that of nonnatives. These mean differences were significant (Sig. = 0.000, t = -50.34). Furthermore, the mean score of natives was much more than that of nonnatives in the comprehension section of the pretest. These mean differences were significant (Sig. = 0.000, t = -59.15).

Table 4: EG and Natives' Performance in the Posttest Comprehension and Production Sections

Test Type	Group	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error of Mean
The Posttest Total	EG (nonnatives)	72	73.68	7.103	0.837
	Comparison (natives)	30	80.70	4.557	0.832
The Posttest Production	EG (nonnatives)	72	33.32	4.225	0.498
	Comparison (natives)	30	38.87	2.726	0.498
The Posttest Comprehension	EG (nonnatives)	72	39.67	4.522	0.533
	Comparison (natives)	30	41.83	2.547	0.465

Table 5: Independent Samples Test in the Posttest Comprehension and Production Sections

			Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
			F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
										Lower	Upper
The Posttest Total	Equal variances assumed		9.054	0.003	-4.994	100	0.000	-7.019	1.406	-9.808	-4.231
		not assumed			-5.948	82.773	0.000	-7.019	1.180	-9.367	-4.672
The Posttest Production	Equal variances assumed		7.931	0.006	-6.628	100	0.000	-5.547	0.837	-7.208	-3.887
		not assumed			-7.879	82.404	0.000	-5.547	0.704	-6.948	-4.147
The Posttest Comprehension	Equal variances assumed		9.057	0.003	-2.462	100	0.016	-2.167	0.880	-3.913	-0.421
		not assumed			-3.063	91.047	0.003	-2.167	0.707	-3.572	-0.762

The comparison of the means also was significant in both the production section of the posttest and the comprehension section of the posttest. As the Table 4 shows, the mean score of natives was more than that of nonnatives in the production section of the posttest. According to Table 5, these mean differences were significant (Sig. = 0.000, $t = -6.628$). Moreover, as Table 4 shows, the mean score of natives was more than that for nonnatives in the comprehension section of the posttest. With regard to Table 5, these mean differences were significant (Sig. = 0.000, $t = -2.462$). Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the performance of native and nonnative English seniors in the pretest and posttest both in terms of comprehension and production of metaphorical language. As Table 4 and Table 5 depict, the comparison of natives' performance and that of nonnatives in the posttest (Sig. = 0.000, $t = -4.99$) suggested that, as metaphorical language is concerned, natives outperform nonnatives even after the treatment. Therefore, it can be suggested that native English seniors perform better than nonnative English seniors in terms of production of metaphorical language.

5. Conclusion

Comparing native and nonnative English seniors revealed that there are positive correlations between their performance on producing and comprehending English metaphors and metaphorical expressions and their linguistic knowledge (grammatical knowledge). Statistical findings indicated the differences of metaphorical competence between native and nonnative English seniors, concerning various affecting factors. Findings also proved that the more frequent employment of and exposure to metaphorical expressions to express certain ideas and thought, the more competent and fluent and the more scores of the native and nonnative English seniors.

However, although there are some differences between the performance of native and nonnative seniors' competence, there are some similarities between their performances on tests. As a result, it can be concluded that metaphorical competence is directly or indirectly influenced by some factors such as age,

gender, type of instruction, period of exposure to the TL, density and frequency of metaphorical expressions in oral and written discourse, and so forth, which will necessitate further research of this type.

References

- Alexander, R.G. (1983). *Metaphors, connotations, allusions: Thoughts on the language-culture connection in learning English as a foreign language*. LAUT Working Papers, Series B, No. 91. Trier: LAUT.
- Boers, F. (2000). Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 553-571.
- Boers, F. (2001). Remembering figurative idioms by hypothesising about their origin. *Prospect*, 16 (3), 35-43.
- Cameron, L. (2003). *Metaphor in educational discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Carter, R. (2004). *Language and creativity*. London: Routledge.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2002). Second language figurative proficiency: A comparative study of Malay and English. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 104-133.
- Deignan, A., Gabryś, D., & Solska, A. (1997). Teaching English metaphors using cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities (Electronic version). *ELT Journal*, 51(4), 352- 360.
- Dirven, R. (1985). Metaphor as a basic means for extending the lexicon. In W. Paprotte & R. Dirven (Eds.), *The ubiquity of metaphor* (pp.85-119). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gardner, H. (1974). Metaphors and modalities: How children project polar adjectives onto diverse domains. *Child Development*, 45 (1), 84-91.
- Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grady, J. (1997). A typology of motivation for conceptual metaphor. In R. W. Gibbs & G. J. Steen (Eds.), *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kellerman, E. (2001). New uses for old language: Cross-linguistic and cross-gestural influence in the narratives of native speakers. In J. Ceñoz, B. Hufeisen & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition* (pp.170-191). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980a). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980b). Conceptual metaphors in everyday life. *Journal of Philosophy*, 77 (8), 453-486.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1981a). Conceptual metaphor in everyday language. In M. Johnson, (Ed.), *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, pp.286-328.
- Littlemore, J. (2001). Metaphoric competence: A possible language learning strength of students with a holistic cognitive style? *TESOL Quarterly*, 35 (3), 459-491.
- Littlemore, J. (2005). Figurative thought and the teaching of languages for specific purposes. Proceedings from the *VIII Jornadas de lenguas para fines especificados*, Universidad de Alacala, Spain: 16-34.
- Low, G. (1988). On teaching metaphor. *Applied Linguistics*, 9 (2), 125-147.
- Sharifzadeh, A. (2013). *A comparative study of metaphorical competence of English among native and nonnative learners: The case of Iranian and American senior students of English*. Unpublished MA thesis, Islamic Azad University of Khorasan, Isfahan, Iran.

- VahidDastjerdi, H. (2001). *The role of conceptual mappings in the perception and production of L2 metaphorical expressions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.
- Winner, E., Rosenstiel, A. K., & Gardner, H. (1976). The development of metaphoric understanding. *Developmental Psychology*, 12 (4), 289-297.