

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

TALONI HUOJUU VIELÄ PAHASTI
Metaphorical expressions used by university students
about themselves as learners of English and about their teachers

A Pro Gradu Thesis in English

by

Paula Turunen

Department of Languages
2003

Paula Turunen

TALONI HUOJUU VIELÄ PAHASTI:

Metaphorical expressions used by university students about themselves and about their teachers

Pro gradu –tutkielma

Englannin kieli

Heinäkuu 2003

107 sivua + 2 liitettä

Tutkielman tarkoituksena on kuvailla opiskelijoiden kertomuksiin perustuen heidän kokemuksiaan englannin kielen oppijoina samoin kuin englannin opettajistaan. Materiaali koostuu viidestäkymmenestä teemallisesta omaelämäkerrasta, jotka Jyväskylän yliopiston englantilaisen filologian ensimmäisen vuosikurssin opiskelijat kirjoittivat vuoden 1994 syksyllä. Osallistujista neljäkymmentä oli naisia ja kymmenen miehiä. Opiskelijoita pyydettiin kertomaan englannin kielen oppimiskokemuksistaan koko siihenastisen elämänsä aikana kronologisesti etenevänä tarinana käyttäen vapaata ilmaisumuotoa ja suomen kieltä. Näistä kertomuksista tähän tutkimukseen valittiin kouluopetusta koskevat katkelmat, ja niistä poimittiin vertauskuvalliset ilmaisut (metaforat), joita kirjoittajat käyttivät kuvailemallaan itseään englannin oppijoina sekä englannin opettajiaan peruskoulussa ja lukiossa. Tarkoituksena oli selvittää, kuinka paljon työtä englannin kielen kouluopiskelu oli heiltä vaatinut ja miten tehokkaina he pitivät englannin opettajiaan. Tällä tavoin ei aikaisemmin ole tutkittu oppijoiden itsensä kertomia kouluaikaisia kielenoppimiskokemuksia.

Vieraan kielen oppimiseen ja opettamiseen liittyvien ilmiöiden tutkimisessa on viime vuosina alettu käyttää diskursiivista lähestymistapaa, jossa kielellä on tärkeä tehtävä, kun halutaan lähestyä ilmiötä ja sen arviointia oppijan näkökulmasta. Tähän liittyy relativistinen käsitys maailmasta: totuuksia ilmiöistä on enemmän kuin yksi. Yhtenä välineenä tässä hyödynnetään metafora-analyysiä, jonka avulla saadaan selville oppijan ajatuksia itsestään. Metaforien käyttö kielessä on tavallista ja lähes tiedostamatonta, joten metafora ei ole vain kielellinen koristus vaan keino ymmärtää maailmaa. Ilmaus on metaforinen, jos se sisältää suoran tai implisiittisen vertailun tai kielikuvan, jota ei voi käsittää kirjaimellisesti. Omaelämäkerrat taas osoittavat, miten kirjoittajat jäsentävät identiteettiään sillä hetkellä, joten ne eivät ole 'tosia' kuvauksia kirjoittajien elämästä, vaan voivat vaihdella eri tarkoituksissa. Metaforien kuvailu on pikemminkin laadullista kuin määrällistä tutkimusta.

Kertomuksista etsittiin kaikki kouluopiskeluun liittyvät kielikuvat, jotka eroteltiin kahteen ryhmään: oppijaa ja opettajaa koskevat vertauskuvat. Löydettyjen metaforisten ilmausten lukemista jatkettiin, kunnes niistä alkoi eriytyä samantapaisia teemoja sen perusteella, kuinka kovasti työtä kirjoittajat näyttivät tehneen englantia oppiakseen, ja kuinka hyvinä he pitivät englannin opettajiaan. Tarkoitus ei ollut vertailla oppija- ja opettajaluokkia toisiinsa, vaan niitä kuvailtiin erillisinä. Vaikeutena oli alussa sen päättäminen, mikä käsitettiin metaforaksi tässä yhteydessä. Kummassakin ryhmässä syntyi selvästi kuusi luokkaa. Valinta oli täysin subjektiivinen – joku toinen olisi saattanut valita toisin. Samassa kertomuksessa esiintyi usein monenlaisia opettajatyyppejä, sillä luokka-asteita ei eritelty; oppimisponnistelujen määrä oli pysyvämpi piirre. Metaforisten ilmausten runsaus vaihteli suuresti kertomuksissa, johtuen osittain kirjoittajien tyylistä ja osittain siitä, että tarinat olivat hyvin eri pituisia. Käytetyt kielikuvat olivat melko tavanomaisia.

Tutkimuksen tuloksista ilmenee, että oppijoista ankarimmin ponnistelee *Perfektionisti*, joita on eniten kirjoittajien joukossa. Hieman vähemmän on *Työntekijöitä*, jotka myös ovat hyvin ahkeria ja kunnianhimoisia opiskelijoita. *Rakastajakin* on ahkera, mutta hän nauttii opiskelusta, kun taas *Luonnonlahjakkuuden* ei edes tarvitse ponnistella osatakseen englantia. Motivaationsa kadottaneita *Kärsijöitä* on puolet vastaajista, mutta tämä ominaisuus on useimmilla tilapäinen, toisin kuin muissa luokissa. Viimeisenä ja pienimpänä luokkana ovat *Ajelehtijat*, jotka eivät ole jossakin vaiheessa kiinnostuneita englannin kielestä tai yleensä koulusta. Opettajista vastaajat pitävät ehdottomasti parhaimpina *Puolijumalaa*, joita tosin on hyvin vähän. Kannustava *Motivoija* osaa luoda oppimiselle otollisen ilmapiirin, ja heitä onkin runsaasti yli puolet kuvailluista opettajista. *Tehtailijaa* keuhataan myös tehokkaaksi, vaikka heistä ei aina pidetä vaativuuden vuoksi. Kolmen viimeisen opettajaluokan tunneilla ei oikeastaan opita. Yli puolella kirjoittajista on kokemuksia *Kärsivällisyyden koettelijasta*, joka saattaa oppijat turhautumaan ja kyllästymään opiskeluun. Pelätty *Noita* ehkäisee oppimisen ilon ilkeydellään. Erityisesti yläasteella esiintyy *Kiusanteon kohde*, jonka tunnit kuluvat opettajan kiusaamiseen opiskelun sijasta. Huonokaan tai liian ankara opettaja ei välttämättä ehkäise oppimista, ainakaan näitten yliopistoon päätyneiden hyvien englannin oppijoiden oppimista, mutta miellyttäviä muistoja koulun englannin tunneista he eivät ole jättäneet.

Asiasanat: metaphor. life-story. student. teacher. language learning. language teaching. comprehensive school. senior high school.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1. Theories of metaphor	8
2.1.1. Substitution and comparison theories	9
2.1.2. Interaction theory	11
2.1.3. Cognitive theory	12
2.1.4. Criticism of the theories of metaphor	16
2.2. Definitions of metaphor	20
2.2.1. Traditional definitions of metaphor	22
2.2.2. Interactional definitions of metaphor	23
2.2.3. Related concepts	25
2.2.4. Recognition of metaphor	27
2.3. Uses of metaphor in non-fictional texts	31
2.3.1. Scientific discourse	32
2.3.2. Metaphors in education	34
2.3.2.1. Language teachers	34
2.3.2.2. Language learners	37
2.3.2.3. Problems with metaphors	38
2.4. Previous studies	39
2.4.1. Metaphors about language teachers and teaching	41
2.4.2. Metaphors about language learners and learning	47
2.4.3. Summary of previous studies	53
3. PRESENT STUDY	55
3.1. Research question	55
3.2. Data collection	58
3.3. Coding and methods	59
3.4. Findings	62
3.4.1. Categorization of learner metaphors	63
3.4.2. Categorization of the teacher metaphors	78
3.4.3. Summary of the categorizations	89
3.5. Discussion	93
3.5.1. Comparison with the categories in the previous studies	93
3.5.2. Validation of the study	95

4. CONCLUSION	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY	102
Appendix 1: Instructions for writing the life story	108
Appendix 2: Sample passages translated into English	111

1. INTRODUCTION

Language learners' constructions of themselves as learners of foreign languages have great importance for their future success as language learners. These constructions develop gradually from the learners' experiences of language learning. Language teachers can benefit from being aware of learners' positive or negative self-images. However, as Ellis (1998:65) points out, second language acquisition researchers do not so much talk about language learners as about language learning. Learning processes have been examined independent of the persons who are trying to learn a second language. Kalaja (1995) notes that the mainstream approach to studying language learning is based on cognitive representations with predetermined assumptions and experimental research methods, whereas the more recent discursive approach focuses on subjects' use of language in different contexts. Therefore, language is gaining a different role: instead of acting as a mirror that reflects what goes on in our minds, language is now given a more active role as a means of constructing the social world around us. Attention can be paid, for example, on speakers' or writers' use of words, grammatical or stylistic constructions, or on metaphors, as in this study. In the field of applied linguistics, a discursive research approach has recently become used in studying learners' interpretations of their language learning experiences.

In the field of applied linguistics, a discursive research approach has recently become used in studying learners' interpretations of their language learning experiences. The aim of this descriptive study is to explore university students' reflections on their experiences as learners of English at school as well as on their experiences of their teachers. More precisely, the aim is to focus on, with the help of metaphor analysis, how much effort is required from students to learn English and how effective they find their teachers. Understanding of learners' self-constructions as language learners can help teachers as well as the learners themselves. In order to find out how the learners construct their previous learning experiences, the learners themselves are the only possible source of data.

The data of the present study consist of life stories written by fifty freshmen in the English Department of Jyväskylä University in 1994. A

metaphor analysis is applied to the life stories in order to glean all the metaphorical expressions the students exploit while recounting their experiences as learners of English, including their memories of their teachers. The data is limited to only those parts of the narratives that concern learning English in a classroom setting, i.e. formal language instruction; otherwise this study would become too wide in scope. The data are naturalistic in the sense that the life stories had not been designed to elicit metaphors.

An analysis of metaphors as a method is employed because it can yield insights into the learners' thoughts. According to Lakoff and Turner (1989:xi), metaphor is an ordinary tool in language since it is omnipresent in our minds and accessible to everyone. Thus, metaphors are a primary means by which people make sense of the world around them; metaphors can reveal, how learners construct their understandings of themselves as language learners. Moreover, beliefs and values are often embodied in personally significant images. The definition of metaphor that is used here is wide and commonplace: it is an umbrella concept for many kinds of incongruent or anomalous relationships between two linguistic expressions, i.e. comparisons that cannot be taken literally. Life stories are used as data because they present the voice of the person within the context. Current thinking of the uses of metaphor shows that metaphors play a central role in this process of storytelling. Metaphors become a bridge between the writers' subjective experiences and their expressions in language.

In this study, explicit or framing metaphors are first identified from the narratives and organized into two files, one for the learner metaphors and the other for the teacher metaphors. Secondly, the collected metaphors are interpreted in order to find similar categories of metaphorical expressions, based on the amount of work and effectiveness they convey. These categories will be described and illustrated with examples of the metaphorical expressions, taken from the life stories. The outcome of this analysis will be an interpretation of the data, not absolute truth.

The present study is organized as follows. First, in Chapter 2, literature on metaphors is reviewed and some examples of the use of metaphors in non-fictional texts are presented. Next, previous studies of metaphors for language learners and language teachers are reported. In Chapter 3, the

methodology and findings of the present study are reported and discussed. Finally, Chapter 4 summarizes the findings of this study.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Theories of metaphor

”The greatest thing by far is to be a master of metaphor. It is the one thing that cannot be learned from others; it is also a sign of genius, since a good metaphor implies an eye for resemblance.” (Aristotle, as quoted in Ortony 1979:3). Aristotle’s treatment of metaphor in his writings both on poetics and on rhetoric found its way into the classical and Renaissance texts on rhetoric. Thinkers regarded metaphor primarily as an enhancement of language, with the exception of the Romantics (Kittay 1987:1). Largely due to his opinion, Aristotle has been accused of being an elitist with respect to metaphor (Mahon 1999:69,72). Nevertheless, Mahon argues that Aristotle’s claims have been misunderstood, and that Aristotle holds a position on the ubiquity of metaphor in conversation and writing, which supports current views about the omnipresence of metaphor in everyday discourse; in other words, theories of metaphor are cognitive theories of human conceptual constructions.

Traditionally, metaphor has been a stylistic means of poetry and classical rhetoric to ornament a literary text. Since the 1950s when cognitive science as a new field of study was born, the use of metaphor has extended from philosophy and literary criticism to various other disciplines, eg. psychology, linguistics, cultural anthropology, social sciences, and education. They have each their own needs for metaphor. Ortony (1979:1-2) proposes two alternative approaches to the study of metaphor: positivism and constructionism. Logical positivists insist that reality could and should be precisely described through language that is unambiguous and testable. For them, other uses of language, for instance metaphor, are meaningless for they violate this empirist criterion of meaning. By contrast, relativists deny any true access to reality. Knowledge of reality is the result of mental construction, and metaphor is an essential characteristic of the creativity of thought and language. The former approach sees metaphors as linguistic phenomena, as semantics, which has been characteristic of linguistic research, and the latter, a more modern approach, as matters of communication that belong to the field of pragmatics.

Hellsten (1998:65) cites two issues of controversy in the literature of metaphor. One point of issue is the level of metaphor: does it construct on the level of words, phrases, or thoughts. The other question is whether metaphor creates reality, or is only a reflection of reality. Another classification quoted by Hellsten (1998:67) divides theories of metaphor into semantic, pragmatic and constructivist theories. In the semantic theory metaphors are placed on the level of word meaning; in the pragmatic theory metaphors emerge when people use language; the constructivist theory conveys that metaphors are characteristics of the human conceptual system and they guide our understanding as well as language, action and thought. The point of view the researchers take has a great influence on their choice of theoretical background.

In recent literature, however, the most common way to describe metaphor seems to be to categorize it in four theories of metaphor: the substitution theory, the comparison theory (sometimes seen as a subtype of the substitution theory), the interaction theory, and the cognitive theory of human conceptual structures. The first three are traditional ones; they were introduced by Richards (1936), who also created the necessary notions for the parts of a metaphor, and further established by Black (1962). Other views also exist. (See Leino and Drakenberg 1993:6 or Ortony 1979:5-6). The most recent view, the cognitive approach to metaphor, presented by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) emphasizes the mental processes in understanding a metaphor. Next, I will briefly present the four views of metaphor and report on some general criticism raised against them.

2.1.1. Substitution and comparison theories

The substitution theory of metaphor simply proposes that an expression is substituted by another expression without any changes in the meaning. Aristotle explained in his *Poetics* (as quoted e.g. by Parker 1982: 133) that the transfer of meaning occurs when a concept from one domain takes the place of a concept from another. This happens on a semantic level, from general to specific, from specific to general, or through analogy. Aristotle mostly valued metaphor based on analogy, because analogy is important for reasoning. Leino

and Drakenberg (1993:6-8) quote supporters of this view who hold that the content of a metaphor can be entirely replaced by a literal expression. They state that the reason for using metaphors according to this view is that they are useful when no literal terms are easily available, and for ornamental purposes. Elovaara (1992:10) points out that the factors that are lost when the literal meaning is employed instead of a metaphor are the liveliness, charm and vivacity of a metaphor.

A special form of the substitution theory is the comparison view of metaphor. Here, a metaphor is regarded as a shortened form of literal comparison, as a reduced analogy; it is based on resemblances rather than identities between the features of tenor and vehicle (Leino and Drakenberg 1993:9). (The names for the parts of a metaphorical expression are explained in section 2.2.) Petrie (1979:442) describes a comparison metaphor conveying implicitly that two apparently dissimilar things have a similarity in common after all. Boyd (1979:354) quotes Black (1962:35): “Successful communication via metaphor involves the hearer understanding the same respects of similarity or analogy as the speaker”. Black understands the comparison view entailing that every metaphorical statement is equivalent to one in which a quite definite respect of similarity or analogy is presented. This pragmatic level emphasizes metaphor as a figurative and deviant usage of language. Cameron (1999:24) describes the Aristotelian view of metaphor as a process of finding the shared ‘ground’, i.e. similarities and differences between the two parts of a metaphor, the simplest version being an implicit comparison of the two ideas. Every metaphor can be expanded back into the literal. Both the substitution and the comparison view are still essentially ornamental and, consequently, they can be deleted. In Aristotle’s words (as quoted in Ortony 1979:3): “Metaphors are not necessary, they are just nice”.

Ricoeur (as quoted by Elovaara 1992:20) sums up the common characteristics of the substitution and comparison theories in classical rhetoric as follows: A metaphor is a trope, which is expanded from the literal meaning of the word through the means of analogy. The literal expression is substituted by a metaphorical expression while the semantic meaning remains the same, so the metaphor can be replaced by the original word. A metaphor offers no new information about the expression.

2.1.2. Interaction theory

The interaction view has its modern basis in Richards's pioneering study in the 1930s. It was Richards (1936) who first shook the classical notion of metaphor being a substitution and therefore having no new information (Elovaara 1992:22-23). In addition, Richards claimed that not only the meaning of one word was changed, but that several words or a sentence were concerned in the interaction which brought about a new meaning. Miall (1982: xii) credits Richards for insisting that disparity in a metaphor may be as important as identification in its effects, thus opening up the view of metaphor as tensive. Miall further reminds us of Richards's opinion that metaphor could convey abstract ideas as well as pictorial. Besides this, Richards pointed out that single words have no meaning but they obtain meaning from their connections with other words in the discourse, which he called the 'interanimation of words', a transaction between contexts. The new meaning is a result of the interaction between two thoughts inside a word or expression. In this cognitive approach thinking as such is metaphorical.

Following Richards's theory, Black (1962, as quoted in Leino and Drakenberg 1993:15) claimed that the new, irreplaceable content of a metaphor is a consequence of interaction between its two distinct subjects, which he called 'primary' and 'secondary' subjects. The two concepts do not have to be presented in words. Black (ibid.:28) continues that the secondary subject is a system rather than an individual thing. The metaphoric utterance works by 'projecting upon' the primary subject a set of 'associated implications' that are predictable of the secondary subject. Thus, a metaphor is not merely a special effect added to an utterance but thinking as such is metaphoric. Black employed an example, 'Man is a wolf', to demonstrate the various interactions implied in the sentence. When people hear that sentence some characteristics of 'wolf' (the secondary subject) are aroused in their minds, depending on their knowledge of the expression, their previous experience of it and the culture they live in. The same metaphor may receive a number of different and even partially conflicting readings. People project the applicable ideas on 'man' (the primary subject) and receive a metaphorical expression. In other words,

metaphor is an instrument with which we can draw conclusions (Elovaara 1992:30). Contrary to the substitution theory where similarity is emphasized, the interaction theory calls attention to both similarity and dissimilarity of the topic and vehicle. A large number of links to different experiences are activated. The interaction theory combines the semantic and pragmatic levels, i.e., the interaction theories go beyond the level of words to a shared body of knowledge and assumptions that are associated with words, producing a meaning that is new and transcends both parts of the metaphor. Petrie (1979:442) maintains that nothing in words on an interactional level of metaphor tells us whether the implicit comparison is between, for example, the positive or the negative features of the source and the target. The same metaphor can be comparative and interactive depending on the point of view taken.

2.1.3. Cognitive theory

The cognitively oriented approach to metaphor is widely employed nowadays. This current view, prompted by cognitive scientists' interest in the study of the human mind in various disciplines, proposes that a metaphorical expression is not only a fundamental and pervasive way of using language but also a way of thinking. Cameron claims (1999:8-9) that throughout history the cognitive nature of metaphor has been shown in the concern to address metaphor in use. Nevertheless, in the 20th century the cognitive and socio-cultural dimensions were downplayed and language studied more as a decontextualised system until Lakoff and Johnson's book *Metaphors we live by* was published in 1980. They and their colleagues tightened the links between metaphor and thought. In Lakoff and Johnson's (1980:3) words:

Metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980:5) state the frequently cited idea that metaphor is "understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of

another". Metaphor works as a means in this process of understanding. It is, for example, the only way we comprehend abstract concepts.

According to Barcelona (2000:2-3), the ability to project concepts onto other concepts is due to imagination. Barcelona points out that there is a continuum between all sorts of cognition, especially body-based cognition but also cognition acquired on the basis of social and cultural experience and language. Nikanne (1992:71-75) interprets Lakoff's ideas and describes that the human conceptual system is based, on the one hand, on our internal ability to form conceptual hierarchies and to place categories into this hierarchy and, on the other hand, on the ability to project physical concepts to abstract things with the help of metaphors. In other words, Lakoff (1987:267) has identified two kinds of structure in our perceptual experience: the basic-level structure and the kinesthetic image-schematic structure. First, according to Lakoff, one level of the conceptual hierarchy is basic to perceiving and memorizing. In everyday life, when we see a dog, we do not immediately think of it, e.g., as a mammal (an upper level concept) or as a dachshund (a lower level concept), but just as A DOG. Second, the image schemas are simple structures that constantly recur in our everyday bodily experience, e.g. CONTAINERS, PATHS, FORCES, and in various orientations and relations, e.g. UP/DOWN, FRONT/BACK, PART/WHOLE, CENTER/PERIPHERY. (Lakoff capitalizes conceptual metaphors.) Both the bodily expressions and the image-schemas are universal; they are central to how we construct categories. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:9) claim that the presuppositions for metaphorical conceptualization are the existence of a coherent system of metaphorical concepts in our minds and a corresponding coherent system of metaphorical expressions for those concepts. Similarly, Lakoff and Turner (1989:51) explain that conceptual metaphors are systematic, unconscious, automatic and widely conventionalized in a language. Lakoff (1987: xiv-xv) argues that conceptual categories are different from what the objectivist view requires of them. In his experiential realism view, conceptual categories imply that thought is *embodied*, *imaginative*, it has *gestalt properties*, and an *ecological structure* (emphasis original).

Conventional metaphors are, according to Lindstromberg (1991: 210) neither 'imaginative and creative' nor 'innovatory', but so natural as to be unconscious. Metaphors vary in the degree to which everyday thought depends

on them. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:14-34) have divided conventional metaphors into three categories. First, 'Structural metaphors' are those where one concept is understood and expressed in terms of another structured, sharply defined concept. They can produce new metaphorical expressions because a more general metaphor scheme can be applied to them. We have an inventory of such structures of which schemas and metaphors are established parts. The authors (ibid.:5) present several examples and show in detail, for instance, how the conventional concept ARGUMENT IS WAR is metaphorically structured, the activity is metaphorically structured, and, consequently, the language is metaphorically structured. We understand the meaning of the argument by virtue of our experience of war. We do not just talk about arguments in terms of war; many of the things we do in arguing are partially structured by the concept of war. In general, some features of the concept are highlighted by the metaphor while others stay hidden. Another, perhaps even more commonly known conventional metaphorical concept is TIME IS MONEY, which conveys that time is valued as money in our culture.

Lakoff and Johnson's (1980:14-34) two other types of conventional metaphors, besides the structural metaphors already discussed above, are both based on our physical and cultural experiences. They exploit the most common metaphoric structures in language and the corresponding structures about the world. The second category of conventional metaphors is 'Orientational metaphors' that organize a whole system of concepts, instead of one concept only, in terms of another. Most of them are spatially related to each other, for example: up/down, front/back and in/out. The authors' example is "I am feeling up today", which is grounded on the concept of 'HAPPY IS UP'. 'Orientational metaphors' can vary from culture to culture: the basic values of a culture are in concordance with the metaphorical structure of the basic concepts of each culture. The third category of conventional metaphors, 'Ontological metaphors', is also based on our bodily experiences, which give a ground for understanding things that are not clearly discrete or bounded, like mountains or street corners. Even abstractions such as events, activities, emotions and ideas are represented as something concrete, such as an object, material substance, container or person; usually they are taken as self-evident and are not noticed as being metaphors. For instance, the conventional concept

of the mind as a machine produces an expression: 'I am a little rusty today.' The most obvious ontological metaphors are personifications of abstract things in human terms, e.g. 'Life has cheated me.' As in the case of 'Orientational metaphors', most of these expressions are not noticed as being metaphorical language, because they are deeply rooted in a language and serve a very limited range of purposes.

While explaining conventional metaphors Lakoff (1987:68-76) represents how we organize our knowledge by means of structures called 'Idealized Cognitive Models', which implies that each concept consists of one or more related schemas. A schema means the image of the things and relations the concept arises in the mind. The schema of the concept JOURNEY (in 'Life is a journey'), for instance, includes passengers, departure, route, vehicle, etc. Life, in the same way as a journey, begins and ends, has a route, and so on (Lakoff and Turner 1989:3; Nikanne 1992:60,63). Significantly, Lakoff and Turner (1989:62) stress that life needs not be viewed as a journey; however, once we learn a schema, we use it automatically and even unconsciously. The metaphor is successful if there can be found enough analogies in the schema of the target of a metaphor. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:10-13) stress that metaphorical structuring is partial, not total. A metaphorical expression focuses on some aspects of the concept while others become hidden. Not all aspects are compatible; the concept TIME IS MONEY, for instance, probably cannot employ an entailment of a bank, because there are no time banks. A metaphorical concept can be extended in some ways but not in others. Moreover, a complete transfer would result in synonymity. Nikanne (1992:67-68) wonders what the principles are that determine what part of the source of the metaphor can, and what part cannot, be reflected in the target.

The metaphors a person has adopted influence the concepts that are understood through metaphors. Thus, metaphors determine our actions and perceiving. This is the way "metaphors we live by" are born, although we could live in some other ways, if we had adopted other kinds of metaphor. Metaphors affect our culture; they spread from person to person, and some metaphors become conventionalized (see Recognition in 2.2.4) in a society. Different cultures have different conventionalized metaphors (Nikanne 1992:64).

The cognitive view of metaphor has two general interpretations of metaphoric representation, which Murphy (1996:176-177) calls the strong and the weak versions. Supporters of the strong cognitive view, e.g., Black (1962, 1979), Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999), Kittay (1987), Turner (1991), Gibbs (1994), and Gwyn (1999) take the notion of understanding one thing in terms of another seriously. They hold that the conceptual system is not only involved in the processing of metaphor, but that thought is itself structured metaphorically, and that language merely reflects the underlying conceptual structure in which something is understood, stored and processed in terms of something else (Cameron 1999:11). This strong cognitive view has been disputed e.g. by Quinn (1991), Steen (1994) and Cameron (1999), who prefer a weaker view on the metaphorical nature of thought. Accordingly, the representation itself is direct, but somehow causally influenced by the metaphor in question. Steen (1999:81-82) calls attention to the limitations of a Topic-Vehicle approach to describing metaphor but he admits, however, that it is fruitful for many types of studies. In his opinion, metaphor should be a matter of underlying propositions and not of linguistic expressions. Similarly, Cameron (1999:12) points out that the fact that metaphor is more than language does not mean that language form is irrelevant to the study of metaphor. Reducing all metaphors to the form of 'A is B' under-emphasizes the potential effect of form on processing and understanding the metaphor.

The list Jackendoff and Aaron (1991:321) and Lakoff and Turner (1989:217-218) present on different approaches to metaphor gives an idea of how varying and contradictory they are: The Literal Meaning Theory, the Pragmatics Position, the Interaction Theory, the No Concepts Position, the Dead Metaphor Theory and the It's All Metaphor Theory. Here, there is no need to go into these theories; even the four more traditional theories mentioned above overlap. The fact that there are differing viewpoints to the concept of metaphor is seen in the criticism in the following chapter.

2.1.4. Criticism of the theories of metaphor

All the four theories discussed have also been criticized. Leino and Drakenberg (1993:12-13) remark that although the substitution and comparison views have

old traditions in the history of linguistics they can be criticized for their view of language as an abstract system that can be studied as such independent of its use in certain contexts. They continue that the substitution and comparative views share the assumption that there are always two objects to be substituted or compared, which is not necessarily true. Steen (1999:82, 84) states that the target of the figurative words does not have to be expressed in the same clause, or even expressed at all. Black (1962:37) was not satisfied with the comparative view because “it suffers from a vagueness that borders on vacuity”. There is vagueness especially in the concept of similarity; also analogy is an indefinite concept. In addition, the traditional comparative view fails to capture the central role that metaphor might play in human thought.

Also the interaction theories have been criticized of vagueness. Black (1978:192) regards the interaction theory better than the substitution one but he points out that it is not always clear what it means to say that in a metaphor one thing is thought of as another thing. It is something more than to compare them, but he asks what that something more is. Jackendoff and Aaron (1991:322) maintain that Lakoff and Turner (1989) erroneously criticize the interaction theory for claiming that metaphors merely compare two domains equally and pick out similarities symmetrically. Searle (1979:99) emphasizes that the interaction theory fails to make a distinction between sentence and word meaning and speaker or utterance meaning. According to him, the former is never metaphorical, while the latter can be. Miall (1982: xiii) finds that the standard view tends to ignore the context and therefore the purpose of the speaker; however, a shift of emphasis from semantic properties to cognitive processes is on its way. This view takes better account of the context, of the creativity of metaphor and of the power of metaphor as an instrument of thought. Nevertheless, not all are satisfied with the cognitive theories, either, as can be seen in the following paragraphs.

Since the experiential basis of thought is regarded as a fact in the cognitive theories of metaphor, the metaphoric structuring of emotions concepts has been questioned by, for example, Onikki (1992) and Murphy (1996). It is puzzling why emotions are not directly represented via our experiences of them but are instead represented in terms of journeys, warfare, containers and so on. Murphy (1996:191) asks why children who are learning

these expressions cannot understand them through their own experiences of respective emotions, rather than through metaphors. Moreover, Onikki (1992:35) argues that the theory overlooks affects, emotional meanings of poetic metaphor. Expressing emotions is one of the major functions of metaphor (Goatly 1997:158). Another problem with the Lakovian theory of metaphor, according to Onikki (1992:59), is that because almost every expression is metaphorical, the concept of metaphor can lose its significance.

Schön (1979:254) finds two problems from a social-political point of view: How to know what the speaker or writer is thinking and how to come to see things in new ways. Niskanen (1992:73-75) maintains that naïve empirism like the theory of metaphor appeals to many people because it offers a world picture where people can become whatever they like to, and their conceptual system is not restricted by a genetic program. The human mind is not dependable of experiences. Human mind cannot be ‘tabula rasa’, because then generalizations would not be possible. Naïve empirism like that is not tenable for the starting point of cognitive theory; it is not psychologically believable, he insists. To his criticism Niskanen (ibid.:63) adds the case where the mapping of the source and the target is total, and no new information about the concept is gained; hence, it does not affect our thinking. As mentioned earlier, Niskanen (1992:68) wondered along which principles the mapping between the source and the target of metaphor occur. In the same way, Jackendoff and Aaron (1991:324) see the problem of the proper choice of the schema. Lakoff and his followers do explain that a particular metaphorical schema applies in a metaphor but they do not show why that schema is appropriate, rather than some other.

Similarly, McGlone (2003:2) finds the empirical claims of the conceptual metaphor view largely unsubstantiated. His opposition is based on three facts. First, this view assumes that abstract concepts are entirely subsumed by concrete concepts. Second, the linguistic evidence is interpreted in a circular fashion both as the motivation for the conceptual metaphor construct and as the only evidence for their existence, in the same way as arguments made in favor of the controversial Whorfian hypothesis. And third, people rely primarily on the stereotypical properties of metaphor vehicles when paraphrasing metaphors; they do not, for example, refer to a concrete metaphor

or judge similarities among metaphors. Quinn (1991, as cited by Cameron 1999:26) suggests that a conceptual metaphor has a cultural basis, rather than a purely cognitive basis. People acquire metaphors that reflect the thinking of their socio-cultural groups. Cameron continues that there would seem to be room for both an experientially and a socially based approach to conceptual metaphor.

Stålhammar (1997:32-33) objects to Lakoff and Johnson's idea that the metaphors they have collected are expressions of universal, biological experiences. She also brings up the fact that research of cognitive linguistics has mostly been conducted in English, in which language the easy exchanging of parts of speech makes personification more numerous than in some other languages. Chilton and Ilyin (1993:14,27) have pointed out the problem of 'translating between cultures': between languages, available translation equivalents do not necessarily correspond to the same cognitive schema. Therefore, metaphors are not transferred with fixed meanings either, because local languages, among other things, influence the process. Likewise, Low (1988:131) warns language learners of a cross-linguistic dimension to word-class preference; the result might be humoristic or erroneous. The same danger is, naturally, evident in all literal translation.

In sum, there have been several different theories about metaphors and their use; metaphors have been described as something to be used for rhetorical purposes, as a decoration, as a way to create a mental model or even as the basis for all human thinking. In recent years there has been a debate concerning metaphor and language in general. The experimentalist view that is raised against the objectivist one is gaining ground. One of the most important experimentalist theorists is Lakoff (1980), who claims that the role of metaphor is central not only in language but in the human conceptual system as well; the connection appears to be quite direct. Our conceptual system is built on the ability to create and understand metaphors, and our conception of the world that surrounds us is deeply metaphorical and based on our senses and our cultural experiences. The relation between language and thought is not as simple as social psychology would want us to believe. It has been called into question by the social constructionist tradition in psychology (Potter and Wetherell 1987), anthropology (Hanks 1996), critical theory (Giddens 1991),

cognitive semantics (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Turner 1987). Cameron (1999: 26) argues that we are still far from understanding the complexity of the human brain at work when it tries to make sense of analogies by finding connections between concepts; theories of metaphor interpretations and comprehension are just attempts to capture some aspects of what we know. Due to the greatly varying theoretical background, attempts to define a metaphor also show great diversity, as can be seen in the next section.

2.2. Definitions of metaphor

A verbal metaphor has been defined in a large number of ways. This is due to disciplinary differences and also to differences in the theoretical approach. A definition useful to one discipline may prove quite inadequate for another. No theorists supporting the same general view agree on every detail. Leino and Drakenberg (1993:7) note that earlier researchers have ignored the pragmatic and communicative aspects of language. The older theorists are more general by nature, while the more recent ones represent new disciplines and also a higher degree of specialization. Among several others, Low (1988:125) claims that none of the definitions works perfectly and that it is theoretically impossible to draw hard and fast boundaries. Leino and Drakenberg (1993:23) even claim that a number of writers do not define the term at all, especially in the field of educational literature.

However, Leino and Drakenberg (1993:24-26) state that there is some agreement on the typical characteristics of metaphor. Very many definitions either explicitly or implicitly refer to transference, similarity or dissimilarity, comparison, and resemblance. Stålhammar (1997:13) describes the etymology of the word ‘metaphor’: it is derived from the Greek verb *meta pherein* (‘transfer’, ‘carry over’) and from the corresponding noun *metaphora*. She also reminds of the fact that the concrete way of transferring the meaning can be seen in the substitution theory of metaphor, but not in the interaction theory. Before describing some differing definitions of metaphor I think it is in order to present briefly the notions used for the parts of metaphor.

In a verbal metaphor, there are usually two explicit parts (Murphy 1996:175). The two component terms of a metaphor are referred to as ‘*source*’

and '*target*', where the source is the domain where the actual statement is generated and the target is the domain that will be used to explain the statement. Jackendoff and Aaron (1991:323-324) point out that elements of the source domain are usually expressed in the text. The target domain may or may not be expressed in the text, but it is what the metaphor is really about. Often, the two domains even help to explain each other (Torgny 1997:5). The target domain, in other words, refers to the entity of which something is stated, what is talked about, which the metaphor is applied to. As technical terms these notions are often written with a capital letter. Other names for the target have been: *tenor* (introduced by Richards 1936), *subject term*, *principal subject*, *focus* (used by e.g. Black 1962), *prime* or *topic*. Other names for the source, the metaphorically used term that is borrowed by or transferred to the topic, through which the target is applied, have been: *vehicle* (introduced by Richards), *referent*, *metaphoric term*, *subsidiary subject*, *comment* or *frame* (used by e.g. Black). A common example in the Lakoff and Johnson terminology would be 'LIFE IS A JOURNEY', in which 'journey' is the source experience being drawn on, while 'life' is the target experience of the metaphor.

The characteristics the target and the source have in common, but are not necessarily expressed, i.e., the means of comparison, are often called the *ground*, *frame*, or *schema* and the dissimilarities are referred to as the *tension* (Leino and Drakenberg 1993:5, Stålhammar 1997:17). A *schema* is the image of things and relations the concept arises in the mind. These things are part of the action; they are linked together and they can change as well. (Previously in section 2.1.3 entailments of the schema of 'journey' were discussed.) A *mapping* is the process of applying our experiences on things that are new to us. A mapping includes epistemic and ontological correspondences, in which knowledge about journeys, for instance, is mapped onto knowledge about life. We can reason about life using the knowledge we have about journeys; mapping is one of our conventional ways of understanding things. Torgny (1997:7) notes that analogy is the most obvious kind of mapping and metaphor the most complex kind of mapping. Next, I will recount attempts to define metaphor, first the traditional kinds of definitions and then the more modern ones.

2.2.1. Traditional definitions of metaphor

The simplest way to characterize a metaphor is to call it a comparison statement with parts left out: “A metaphor is an abbreviated simile” (Miller 1979:226). An Oxford English dictionary (2002:1759) defines metaphor as

1. A figure of speech in which a name or descriptive phrase is transferred to an object or an action different from, but analogous to, that to which it is literally applicable; 2. A thing considered as representative of some other (usu. abstract) thing.

The Aristotelian definition in *Poetics* is probably the most influential account of metaphor ever provided: “Metaphor consists in giving one thing a name that belongs to something else; the transference being either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or on grounds of analogy” (Parker 1982:133). Also Mahon (1999:69-72) interprets Aristotle to believe that all metaphors fall into at least one of these categories, although analogy metaphors are the most pleasing. This account of metaphor is known as the comparison theory of metaphor.

Other definitions with the idea of ‘one thing treated as if it were another’ have been provided, for example, by Burke (1945:503 as quoted in Cameron 1999:13): “Metaphor is a device for seeing something in terms of something else.” Burke’s statement implies an anomaly of some sort between the target and the source. Oxford (1998:90) employs Bartel’s (1983:3) definition of metaphor as “any comparison that cannot be taken literally” and defines it as “a figure of speech in which a name or quality is attributed to something to which it is not fully applicable”. Soskice (1985:15) describes a metaphor as “that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another.” Low’s definition (1988:126) involves “treating X as if it were, in some ways, Y”. Here, X and Y are variables with non-identical values and no claim is made about how far either speaker or listener may believe in the identification. And finally comes Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980:5-6) basic statement: “The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.”

Lastly, two accurate and elaborated definitions are cited, the first from a linguistic point of view by Goatly (1997:108-109) and the second from a semantic point of view by Cohen (1979:74):

A metaphor occurs when a unit of discourse is used to refer to an object, concept, process, quality, relationship or world to which it does not conventionally refer, or colligates with a unit(s) with which it does not conventionally colligate; and when this unconventional act of reference or colligation is understood on the basis of similarity or analogy involving at least two of the following: the unit's conventional referent; the unit's actual conventional referent; the actual referent(s) of the unit's actual colligate(s); the conventional referent of the unit's conventional colligate(s).

An expression has a metaphorical occurrence in a sentence-sequence if and only if the extent of cancellation (from the expression's semantic features) is so great as to exclude it from identifying a topic independently of some special circumstance (such as a relevant previous sentence in the sequence, a familiar linguistic practice, and so on).

Differing voices can be found as well. Davidson (1978:30) is against the major conception of time: "Metaphors mean what the words, in their most literal interpretation, mean, and nothing else." Loewenberg (1975:338 as quoted by Beckmann 2001:54-55) claims: "Metaphors, as I have analyzed them, are statements without truth-value." The transfer of meaning has also been questioned by Searle (1979:93), for example, who insists that as long as the interaction between the two domains works, the meaning of each one of them is still intact. He rejects the idea of two kinds of meaning: literal and metaphorical.

2.2.2. Interactional definitions of metaphor

The interaction view of metaphor emphasizes the fact that something new is generated when a metaphor is used. Black (1962:44) states that a metaphor works by applying to the principal subject (the target) a system of 'associated implications' characteristic of the subsidiary subject (the source); a new thing is created when a novel metaphor is understood. His approach is pragmatic. Paivio (1979:150) employs a metaphor himself in his definition:

Metaphor is a solar eclipse. It hides the object, the linguistic meaning, and at the same time reveals some of its most salient characteristics when viewed through the right telescope. Metaphor obscures its literal and commonplace aspects while permitting a new and subtle understanding.

Katz (1982, as quoted by Leino and Drakenberg 1993:24) holds that a metaphor can be considered a juxtaposition of two concepts that, when the latter are related to one another, lead to a novel interpretation of one of these concepts. Likewise, Lakoff (1990:47-48) states:

The metaphor involves understanding one domain of experience in terms of a very different domain of experience. The metaphor can be understood as a mapping from a source domain to a target domain. The mapping is tightly structured.

Haser (2000:173) declares: “The label metaphor will be reserved for transfer across semantic domains (criterion 1) which is (putatively) based on similarity (criterion 2)”, where Lakoff and Turner (1989:103) add a third defining characteristic: “In metaphor, a whole schematic structure (with two or more entities) is mapped onto another whole schematic structure.” Kramsch (in press) expresses the same briefly: “Metaphor is a cognitive as well as linguistic process that brings two domains, or ‘mental spaces’, together in one linguistic phrase.” On the linguistic surface a metaphorical expression looks like either a metaphor or a simile, ie., it can be realized by such linguistic expressions as “Learning is ...” or “Learning is like ...”.

Taylor (1984:8 as quoted in Oxford 1998: 90) maintains that all language is metaphorical: “Language works by means of transference from one kind of reality to another. It is thus essentially rather than incidentally or decoratively or even illegitimately – metaphorical.” Lastly, Way’s broad definition (1991:49) is cited:

Language is seen as having a shifting distinction of literal and metaphoric expressions relative to particular contexts. Therefore, the definition of what is metaphoric and what is not will change in different contexts and as our language itself changes over time.

This presentation of definitions of metaphors only gives some typical examples of the way the concept has been defined. Very many refer to

transference, similarity or dissimilarity and comparison. Some focus on words or phrases; few account for the metaphorical use of a whole sentence. From this variety of definitions it will suffice for the purposes of the present study to define a metaphor as “any comparison that cannot be taken literally” (Oxford 1998:90), or “understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:6). Because the aim of the present study is to detect metaphors in the data in order to interpret the writers’ understandings of themselves, it is not significant to examine why the writers employed metaphorical expressions or what they possibly meant by the expressions. Readers’ interpretations are decisive. In addition to these substitution and comparative definitions, an interactional view might be useful for metaphorical processing in some cases (see Kramsch’s definition above). What is more, a metaphor will be used as an umbrella concept for some related tropes that are discussed in the next section.

2.2.3. Related concepts

As has been mentioned in the previous section, metaphor can be regarded as a kind of ‘umbrella’ term (e.g. Leino and Drakenberg 1993:35) for many other rhetorical devices, or tropes that exist. In a way, they can be seen as subtypes of metaphor. Black warns (1979:20) that if all ornamental speech is considered metaphorical we do not notice the differences between metaphor and other classical figures of speech. In the following I will briefly present three stylistic devices of non-literal language: simile, metonymy, and synecdoche.

Simile is a category defined by its surface linguistic form, i.e. the inclusion of ‘like’ or ‘as’ (Cameron 1999:131). Similarly, Suskice (1985:59) emphasizes that metaphor and simile are functionally the same, though they are textually different. Miller (1979:220) sees a distinction between a simile and a comparison. According to Miller, a simile is a rhetoric way of exemplifying the properties of a phenomenon, for example, “He was strong as a horse”, whereas a comparison deals with the actual differences and similarities. Low (1999:56-57) opposes Glucksberg and McGlone’s (2001:1) view of metaphors and similes as being interchangeable; they insist that “one just needs to delete **like**” (emphasis original). In Low’s opinion, similes need by definition to contain

both the Topic and the Vehicle, which a large proportion of metaphoric utterances actually do not. Both Davidson (1978:39) and Beckmann (2001:54-55) support the view that all similes are true and most metaphors are false. We use a simile only when we know the corresponding metaphor to be false. We can say, “The earth is like a floor”, but “The earth is a floor” would be false. Also McGlone (2003) asks why literal comparisons are reversible but metaphors and similes are not. We can reverse phrases ‘a Saab is like a BMW’ vs. ‘a BMW is like a Saab’, but phrases ‘a job is like a jail vs. a jail is like a job’ are not reversible. Aristotle compared a metaphor with a simile and found that a metaphor was shorter and more concentrated than a simile (Torgny 1997:7). Lastly, Leino and Drakenberg (1993:29-30) claim that a metaphor and a simile are two different kinds of analogy. A simile is considered to be an explicit comparison and an analogy an implicit one.

Metonymy is a widely used figure of thought. The term derives from the Greek word *metonymia*, which means ‘changing the name’. Here, the original concept is described by employing a characteristic that is somehow related to it (Stålhammar 1997:15-16). Some researchers make a distinction between metaphor and metonymy, others claim that they cannot be distinguished. The idea of ‘changing the name’, however, is common to all of them. First I will mention the writers who insist on dividing metaphor and metonymy into separate classes and those who see no absolute differences.

Lakoff and Turner (1989:103-104) see metonymy as a connection between two things like in a metaphor but the connections are different: a metonymic mapping does not occur across domains. Both metaphor and metonymy can be conventionalized conceptual mappings. An example of a vastly employed definition is the one Fraser (1979:175) gives: “Metonymy involves a replacement of a term where the relationship of the first to the second is felt to be more functional: cause/effect, actor/acting.” We take a well-understood or easily perceived aspect of something to represent the thing as a whole. The separating factor between metaphor and metonymy appears to be whether the concepts in question belong to one or two domains. Thus e.g. Gibbs (1999:36) explains that in metaphor, one conceptual domain is understood in terms of another, whereas in metonymy the mapping between two things is within the same domain. He proposes a test: “If a non-literal

comparison between two things is meaningful when seen in an ‘X is like Y’ statement, then it is metaphoric; otherwise it is metonymic”. Likewise, Goossens (2000:149) holds that metonymy is a mapping within the same conceptual domain, and metaphor is a mapping of one conceptual domain onto another across domains; the latter awakes more links in the mind. Accordingly, the cognitive process is much simpler in the case of metonyms than of metaphors.

Alternatively Lakoff and Johnson (1980:35-37) claim that there is not always a clear distinction between metonymy and metaphor; the difference is functional. In metonymy, one entity is used to refer to another that is related to it. They give an often cited example of one kind of metonymy: “The ham sandwich is waiting for his check”, which means that the person who ordered a ham sandwich is waiting for his check. The context is essential for understanding the meaning. The metonymic expression focuses on one characteristic of the whole, leaving others in the background. Metonymic concepts are also systematic, not random or arbitrary occurrences. Lindstromberg (1991:208) sees metaphor as a ‘blanket’ term for both metaphor and metonymy when he defines metonym as an adjunct or attribute standing for the thing meant. This umbrella concept includes simile, metonymy and synecdoche.

Synecdoche is a central type of metonymy. In synecdoche a part of the concept represents the whole concept (*pars pro toto*) or vice versa; it is substitution of one term for another within a predetermined hierarchy. One referring term replaces another that is either more general or more particular than the actual term itself. An example from Lakoff and Johnson (1980:37): “She is just a pretty face.” In the present study a metaphor is considered to be an umbrella term for all kinds of figurative, non-literal, or deviant language. How to recognize a possible metaphoric expression will be discussed in the next section.

2.2.4. Recognition of metaphor

A certain expression can mean different things in different contexts. According to Ortony (1979:178), a metaphor can be explicitly announced, semantically

anomalous, or pragmatically anomalous. Paivio's example (1979:150) "Put a tiger in your tank" is anomalous semantically, but a driver understands the meaning. Low (1988:133) mentions some adverbials that indicate whether an utterance is intended to be taken literally, metaphorically, or in both ways, e.g. 'metaphorically', 'figuratively', 'indeed', 'really'. The situation becomes complex if an apparently metaphorical expression should be taken in its literal sense; terms like 'really' or 'literally' do not help because they are often used with the opposite meaning. Goatly (1997:172) gives an even longer list of markers of metaphor. Furthermore, Goatly argues (ibid.:137) that text interpretation acquires information, which interacts with a person's existing beliefs or thought. One needs knowledge of the language system and of other context, and background schematic knowledge: factual and socio-cultural. Similarly, Hellsten (1994:75-76) claims that in order to recognize and understand a metaphor we need, in addition to the context, background knowledge of the speaker or writer and of their intentions. If the phenomenon is new to us, we try to understand it in terms of our earlier experiences mapping it within the same domain. Miall (1982:33) argues that we do not always recognize metaphor, but when we do, it is because of the clash between separate domains. According to Cameron (1999:5), researchers have noticed that people are more likely to process familiar metaphors directly, while less familiar metaphors often invoke the literal meaning of the metaphor.

Petrie (1979:442) ponders on whether a metaphor can be identified by some set of linguistic features independent of its use on particular occasions. The appropriate category for metaphor seems to be not that of formal linguistic sentence meanings but rather utterance meanings or speech acts. Such a categorization is suggested by the necessity of taking account of the context of understanding in deciphering the metaphor. Petrie argues that in the typology of speech acts there is not one, which corresponds to speaking metaphorically. There is a connection between uttering a metaphor with making an assertion. Assertions are speech acts that are properly assessed in the true-false domain. A basic convention of language is that people intend to utter meaningful, useful and true statements. The utterance of a metaphor is false, because the world just is not the way it is represented if the words are given their literal interpretation.

Miller (1979:227) separates three phases in understanding metaphor: recognition, reconstruction and interpretation. The problem is that metaphor is either false in the real world or apparently unrelated to the textual concept. The metaphorical expression is true, according to Miall; we only have to find the similarities between the text and the real world. Miller (1979:248) divides metaphors into nominal metaphors, predicative metaphors, and sentential metaphors. In any case, to be able to discern a metaphor depends on one's ability to make a connection between two seemingly unlike objects and find their commonality.

Hellsten (1998:71) claims that metaphors are in a state of continuous change. The varying and developing characteristic of metaphor causes new metaphors to be born and existing metaphors to become fixed. Metaphors have a varying position on the cline from living metaphors to dead metaphors. Leino and Drakenberg (1993:26) state that in a living metaphor we realize that facts of one sort are presented as if they belong to another. Living metaphors are real, strong genuine and fresh, whereas dead metaphors are weak, stored, institutionalized and conventionalized. In a dead metaphor an actual transfer of meaning has taken place so that the sense of a transferred image is not present any more. Furthermore, Stålhammar (1997:14-15) explains that dead (or petrified, conventionalized, fixed) metaphors have originally been metaphorical expressions that have been used in a language so long that their initial implications have been changed or forgotten or are difficult to recall. They become lexicalized, idioms which have a meaning of their own. This is a natural process in a language, as new expressions are often created through familiar terms. As an example Stålhammar mentions mixed metaphors, i.e. combinations of two or more inconsistent metaphors that occur in the same sentence, are used to express the same concept, often to fill in lexical gaps, e.g. 'bergets fot' or 'bordets ben', i.e., 'the foot of a mountain' and 'a leg of a table', respectively.

Etymological metaphors in English are abundant; most of them are derived from Latin or Greek. Although they are 'buried', they can be invented for new purposes as well. Likewise, Hellsten (1994:76) claims that the etymological origin of many Finnish words is metaphorical: for example, 'ajatella' (*to think*) derives from a concrete expression 'ajaa takaa' (*to pursue*),

which has gradually lost its original meaning and in that way its metaphorical nature. Everyday language of thought and action is full of similar 'sleeping' metaphors where the contact with the initial idea has been lost. Torgny (1997:8) holds that real metaphors always create a new meaning and a more profound understanding of the phenomenon.

Goatly (1997:14) presents a division into active and inactive metaphors. Active metaphors are based on interaction or comparison; they are relatively new and have become part of everyday linguistic usage; therefore they demand interpretative work and decoding of their semantics. Inactive metaphors are based on substitution; they are dead, sleeping, maybe buried, and have become lexicalized so that they can be found in a dictionary, as Stålhammar (1997) explained earlier. The difference between a metaphor and an idiom, according to Lindstromberg (1991:212), is that in a metaphor lexical meaning is rendered less arbitrary than in an idiom, whose constituents give no clue to its overall meaning.

Lakoff and his collaborators (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Lakoff and Turner 1989) have introduced the theory of conventional metaphors (see the kinds of conventional metaphors in section 2.1.3). A conventional metaphor is commonly used in everyday language in a culture to give structure to that culture's conceptual system. They are so basic to our thinking that if they were changed, the way we think would be changed as well. For instance, expressions 'mind's eye' and 'viewpoint' refer to the conventional concept of SEEING IS THINKING. Since conventional concepts are so common, we hardly notice them and therefore they are difficult to resist (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:63). A metaphor is new if it is not already part of the conceptual system of a culture as reflected in its language. Leino and Drakenberg (1993:27) use the name 'root metaphors' for basic metaphors, which are embedded in a language and influence the way people in that culture act, think and speak.

Following Lakoff and Johnson, Sanchez (1999:3) recognizes conventional metaphors, which can be classified as live or dead, and imaginative metaphors, which can be either live or novel. Live conventional metaphors are the used part of a metaphorical concept; for example, the metaphorical concept LIFE IS A JOURNEY can produce a live conventional metaphor 'a solitary journey made by each of us' (from Stephen Dobyns's

poem ‘Summer Evenings’). Lakoff and Johnson (1980:53) propose that novel imaginative metaphors represent a new way of thinking about something, whereas imaginative live metaphors are either instances of the unused part of the literal metaphor or extensions of the used part of a metaphor.

As mentioned before (in section 2.2.2), for the purpose of the present study it will suffice to consider metaphor as an umbrella concept for all kinds of figurative language. Only the living, fresh and conspicuous metaphorical expressions, although some of them might be considered idioms, are taken into account in the metaphorical processing of the data. In a metaphor a lexical meaning is rendered less arbitrary than in an idiom, whose constituents give no clue to its overall meaning (Lindstromberg 1991:212). The aim here is not to investigate deeply conventionalized metaphors or the etymology of words. In the next sections, some examples will be given of the benefits as well as drawbacks of using metaphor in other kinds of literature than poetry or fiction.

2.3. Uses of metaphor in non-fictional texts

For centuries metaphor has been a stylistic phenomenon, the property of classic rhetoric and literary criticism. Originally it only had aesthetic value and was regarded in the same way as other figures of speech in literature. The traditional fields of science, philosophy, psychology and literary criticism did not pay much serious attention to metaphor while present day cognitive sciences, artificial intelligence, politics, journalism, linguistics and so on, see metaphor as a powerful and applicable device. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:185) have pointed out that we use metaphors for organizing our thoughts; that applies to scientists and their thoughts as much as to everybody else. Here, I will give a brief review of the purposes for employing a metaphor instead of a literal expression (excluding all fictional literature), first in scientific discourse in general, and then especially in education; finally I will discuss some potential drawbacks in the use of metaphor in education.

2.3.1. Scientific discourse

Metaphor is a very interdisciplinary concept. Lantolf (1996:719) notes how the history of Western scientific tradition shows the central role of metaphor. William James, a psychologist, argued for the critical role of analogical thinking in the development of human knowledge, scientific or otherwise (Leary1990: 44-45). Especially cognitive psychology has seen the relation of metaphor to subconsciousness and has adopted the use of metaphors as an instrument in investigating the structure and functioning of human mind and memory (Kalliokoski 1992:336).

In addition to being a methodological tool in attempts to explain and understand the different ways people think and talk, metaphors help to understand scientific words. Metaphors have a theory-constitutive function, especially in pretheoretical stages, in creating new understandings of a phenomenon and in creating new terms, and in formulating and transmitting scientific theories. Lantolf (1996:721, 723) argues that in order to keep a field fresh, one must create new metaphors. He also notes that theories are metaphors that have become accepted by scientists. Metaphors make concepts concrete and, at the same time, limit them. Furthermore, a metaphor conveys more information in less time. It is a new product in familiar terms because creative processes often involve a combination of familiar concepts into new ones, and here metaphors can play an important role by creating visions on how the first concept and its domain can be developed; in other words, a metaphor is a catalyst for new visions in science, politics, technology, etc. (Schön 1979:255). Familiarity with the dominant metaphors or models of major schools of thought can clearly facilitate students' understanding of a subject.

In the natural sciences, some scientists employed metaphors to explain the physical world from their observations of the social world. Leary (1990:10,37) describes, for example, Newton's concept of universal gravitation that conceptualized the movement of masses of matter toward each other "as analogous to the attraction of human persons towards one another". Leary gives another example of term building, Locke's comparison of the human mind to a 'tabula rasa', which is one of the most famous and enduring

metaphors in science. Stålhammar (1997:9) suggests that metaphors in literature are often emotive, new and creative, while in ordinary and scientific literature they are cognitive and shared by people in that culture. The author continues that metaphors in scientific literature and in journalism, for example, are derived from various areas, such as information processing, biology, medicine, or organizational theory. They are often interrelated and based only on a limited number of root metaphors; each branch of science often has its own domains.

Metaphors are so common we may not realize how they influence the way people think and act; that is why they are used, for example, in journalism to manipulate readers in a politically desired direction. Chilton and Ilyin (1993:9) consider metaphor an important diplomatic device of politeness because metaphor eases interpersonal contact and leaves room for the negotiations of meanings and references. With a metaphor the speaker can avoid to employ a threatening expression. A metaphor can create common ground by appeal to a cultural frame. Nonetheless, there can be risks in assuming a common ground. From a listener's point of view, a metaphor provides a cue to what kind of thinking should be performed. The speaker can say a few words and allow the audience to ponder the metaphor and to come to their own conclusions (Torgny 1997:8). The user of metaphor can choose to focus on some particular entailment of the metaphor.

To summarize I entail the major functions of metaphor listed by Low (1988:127-128) (see also Paivio 1979:151-152), who claims that a metaphor fulfils the necessary communication function of conveying continuous experiential information. There are concepts and experiences that are hard to describe or cannot be literally described or for which language may not have any literal terms available. Entities like 'mountains' or 'storms' which have vague boundaries, as well as experiences, events and also abstractions like 'beauty' are given a noun status. Furthermore, Low continues, metaphors demonstrate that things in life are related and systematically linked, as in 'Life is a journey'. Metaphors also extend thought by providing new paths along which thought can proceed in a relatively principled way; a metaphor is a bridge from the known to the unknown. Besides this, metaphors compel attention, positive or negative, by dramatizing an expression. At the same time

they help speakers avoid or deny responsibility for their words because they have said nothing literal. Lastly, metaphors allow people to discuss problematic topics, which are often emotionally charged. To this list Paivio (1979:152) adds that metaphor provides a compact way of representing the salient features of a concept. Through imagery metaphor provides a memorable and emotion-arousing representation of perceived experience.

2.3.2. Metaphors in education

Since metaphors are grounded in subjective experience, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980:185-186), they are necessary in making sense of what goes on around us. Consequently, metaphors should be seen as an integral component of scientific thought, providing insight and direction to even the most technical or theoretical constructions. In short, metaphor is an essential mental tool, a problem-solving device applicable to all fields, including language learning and teaching. Nevertheless, for a long time metaphor was not thought to be essential to a cognitive understanding of what is being taught and learnt (Petrie 1993:438). Marchant (1992:34) states that the use of metaphors in education is just beginning to be realized. Also Leino and Drakenberg (1993:1) note how the interdisciplinary nature in modern thought has moved metaphor to the core of educational questions. Furthermore, Ellis (1998:67) argues that metaphor analysis has become an accepted tool in both educational and applied linguistic enquiry. In what follows an attempt will be made to describe how language teachers as well as language learners might benefit from the understanding of the importance of metaphor in education.

2.3.2.1. Language teachers

Metaphors are held to have a general value in education in assisting in reflecting and organizing social thought and practice in schooling (Scheffer 1960:62 as quoted in Cortazzi and Jin 1999:152). Marchant (1992:44) notes that metaphors have been found to influence how teachers think and talk about teaching. Therefore, it can be useful to a teacher to understand one's own metaphors. Metaphors help teachers see what is invisible and describe what

otherwise would be indescribable, and enhance their understanding of the world. Marchant cites Fairclough (1985) who has suggested that ‘ways of talking’ are directly associated with ‘ways of seeing’. Metaphor analysis can reveal the embedded beliefs that teachers value as important.

Similarly, Cortazzi and Jin (1999:151) urge teachers to study their own metaphors, which might help them to reflect on their own experiences and to develop professionally. Also Ellis (1998:67-68) emphasizes the fact that the images teachers use metaphorically help to organize their belief sets and serve as an aid to reflection-on-practice. In the same way, Oxford (1998:5) notes that metaphor has the power to enhance the subject’s understanding of educational problems and thus increase perspective-consciousness. For example Leino and Drakenberg (1993:60-61), in their study of teacher images, found three root metaphors about teaching (*guidance, growth and liberation*), which give quite different perspectives on education. They add that pedagogy can benefit from metaphors because metaphors focus thoughts in a desired direction and also introduce new terminology and organize explanations.

Ryan (1996:574) recounts research results of teacher thinking; numerous studies of teachers’ beliefs suggest that such beliefs strongly affect behavior and are highly resistant to change. Ryan further claims that research on teacher thinking has been limited in the field of foreign language study. Marchant (1992:44) quotes Schön (1989) who has used the term ‘reframing’ to describe how an initial frame is changed in the light of new information. Metaphors are powerful tools for reframing; they invite alternative approaches to problem solving; they actually put the problem into words. Still, McAllister and McLaughlin (1996:80) remind us that altered beliefs may not necessarily change our behavior. A thought does not always lead to an action. Moreover, teachers’ beliefs are resistant to change. They add that metaphors can also be employed as a way to promote conservative agendas. Besides this, metaphors of teaching attitudes can become so routinized that they are accepted unquestionably. Kearns (1987:23) introduces Sperber’s law, which argues that “an era’s dominant concerns are reflected in its metaphors”. In order to be able to recognize and possibly to change fashionable, attractive metaphors, one has to be aware of them.

Implications of metaphor for classroom education deeply affect both teaching and learning. As an instructional tool metaphor elicits vivid imagery and, consequently, it illuminates, enhances and enlivens teaching and facilitates learning, memorizing and understanding vocabulary (e.g. Petrie 1979: 439). Sticht (1979:475) recounts three theses of how metaphor facilitates language learning: the compactness, vividness, and inexpressibility thesis. Metaphor is a tool for active memory and creative problem solving. To stretch students' thinking skills, to enhance the learning process by creating vivid imagery that establishes powerful connections between the concept and the students' prior learning and personal experiences. Petrie (1979: 439,442), among several others, points out that because metaphor creates similarities it is the bridge between a student's earlier knowledge and later concepts of an unfamiliar subject. It provides us with effective means for moving from the known to the less known; therefore, transfer of meaning cannot take place in the acquisition of something radically new. Green (1979:463) and Sticht (1979:475) see two types of opinions about metaphors not being important in (language) learning: some writers find that metaphors are not needed because reasoning suffices for learning new things, others hold metaphors unnecessary but useful as an indication of understanding and a tool for creative thinking. McAllister and McLaughlin (1996:75,79) highlight understanding the role that metaphor plays in thinking: because thoughts influence action, the metaphors used to understand teaching influence how teachers actually teach. Metaphors can assist teachers to understand how practical knowledge is acquired. This in turn elaborates and expands teachers' understanding of their profession, which, in turn, enhances students' learning.

McAllister and McLaughlin (1996:83-84) cite Johnston's (1992) opinion that when student teachers are aware of their images about teaching, they can be challenged to scrutinize their values and to accommodate specific pedagogical and professional implications into training programmes. The authors add that creative, personal and non-rational meanings are now valued. Thornbury (1991:196-197) argues furthermore that on preservice training courses the image of teaching that trainees bring to the course is probably all the experience they have, and it is useful as both a starting point for further development, and as a gauge by which development can be measured.

Teachers' metaphors offer an insight into the images teachers hold of teaching and learning. These images in turn significantly influence their practice. To teachers in their classrooms, then, it is the image of teaching that has potency, not the theory of teaching.

2.3.2.2. Language learners

Boers (2000:553) cites Kövecses (1995) when arguing that language learners encounter figurative discourse during their learning process and, therefore, mastering conventional figurative language should be part of their learning, especially since metaphors vary across cultures. Fortunately, a lot of metaphoric expressions can be traced back to source domains, which facilitates understanding and memorizing the expressions; thus, metaphor is an additional channel for vocabulary acquisition. Lindstromberg (1991:207) points out understanding of the metaphorical derivation of any lexis and discourse meaning, even specialized texts. Oxford (1998:5) argues that metaphors may express the meaning more concisely than non-metaphorical equivalents. At the same time, metaphors capture multiple meanings of experience.

Research on learner beliefs has been dominated by modern, neo-platonic paradigm prevalent in social psychology. Leino and Drakenberg (1993: 4) report how metaphors that are accepted and widely used by educational researchers and practitioners have influenced educational theory, research or practice. Lantolf (in Ellis 1998:67) argues that second language acquisition (SLA) is inherently metaphorical, and that there is a practical need for a tool to compare the constructions of researchers and learners. Metaphor analysis can serve two primary functions in the study of SLA. First, it can help to clarify the nature of the constructs that SLA researchers work with. Secondly, it can assist in the process of demythologizing SLA by revealing what has become hidden as metaphors are literalized. In particular it can serve to show how deep-rooted the assumption is in SLA that the learner functions as some kind of computer, processing input in a machine-like way.

Information about the ways in which learners conceptualize language learning constitutes one kind of data that researchers would do well to consider. Wenden (in Ellis 1998:84) revealed how learners' metacognitive

knowledge guides how they work during learning. Oxford (1998:5) points out that listening to teachers' and students' voices is an important priority for research and curriculum design. Diverse instructional styles and curriculum theories can be simplified by showing, through metaphor, the relationship between abstract concepts and something that is more familiar, concrete and visible. Indeed, metaphor can even reduce a whole philosophy of education to a single comprehensive image. Cortazzi and Jin (1999:152) remark that in linguistics, for example, much has been made of such a dominant metaphor as 'Language is a game'.

2.3.2.3. Problems with metaphors

Petrie (1979:438-439) calls attention to some drawbacks in the use of metaphors in education. He insists that metaphors encourage sloppy thought when one is too lazy to determine precisely what one wants to say. Metaphors can also be misleading, because they can be interpreted in many ways, depending on the listener. And metaphors can be used to cloud educational issues and to reduce complex matters to simple-minded banalities. Petrie adds that both those who give metaphor only aesthetic value in education and those who admit that metaphor is useful as a teaching aid, tend to agree that metaphors are not essential to a cognitive understanding of what is taught. In their opinion (but not in Petrie's), explicit language would serve the cognitive function better. Metaphors about teaching can, according to McAllister and McLaughlin (1996: 79), be advantageous to conservative agendas if metaphors are employed unconsciously and accepted unquestionably. Metaphors can become parts of a hidden curriculum; for example, in the metaphor 'teacher as a gardener' the emphasis is focused on the activity of the teacher in contrast to the passivity of the pupils. A word of warning comes from Cortazzi and Jin (1999:153), who claim that metaphors can become empty slogans, and from Bullough (1991:49) who argues that metaphor analysis may encourage a narrow focus on self. Furthermore, Blair (1982:12 in Thornbury 1991:196-197) wonders if teachers are simply methodological fashion victims who are "ready to believe anything and anyone with a kooky idea".

Torgny (1997:18) reports on Löwgren's (1991) observation about problems with metaphors: they sometimes say too much and too little, at the same time. Another problem is that in some cases, users from other cultures might also be excluded by a certain metaphor. One drawback of metaphoric language is the potential for irrelevant and even misleading information to be communicated unintentionally (see also Hellsten 1994:79). Nikolajsen (1991:319 as quoted in Leino and Drakenberg 1993:36) urges us to ask what the intensions behind the use of a certain metaphor are, as well as what aspects are highlighted and what ignored. Nikolajsen advises writers to explain their meaning and not to use metaphors unconsciously. Each domain has its own metaphors, which can cause misunderstanding. Some metaphors just are fashionable. There is a limited number of metaphors. Kramsch (1995:68) states that metaphors open new perspectives but they can also stir and confuse listeners' or readers' thoughts.

Schön (1979:12) presents that some metaphors convey a natural solution to a problem, e.g. 'Slum is a cancer', where 'slum' is bad and has to be cured. But Schön warns us of metaphors that generate their own solutions without defining the problem, because they can control the way in which we construct the world we live in. Leino (1987:47) reminds us of the fact that metaphors can hinder us from noticing those characteristics of the target of the metaphor that are not consistent with the metaphor. Therefore, metaphor is a powerful means of manipulation. Uncritical use of metaphors in the media often supports the dominant view in society.

In the following I will report on some research on the use of metaphorical expressions by language students and teachers about language learning and teaching. I will especially address studies whose concern is metaphor analysis about foreign language students' or teachers' metaphorical constructions about themselves as learners or teachers.

2.4. Previous studies

In section 2.3 I described the benefits of using metaphors in scientific texts. In this section I will focus on empirical studies in the fields of cognitive linguistics and education. Barcelona (2000:2) claims that cognitive linguistics

has evolved as a part of the growing interest in understanding the nature of human mind in general. Similarly, Cameron (1999:8) maintains that the shift in metaphor studies back to a more overtly cognitive position is due to the work that has been done for the last twenty years by the key figures in the field. According to Stålhammar (1997:33), Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) *Metaphors we live by* has received a cult status in spite of some disagreeing voices. In order to find out what a person thinks Lakoff (1987:xiv-xv) presents experiential realism in contrast to the previous objectivist view. Leino and Drakenberg (1993:1) have noted a paradigm shift from positivist research orientations to more phenomenological ones with the introduction of narrative methods, including the use of metaphors. Cortazzi and Jin (1999:173) point out that it is now common in teacher training to ask teachers to identify their own metaphors for teaching, learning and the classroom as a part of a reflective process of helping them to develop professionally.

On the other hand, Leino and Drakenberg (1993:2) and Guerrero and Villamil (2000:341-342) have argued that little research has been conducted on the metaphors of foreign language learning and teaching; however, the value of pursuing metaphorical analysis is acknowledged. Guerrero and Villamil continue that most of the research is based on reviews of literature on metaphor identification and only few studies have used empirical data. I will introduce some empirical studies where individual language learners and teachers report on themselves as language learners and teachers. The majority of them account for teachers and teaching. They are attempts to access the participants' mental states indirectly by analysing the metaphors they have used in their journals, or directly in their responses to questionnaires about attitudes and beliefs.

The studies are, summarized in a chronological order: Bullough's (1991) life-story writings; Thornbury's (1991) review on teacher images; Marchant's (1992) factor analysis of similes; Katz's (1996) teacher portraits; Liskin-Gasparro's (1998) immersion program; Ellis's (1998) comparative analysis of researcher and student metaphors; Oxford et al's (1998) and Oxford's (1998) education view approach; Cortazzi and Jin's (1999) typology of metaphors; Guerrero and Villamil's (2000) teaching roles; and Kramsch's (forthcoming) alternate readings of language learners' narratives. In the

following I will first report on studies concentrating primarily on teachers and then on studies focussing on language learners; part of the studies has both groups as subjects.

2.4.1. Metaphors about language teachers and teaching

Bullough (1991) explored personal teaching metaphors in preservice teacher education. He had noticed that teacher educators often ignored the student's background knowledge about teaching, partly because much of it was tacit, embedded in language and hidden from view. He tested a few ideas about the use of metaphor analysis with a group of 15 preservice, graduate certification students. They began by identifying a root teaching metaphor that captured them, and wrote about the metaphors and discussed them in seminars. Unsatisfied with the results, because much what was written and said was superficial and, for some students, metaphors came too easily, without thoughtful self-examination, Bullough then gave a second assignment to another small group of education students: to write a education-related life-story and to identify the metaphors in their written histories that best captured how they thought of themselves as teachers. He described in detail three generally representative examples of the teacher students' metaphors of themselves as teachers: *husbandman of the young*, *devil's advocate* and *butterfly*. During student teaching the group reflected on their metaphors several times and discussed any changes that were noted as well as sources of the changes.

Bullough concludes (1991:48-49) that the teacher candidates found the analyses of their teaching metaphors important to their development as teachers. Drawing on their past experience, beginning teachers first seek confirmation of what they assume to be true about themselves as teachers and about teaching. If this view proves erroneous, they have to accommodate to the situation and to find a copying strategy. Here, the identification of their teaching metaphors, coupled with life story and action research, is of particular importance to teacher-students' development as teachers.

Thornbury (1991) reviewed current thinking on teachers' metaphors for teaching. To illuminate theorists' numerous arguments about

metaphors in language learning, Thornbury used comments of a small group of English foreign language teachers (EFL) when they were viewing a video of their first lesson in Japanese. The comments were related to three recurring metaphors for learning: *journey*, *machine* and *puzzle*, as in the metaphorical expressions like *lesson as a moving object* or *learning as a journey*, as well as to *learning as a mechanical or computational process* or *learning as puzzle-solving*. The way the teacher-students in the Japanese lesson talked about language suggested the metaphor of language as *a matter*: language can, for example, be *chunked* and *segmented*, *filtered*, *picked up*, and even *fossilized*. Thornbury (1991:193,196) noted that the occasional metaphors in the comments of the teacher-students were perhaps more revealing of their teaching styles than of their individual learning styles. In general, teachers' metaphors offer an insight into the images teachers hold of teaching and learning.

Marchant (1992) conducted a factor analysis of responses to a number of metaphors presented in the form of similes. Metaphors, in his opinion, are not simple comparisons but also interpretations, analyses and evaluations. Marchant attempted to explore students' beliefs of teachers, themselves and the classroom in order to discover if there were consistent logical constructs that underlay the metaphors. The participants were 104 undergraduate and 102 graduate education students at a university in the United States; the majority of them were female. They were asked to complete the following open-ended statements: A teacher is like a(n) ...; A student is like a(n) ...; A classroom is like a(n) In addition, they had to indicate, on a scale of four alternatives (never – sometimes – often – always), how often they agreed with the similes about teacher, student and classroom on another list. Responses to the open-ended statements in part one that did not match exactly those in part two were included within similar constructs (Marchant 1992:42-43).

The statistical analysis (Marchant 1992:37-42) yielded eight generic teacher factors. The AUTHORITY factor included teacher similes of, for example, *animal trainer*, *boss*, *judge*, *police officer* and *prison warden*. Corresponding student similes were: *wild animal*, *enemy*, and *pawn*; the classroom was viewed as *battlefield*, *jungle* and *prison*. The second factor

described a teacher as CAREGIVER and included teacher similes related to family and to professional caregivers, such as, for example, *parent, brother/sister, counsellor* and *doctor*. The student was *daughter/son, brother/sister* and *patient*, while the classroom was *home, hospital, church* and *community*. In the third factor the teacher was PRODUCER or DIRECTOR of the students and of the classroom, for example, *movie director or orchestra conductor in concert, hospital* or *factory*. The CAPTIVES factor created constructs of powerlessness and included the teacher as *victim*, the student as *prisoner* and both of them as *slaves*, while the classroom served as *prison* or *cage*. The FUN factor described an environment of fun with classroom similes of *party, playground* and *zoo*; the teacher was viewed as *party host* and the student as *friend*. The sixth factor placed the teacher on TRIAL and into the role of *student*, who again was *jury, mountain* and *teacher* in the classroom as *courtroom*. The seventh factor focused on the classroom as a BUSINESS, where the teacher was *referee* and the student *worker*. In the eighth factor, CHANGE, the student was emphasized as *sponge* or *ball of clay* desiring to be filled or shaped; the teacher was viewed as *advocate*. In conclusion, Marchant (1992:44) showed that there existed constructs that linked metaphors for teachers, students, and classrooms. Moreover, he assumed that there would be metaphors to be preferred in teaching.

Katz (1996) presented portraits of four different composition classrooms in her study of teaching styles. By utilizing framing metaphors as a device, Katz demonstrated how knowledge is socially organized, formed and shaped by participants. From among 310 teachers on a writing course at a university, four were selected on the basis of their interest in participating in the study, excellence of teaching and teaching style. The data for analysis consisted of two audio-recorded interviews with each teacher, the researcher's informal notes and classroom observations during one semester. Since teaching style is a slippery construct, Katz used metaphor as a research tool to create a pattern and to make generalizations. The metaphors emerged over time and the decision to use them was made after data collection was underway. The teachers did not consciously nominate specific metaphors to characterize their teaching styles; the metaphors were chosen based on the teachers' behaviour in the classroom and their talk about the issues involved in teaching.

Katz (1996:64-85) claimed that the metaphors were characteristic of the four selected teachers and therefore easy to choose. The theme and images of direction, of carefully structuring and arranging instruction returned throughout the interviews with the *choreographer*. Personal contact as the basis for helping the students was important to the *earth-mother*. A flair for the dramatic was characteristic of the *entertainer's* classes. Lastly, the *professor* got to the point as directly and as efficiently as possible. This image was similar to a folk notion of a professor. Katz had two purposes for her analysis: first, she attempted to make sense of the climate of instruction in the classroom and second, to provide descriptions of teaching styles, which would lead to a fuller understanding of how teachers use specific instructional techniques as part of their teaching plan.

Oxford et al (1998:7-10) examined the concept of teacher and their actual status, and control and power in the classroom. The metaphors they collected came from students, teachers and education experts. The key source were personal narratives from more than 250 written or oral responses to a series of open-ended questions, such as: "Describe a teacher whom you especially liked" or "Explain a problem you had with a specific teacher". The researchers made no effort to elicit the use of metaphors. Many of the personal narratives regarded the learning of a second or foreign language; others concerned the individual's native language development. The metaphors that emerged from the stories and from about twenty theory books were then fitted into four main philosophies of education, which are the perspectives of Social Order, Cultural Transmission, Learner-centered Growth and Social Reform.

Each text was analysed by the techniques for content analysis. Oxford et al (1998:13-43) classified 14 distinct metaphors, explicit and implicit, with entailments. The material was then organized according to the four main perspectives on education. The most prevalent image of schooling was the teacher-controlled Social Order perspective with the following metaphors that view school as a factory where the teacher dominates: Teacher as *manufacturer, competitor, hanging judge, doctor* and *mind-and-behavior controller*. Another teacher-controlled perspective on education, the Cultural Transmission, produced only two metaphors, in which the teacher was regarded as unidirectional information-giver: Teacher as *conduit* and *repeater*.

In the Learner-centered Growth perspective both teacher and learner have control and the teacher is seen as *nurturer, lover or spouse, scaffolder, entertainer* and *delegator*. These metaphors showed concern for the welfare of every student, and the perspective had more supporters than the two previous ones. The fourth philosophical approach to education, the Social Reform, was not discussed as frequently as the other three approaches. The metaphors in this group included: Teacher as *acceptor* and *learning partner*. They showed shared teacher-and-learner control in learning; diverse opinions were welcomed, as well.

Oxford et al (1998:43-44) found many different forces and pressures at work across the participants. By organizing the metaphors held about teachers and teaching they have attempted to emphasize the beliefs underlying the metaphors around the four perspectives. Style conflicts can be caused by unrecognised differences in belief systems. Since language teaching methods relate to their metaphors, teachers ought to be aware of their various and often contradictory metaphors in different situations and employ metaphors as instruments of analysis in order to develop in their occupation. Reflection about teaching and learning processes profits each language teacher, researcher and student.

For another study Oxford (1998:92-93) and her colleagues collected 473 written narratives from high school students, teaching candidates or language teachers on varying levels of language learning. The participants were mostly US born, of mixed ethnicity; some were all Egyptian. Nearly half of the participants were male. They were instructed to write an essay describing a language teacher they especially liked or disliked, or with whom they had had a style conflict or style harmony; no instruction about using metaphor was given. Oxford (1998:96-97) began her study with a theoretical emphasis on learning styles, but soon moved to a grounded theory approach. Many of the metaphors were explicitly mentioned in the narratives and therefore easy to identify. However, other metaphors were inferred from the narratives if the student did not use a specific metaphor. The metaphors were then organized within three different teaching approaches, of which the democratic approach appeared to be the most popular.

The metaphors are listed below (Oxford 1998:98-105). Within the AUTOCRATIC TEACHING APPROACH eight relevant metaphors arose from the narratives. The categories were: Teacher as *manufacturer, witch, hanging judge, tyrant, arrogant animal or person, preacher or moralist, patron* and *gossip*. An autocratic teacher maintained utmost control in the classroom and revealed lack of empathy for students, who, on their part, expressed feelings of disgust, fear and helplessness. The eight metaphors deduced in relation to DEMOCRATIC or PARTICIPATORY TEACHING APPROACH included: Teacher as *challenger or catalyst, force of nature, entertainer, nurturer/inspiration/role model/counsellor, egalitarian or co-learner, family member, prophet or god's gift* and *tool provider*. A democratic teacher was compassionate and empowering, which most students found positive, although some discomfort was expressed, due to cultural differences. Teachers and learners worked together. Within the third, LAISSEZ-FAIRE TEACHING APPROACH, nine metaphors were clustered together to reflect the teacher as *blind eye, bad babysitter, whirlwind, guardian of the door, sleep inducer, piece of cheese, uninterested footdragger, tool withholder* and *absentee*. A laissez-faire teacher did not care about students or teaching; they did not do their jobs. None of the students were happy with the lack of discipline and enthusiasm in the classroom.

Oxford (1998:99, 108) found differences in the nature and frequency of metaphor use among ethnic groups, because the same characteristics of language teaching are not always honoured in all cultures. Fairly strong emotional responses were displayed, as well as individual differences; few students were indifferent in describing their experiences. Oxford illustrates some of the findings in more detail and explains how she interprets them within respective teaching approaches. As a result, Oxford (1998:106) described the features of good teaching and argued that if they were positively executed in the classroom the students felt motivated and connected to the teacher, the language and each other. In this the language teacher has a significant role.

Guerrero and Villamil (2000:342-344) explored teachers' beliefs about their roles as English second language (ESL) teachers through an analysis of metaphors they produced. A further aim was to explain theoretical

assumptions about teaching and learning. Simile was treated as metaphor in this study. The data were obtained at a workshop in Puerto Rico. The 22 participants were asked to write a simile beginning “An ESL teacher is like ...” using a metaphor that best represented the way they saw themselves as ESL teachers in an original way. During the workshop, the metaphors were deconstructed by the participants. The authors’ view of metaphor was the same as Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980): metaphors reflect how people know the world and how they think. The metaphors produced, both explicit and implicit, were then carefully examined until nine general conceptual categories emerged. The most common teacher roles were: *cooperative leader*, *provider of knowledge* and *agent of challenge*. Other categories with less tokens were: *nurturer*, *innovator*, *provider of tools*, *artist*, *repairer* and *gym instructor*.

The teaching roles (Guerrero and Villamil 2000:348-349) were traditional and reflected conventional notions about what it is to be a teacher. These metaphors clearly put the teacher in a position of leadership and the learner at a certain level of dependence; however, the students did not envision the teacher as a dictatorial figure. The metaphors also suggested personal preferences and grievances among teachers. In addition, teachers may vary in their roles depending on different instructional settings they work in. The study confirms the notion that ESL teaching is a complex profession that seems to be best captured by multiple metaphorical concepts. The data showed some beliefs in the learner to be somehow defective or problematic.

2.4.2. Metaphors about language learners and learning

Studies on metaphorical expressions about language learning, let alone about language learners, seem to be much fewer than about language teachers. One large research on metaphor use that addressed also the problems of knowing about learners’ thinking of learning was conducted by Cortazzi and Jin (1999). The authors collected metaphors from four sources: three groups of British undergraduate and postgraduate students on educational courses in the UK and one cross-cultural group of students on a summer course in Britain. All participants taught or studied English as a first or other language; the total corpora were 868 participants. Cortazzi and Jin (1999:150) wanted to find out

what sorts of metaphors teachers and students used to refer to learning, teaching, language and good teachers, and in what ways these metaphors could be “bridges to learning”. They also explored aspects of different cultural orientations to communication and learning, as well as searched for similarities and differences across the groups of subjects. Their definition of metaphor was similar to that of Lakoff and Johnson (1980).

In the first group (Cortazzi and Jin 1999:157-160) the metaphors occurred in normal running speech in interviews with 128 primary school teachers. The majority of them used metaphors repeatedly at the high points of their narratives on their experiences of primary children’s learning. Their metaphors referred to moments of sudden learning: Learning is *a click, light, a jigsaw* and *movement*. Metaphors often preceded expressions of affect and important job evaluations, and seemed to replace technical terms for teaching. In contrast, the rest of the data consisted of elicited metaphors obtained by asking the subjects in other groups to complete sentences: ‘Teaching is ..., because ...’; ‘Language is ...’; and ‘A good teacher is ...’. The subjects were encouraged to give metaphors, and those who did not, were excluded from the data pool. The elicitations generated a much wider range of metaphors than the spontaneous ones. The classification was based on the metaphor itself with its entailments, the reasons given by the students, and on similarities with other metaphors.

The dominant conceptual teaching metaphors, generated by 140 teacher trainees in the second group, were (Cortazzi and Jin 1999:163): Teaching is *journey, food or drink, plant growth, skill, occupation (other than teaching), entertainment, searching for treasure, family relationships, war, and construction or part of a building*. Reasons for every metaphor were given; for example, teaching is *an endless journey* because everyone (including the teacher) is always learning. These teachers showed warmth, achievement, challenge and awareness of their professional culture and commitment to teaching and learning.

Examples of metaphors on the theme of language, collected from 140 linguistics students in the third group, were (Cortazzi and Jin 1999:165): Language is *nature, leisure, tool or object, everyday life, building, relationships, clothes* and *journey*. Two main themes about language could be

seen, i.e., language is structural and language is functional. Sometimes the metaphor appeared to emphasise structural aspects of language, but the reason given reflected functional aspects, or the reason might include both aspects. For example, *language is a house* because it has a structure but it can be *decorated to suit taste*. There were some overlaps between the metaphors for teaching and language, produced by different groups of students. Both were seen in terms of *journeys*.

The fourth set formed part of a wider questionnaire study. The data gathered from the large cross-cultural group of 460 students to whom English was a foreign language, which could have inhibited the expressions, gave fairly similar lists (Cortazzi and Jin 1999:168-172). The Chinese participants employed the following metaphors: A good teacher is *friend, parent, source of knowledge, guide, model or moral example, gardener* and *actor*. The Japanese metaphors included: A good teacher is *friend, arouser, source of knowledge* and *model*. Among the large number of metaphors employed by the Lebanese were: A good teacher is *parent, friend, source of knowledge, model, guide, lover* and *food*; and by the Turkish: A good teacher is *friend, parent, relative, source of knowledge, guide, model, sunny day* and *comic*. Finally a small number of Iranian metaphors, which include: A good teacher is *friend* and *parent*. Cortazzi and Jin (1999:173-175) observed that many metaphors occurred frequently, e.g., seeing a teacher as a friend among all ethnic groups. Especially metaphors for teaching and learning were highly consistent; they shared some common elements and often had an affective tone. Nevertheless, there were also differences in the quantity and range in the use of metaphors, which could be a signal of different cultural frames.

Liskin-Gasparro (1998:159) explored introspections of seven advanced learners of Spanish, who were selected from a larger group of volunteers. The data consisted of their oral and written, formal and informal reports and reflections on their experiences functioning in Spanish in a U.S.-based immersion program in the Spanish School lasting six weeks. Three major themes emerged from the participants' introspections; one of them was the metaphorical framework in which the learners cast the second language acquisition process. Fluency in speaking a second language was represented by metaphors like *geese in flight, a car gliding on ice* and *a person being carried*

along by a river. They all showed fluency as an effortless flow between thought in mind and speaking. The participants used metaphors of smoothness to express how they felt when things were going well. In contrast, moments of failure were described using metaphors of struggle. Other common images used were, e.g., *construction, container, barrier* and *war*.

Ellis (1998) conducted a comparative analysis of the metaphors used by second language acquisition (SLA) researchers to characterize language learners, and those used by learners to characterize their learning. The first part of the study (Ellis 1998:71-72) consisted of selecting current articles by nine leading researchers in 'mainstream' SLA. Key metaphorical linguistic expressions were classified. It proved difficult to determine what was metaphorical in a text. Following Lakoff and Turner (1989), Ellis deemed a linguistic expression metaphorical if it was linked conceptually to an obvious source domain. Thus, literalised expressions were not taken into account. Although many metaphors in the corpora had the target domain 'learning' or 'language use', he decided to refer to them using the frame LEARNER AS X. The basic metaphors used by the nine researchers were: learner as *container, machine, negotiator, problem-solver, builder, struggler* and *investor*. Ellis (1998:71-78) interprets the metaphors by describing their meaning in length. Some of the metaphors were conflicted, i.e., the same researchers could conceive the learner as, for example, a passive object and as an active investigator. Ellis added that the SLA researchers failed to explain this paradox.

The second part of the study (Ellis 1998:78-82) followed the same methods as the metaphorical reading in the first part. Diaries kept by six adult beginning learners of German as a foreign language in two colleges in London were analysed. The learners were selected as diarists because they showed a positive attitude to learning German. They were asked to keep a journal of their reactions to the course and instructed to reflect upon their attitudes towards teachers and language learning. They continued writing for seven months. The analysis of the diaries resulted in the identification of five main metaphors. The basic metaphors used by learners were: learner as *sufferer, problem-solver, traveller, struggler* and *worker*.

Again, Ellis (1998:83) interpreted the metaphors in detail. The learners were as critical of themselves as of their teachers. Furthermore, the metaphors showed the learners' awareness of their feelings and how these affected their progress in learning. He also discovered apparent differences between the researchers' and the learners' conceptualisations of language learning. The former constructed the process of language acquisition mechanistically, as something that happened automatically, while the latter saw themselves as sentient beings, who experienced fear, frustration, and sometimes personal gratification. Only two similar metaphors were found: learner as *problem-solver* and *struggler*, of which the former was very common between the researchers and the students. As a result, Ellis (1998:84-85) suggests that researchers should pay more attention to the learners' metacognitions, as revealed by metaphor analysis. He doubts, however, if learners have much to gain by 'listening to the researchers'. Making learners aware of the metaphors they use to conceptualise their learning may be one way of increasing their control over learning.

Kramsch's paper (in press) explains language learners' beliefs about language learning. Her study makes a move from the study of beliefs to the study of believers. She claims that it is important for the second language acquisition (SLA) research to understand the two distinct meanings of the verb 'believe', i.e. believing that and believing in. These, in turn, correspond to mundane beliefs and monumental beliefs (Hanks 2000). The former generally go unnoticed and are often resistant to change. The latter are Beliefs with a big 'B', convictions that are accessed by observing what people do, not what they say they do. Kramsch points out that the relation between language and thought is not as simple as social psychology would want us to believe. She describes two different approaches to studying the way language learners construct the reality of their language learning experience. One way is 'processing metaphor', i.e., researchers elicit metaphors from respondents and examine how they metaphorically conceptualise their experience. The other way is 'metaphoric processing', i.e., researchers process learners' seemingly non-metaphorical discourse in a metaphorical way.

For the purpose of documenting how language learners constructed their language learning experience and which semantic domains they drew

from Kramersch administered a traditional survey of 953 undergraduate learners of 14 different languages in the United States. The respondents filled in three open-ended sentences about learning, speaking and writing a foreign language, after which the answers were combined into one form: “Learning a language is like ...”. Here, metaphor could look like either a metaphor or a simile on the linguistic surface. Two researchers classified the 1496 different metaphors generated by the students and identified 18 main categories. The triggers were in -ing form and so were the constructions. Three most frequent categories were: ‘Learning a foreign language is like *engaging in an artistic process*’, ‘Learning a language is like *learning a physical skill*’ and ‘Learning a language is like *getting to know another culture*. Each category was illustrated by two examples. There were problems with classification of the metaphors and with the contradictions among various metaphors. Processing the metaphors could be approached in two ways: either by using a social psychological approach or a social discursive constructionist approach. The latter was demonstrated with several examples. Lastly, Kramersch maintains that, following Lakoff (1993) and Steen (1999), these metaphors can be analysed under the three aspects of metaphor as a conceptual, a linguistic and a discursive construct.

In contrast to the mundane beliefs above, we need other evidence for understanding the students’ unarticulated identities as language learners, Kramersch reports. Instead of learners stating: “I believe that ...”, it would be more useful to find out what they believe in. For this reason, multilingual students from various foreign language courses were asked to write an essay “expressing what it means to be multicultural”. These essays and their implicit metaphors, two previous linguistic autobiographies and a focussed interview were combined into analyses. To illustrate metaphorical processing, Kramersch portrays a Korean student in detail. The triangulation of the three sources of data helps the reader to process her essay’s implicit metaphor that could be expressed as, for example, CULTURAL TRADITION IN BOTH PEACE AND CHAOS. She concludes that a metaphorical reading of biographical testimonies from learners brings to the fore potential scenarios for learner development that can be openly discussed by teachers and learners.

2.4.3. Summary of previous studies

Metaphor analysis has been employed in linguistics for various goals. For the most part, metaphorical expressions have been looked for in literature, and then interpreted in order to explain the phenomenon in question. The above eleven studies have been selected because they mostly focused on foreign language learning and teaching. The earlier studies concentrated in teaching and teachers; the more recent a study is, the more often the personality of a learner becomes as the target of an examination. Here, the first seven studies were focused on teaching, and the last four on learning. Teaching and teachers were often treated as one issue, as well as learning and learners, or even language. Table 1 provides a summary of the main factors in these studies.

Table 1. Previous studies: participants, methods and results.

Author	Participants	Methods	Metaphors about language ...
1. Bullough 1991	Graduate education students	Life-stories (spontaneous)	teachers
2. Thornbury 1991	Teachers, researchers	Discussion after video (spontaneous)	teaching, learning, language
3. Marchant 1992	Graduate education students	Simile lists; complete statements (elicited)	teachers, students, classroom
4. Katz 1996	Teachers	Interviews; class-room observations (spontaneous)	teachers, teaching styles
5. Oxford et al 1998	Teachers, students, researchers	Written narratives; theory books (spontaneous)	teachers, teaching philosophies
6. Oxford 1998	Graduate students, language teachers	Written narratives (spontaneous)	teachers, teaching approaches
7. Guerrero & Vill. 1999	ESL teachers	Similes (elicited)	teacher roles
8. Cortazzi & Jin 1999	Teachers, graduate students	Interviews (spontaneous); sentences (elicited)	teaching, learning, good teachers
9. Liskin-Gasp. 1998	Graduate students	Oral and written reports (spontaneous)	learning
10. Ellis 1998	Students, researchers	Diaries, articles (spontaneous)	learners
11. Kramsch in press	Undergraduate students	Complete sentences (elicited); essays (spontaneous)	learning

In most cases the participants were graduate students or language teachers. Oxford (1998), Ellis (1998) and Cortazzi and Jin (1999) had conducted their studies in several parts, with different groups as participants. The number of the respondents varied from one person to almost one thousand respondents. Methods for collecting metaphors from the participants were, in order of the frequency of their use, sentences to be completed, written narratives, and interviews; thus, the metaphors were either elicited from the respondents, or they had used the expressions naturally. In most studies the metaphors were processed in order to be classified. An example of metaphoric processing of a text was demonstrated in Kramsch (in press). The results of the studies were three or four main teaching approaches, 8-25 metaphor categories about teaching or teachers and 5-18 metaphor categories about learning and learners. Some studies described the developing of one student's metaphor, others collected all the metaphors produced and looked for similar features in them. In five studies there were teachers' metaphors about themselves and also in five studies students' metaphors about teachers. Learner as a target was much less represented: one study about researchers' learner-metaphors and one about learning. Learners' metaphors about themselves were demonstrated only in Ellis (1998) and about language learning in two other studies. It is obvious that language learners' metaphorical constructions have been very little explored. Therefore, an attempt will be made in the next section to analyse language learners' metaphorical expressions about themselves as well as about their language teachers.

3. PRESENT STUDY

3.1. Research question

In section 2.4 results of eleven previous studies on language learning and language teaching were reported. The studies were conducted by the means of metaphor analysis. The subjects in the investigations were students and teachers at universities and researchers of linguistics. The number of the participants in the research projects varied from one individual to almost one thousand participants. The participants were either asked to employ metaphors in their responses or the metaphors were searched for in their responses afterwards. Different kinds of classifications of the metaphors used by the participants about how they saw themselves as language learners or language teachers were obtained in the investigations. The researchers gave lists of metaphorical categories, which had a number of frequently occurring, often identical types of learning and learners as well as teaching and teachers although examples of more rare metaphors were also found. In general, the results gave knowledge about different ways of experiencing what it is like to acquire or instruct a foreign language. So far, there have been very few metaphor studies on the views students have about themselves as language learners and about their experiences of their language teachers. Especially memories of language learning before entering a university have remained unexplored. Metaphor analysis has, of course, been applied to life-stories written in Finnish (e.g. Vilkkö 1997), whereas language learners' narratives about their language learning experiences have not been examined in order to interpret them with metaphor analysis. In any case, metaphors are varying and culturally and socially defined.

The aim of the present study was to identify students' metaphors when they reflected on their experiences as learners of English as a foreign language and on their teachers during the twelve years of school they had gone through. Furthermore, the idea was to classify the metaphors the participants employed in their narratives in order to find potential groups of similar metaphors. The aim was not to attempt to match the classifications of metaphors with the ones found in research literature but rather to detect if there

existed any common types of language learners as well as language teachers in the present data. The present study focused on Finnish university freshmen's language learning experiences in comprehensive school, where instruction on languages is part of the official curriculum of the compulsory education in Finland, and in senior high school, which is not a compulsory school although more than half of the age group go there. The idea was to find out, through metaphor analysis, how the students constructed their language learning experiences in their self-narratives. Objects of interest were Finnish university students' reflections on themselves as learners of English and on their teachers at comprehensive school ('peruskoulu') and in senior high school ('lukio'). Thus, the research questions were: How much effort had the students had to put on learning English at school? How effective did they find their English teachers at comprehensive and senior high school?

Metaphor analysis has become an accepted tool in both educational and applied linguistic enquiry (Ellis 1998:67). It is a qualitative method that offers an alternative to conventional and formalistic approaches to the study of learner cognitions. Instead of asking people directly to express their personal thoughts about their experiences, their viewpoints can be inferred from the language they use. Metaphorical language is one way in which people can convey highly personal ideas. Imagery is often present in our language; in a way, all language seems to be metaphorical. Metaphors offer a different way of perceiving reality, a creative and perhaps surprising way to connect two domains. Because metaphor is central to our thinking, the study of metaphor produces a means to better understand how people think from what they say. Furthermore, metaphors reflect learners' orientations to language learning and function as windows through which we can view the mental constructs learners work with.

Metaphor analysis offers the researcher (Miles and Huberman 1984, as quoted by Katz 1996:61) two important qualities: it can reduce the data by making generalizations and it can create patterns. Gibbs (1999:40) claims there to be two kinds of metaphor analysis. On the one hand, metaphors can be elicited from people and then examined to find out how people conceptualise their experience metaphorically. This is done by processing their metaphors systematically, i.e. studying any stretches of language identified as

metaphor. On the other hand, a discourse can be processed in a metaphorical way even if it does not contain explicit metaphors. This 'seeing in terms of something else' involves active reasoning across incongruent domains. Metaphoric processing is an intentionally selected strategy of analysing texts; its aim is not to explain metaphors but to explain a discourse by metaphors. It is an interpretive method though mere identification of metaphor might be quite mechanistic. In the present study, an attempt was made to employ metaphoric reading of the narratives and to process explicit and potential implicit metaphors that supported the aim of the study.

The choice of data collection in the form of life stories was based on the idea of spontaneous narratives, which reveal what a person thinks about the subject matter at the moment of writing. Metaphorical expressions were expected to be natural elements of the stories and to emerge spontaneously in the writing. There was, however, the danger of gleaning fewer metaphors from the participants in this manner than if they had been asked directly to employ metaphors in their replies; hopefully the metaphors collected in this way would be more revealing and genuine than elicited metaphors. Leppänen and Kalaja (1997:12) have pointed out that people account for the events in their lives in quite different ways to different readers or listeners, in different phases of their lives and for different purposes. Life stories do not only reveal something about their presenters; they also convey more general meanings and beliefs that are shared by social and cultural groups. Interpretations of the past are manifold, variable and relative.

Another strength in using life stories as data is the almost non-existent role of researcher influence (Potter & Wetherell 1987:162). There was no preformed theory that might have had an influence on the data collection. The metaphors could be looked at from the perspective of the subjects themselves. Students were given questions to reflect upon but only as starting points for their life stories which were otherwise individual constructions of 'self as a language learner'. According to Potter & Wetherell (1987:22), giving topics for discussion might even extend and bring more depth to accounts. In spite of the fact that the stories were turned in named and as academic tasks the style of the self-narratives was open and colloquial. Besides this, since the stories were written in the students' mother tongue and were not graded, they

could be taken as fairly realistic and truthful. A life story does not tell the whole truth; it is one interpretation of how people construct meaningfulness to their lives. To some extent, all life stories are fictitious. Virtanen (1982:177) argues that memory acts selectively and the writer makes choices between forgetting and remembering. There prevails a silent agreement between the teller and the listener: questions of truthfulness are not stuck in.

3.2. Data collection

The data for the present study were collected in November 1994 in the English Department of Jyväskylä University for a larger research project; the same data have been exploited by for example Leppänen and Kalaja (1997) and Heikkinen (1999). Fifty-two freshmen attending an introductory course in Applied Linguistics were asked to write a life story reflecting on their experiences as English learners starting from their first memories of the English language. Quite a few students (17) had spent one year or more doing or studying something else before coming to university, so the ages of the writers varied between nineteen and twenty-three years. Typically, the majority of the students were female; only eight of them were male students. Two life stories were excluded from the data because English was not a foreign language for those writers. Thus, fifty students' life stories were selected for analysis; English was either a major or minor subject of theirs. The students had studied English from the age of nine onwards (the so-called A-language) with two exceptions, whose first foreign language had been Swedish (and English the so-called B-language).

The writing process took place in phases. First, the students discussed their negative and positive language learning experiences with a classmate in class, after which they produced drafts of their stories at home. For the freshmen, a life story was defined as a coherent and chronological story about themselves as learners of English, and they were to write it in an informal manner as if to a friend (see Appendix 1 for instructions). In addition, the students were given a list of questions to consider in order to help them get started in writing, such as: What were your first experiences of the English language? What was it like to study English at comprehensive school

(‘peruskoulu’) and in senior high (‘lukio’)? What were your teachers, classmates, textbooks like? Were you a good pupil? What are your future plans? (see Appendix 1). The writers did not have to answer all the questions. The recommended length of a life story was five to ten typed pages. Nevertheless, six pages appeared to be the maximum length, the average being three pages; the male writers were markedly more sparing with words. After finishing their life stories the students were asked to discuss them in pairs again and they were allowed time to edit their texts. The life stories were written in Finnish, the students’ mother tongue, in varying styles, since no perfect language was required; a large number of them employed colloquial language. Description of all the metaphorical expressions in the life-stories would have made the data too large and scattered the explanations; therefore, for the purpose of the present study, only the students’ reflections on formal instruction of the English language were selected.

3.3. Coding and methods

The methodology used in the present study was adopted from both Ellis (1998) and Oxford (1998), who have followed the approach to metaphor analysis outlined by Koch and Deetz (1981). This involves six general steps, which are:

1. choose a representative corpora of texts;
2. isolate metaphorical expressions in texts and list them;
3. decide which metaphors are worth analysing depending on the research purpose;
4. reduce the metaphorical expressions to broader metaphors;
5. sort these metaphors into coherent groups, thereby establishing the ‘main metaphors’;
6. consider possible entailments of each metaphor and the extent to which these are or are not expressed in the corpora of texts (Ellis 1998:70, Oxford 1998: 97; see also Cameron 1999:117).

The key procedure was the identification of metaphor in the texts. Here, a standard definition of metaphor was employed like the one in a

dictionary, or in the simple substitution or comparison theories, which claim that a metaphor is where ‘X’ is treated as if it was to some extent (but not completely) ‘Y’ (Low 1999:224, Low 1988:126) (for the various definitions of metaphor see section 2.2). In these definitions some kind of anomalous relationship between the target, in this case the learner or the teacher, and the source is emphasized. In addition, following Lakoff (1980), a linguistic expression was deemed metaphorical if it was linked conceptually to an obvious source domain. In some instances the metaphors were explicit, in others embedded, i.e. the referent of an implicit metaphor was not expressed in the same clause, or not at all. In addition, as mentioned in section 2.2.3, a metaphor was considered an umbrella concept for many kinds of linguistic extensions of meaning. The focus was on the word level but not on isolated words. The context was of crucial importance; take for example ‘a monster’, which can be understood literally, as in a Loch Ness monster, or metaphorically, as in ‘the teacher was a real monster’.

Thus, the metaphors were not pre-established but instead arose through intensive readings of the narratives. Strategies for the detection of metaphor were to contemplate, whether the expression was anomalous, inappropriate in the context or defective when taken literally. Implicit metaphors were inferred from the texts. Metaphors can take many linguistic forms; they are not limited to the traditional form of a particular trope. Metaphor directs the reader to make many different interpretations; however, it does not offer an answer. Many of the metaphors were explicitly marked as metaphors in the stories. Such surface level markers as quotation marks, adverbs *kuten* (like), *niin sanottu* (so-called), even *kirjaimellisesti* (literally) (which usually means the opposite in English as well as in Finnish), and the use of dialect or foreign words, were interpreted to indicate a metaphorical meaning. Examples of the linguistic markers are, respectively: *ala-asteen “leikkimielisyys”* (47F), *kaikki meni kuin vettä* (05F), *se taitaa olla niin sanottu kutsumus-juttu* (31F), *pojat pistivät ranttaliksi ja kirjaimellisesti hyppivät seinille* (31F), *edessäni ollut pieni tenkkapoo* (15F) and *joka tarkoitti grammaria in deadly dozes* (09F).

Etymological metaphors were excluded from the data because they are so conventionalised or lexicalised that most people do not even recognise

them or know their origin. Only fresh metaphors were accounted for, not conventional idioms, common ways of expression in Finnish, e. g. *kantaa vastuuta* (one ‘carries’ responsibility) or *omatuntoini kolkutti* (my conscience was ‘knocking’, i.e. pricking me). Nevertheless, since many metaphors actually are idioms and even included in dictionaries, the less obvious sayings were included. Whether an expression is part of shared norms in a linguistic community or a metaphor depends on the context and on the reader’s previous experiences. Metaphoricity is a matter of convention and probability. It is of no importance, whether the writer has meant the expression to be metaphorical; the search for metaphorical figures is justified without assuming that the writer is conscious of their use. Furthermore, conceptual metaphors were mostly excluded, since they are so ubiquitous that they do not help in the classification for the present purposes; for example, almost every writer employed the metaphorical concept of MOVEMENT, as in ‘a lesson is a movement’, while portraying the goal-oriented action of language learning with metaphorical expressions like, e.g., *edistyimme hitaasti tai nopeasti* (we advanced slowly or fast) or *etenimme samassa tahdissa* (we progressed in step). Low (1999:54-55) argues that in English verb metaphors are more common than noun metaphors in some contexts. Nevertheless, many phrasal verbs are lexicalised and not considered metaphors. In these Finnish data, the more eloquent the writer’s style was, the greater was the use of figurative verbs as well as nouns. Colourful verbs as such were excluded, unless they contributed to some other purpose.

As mentioned before, metaphors were sorted out from the students’ life-stories, and exclusively from excerpts of language learning at school. The analysis of the data was carried out in two phases. First, the sets of data were read and reread until the potentially interesting metaphorical figures had been detached from the life stories. Once identified, an attempt was made to observe salient features, common elements, and similarities among the metaphors until some general conceptual categories representing students’ beliefs emerged. Secondly, after identifying each instance of metaphorical language the metaphors were interpreted further in order to find themes of metaphors and to establish main metaphors, which were grouped into separate files. In this recursive process, category labels and definitions within each subfile of

metaphors were defined tentatively. General knowledge of the Finnish school system and my experience as a language teacher formed a background for all decisions. The selection criteria were not objective and the interpretation was construed from the perspective of one person only.

The coding stage produced two main files of metaphorical expressions, one referring to the students' understandings of themselves and the other to the students' understandings of their teachers. These main categories were further divided into six groups each. There was no narrative totally lacking metaphors, although variation was great in the use of metaphorical expressions. In general, the male students employed less figurative language than the female students. No exact statistics on the metaphorical expressions identified in the narratives can be given, because it was not always easy to classify the expressions. Instead, a more interpretative account will be provided by describing and discussing a great number of metaphors. Nevertheless, an understanding of the most frequent metaphorical expressions and their placement in the categories was gained during the readings of the life-stories, as well as of the number of the writers who employed these metaphorical expressions. The length of a sample ranged from one word to a couple of lines. The codes at the end of the passages indicate the number assigned to the writer and his or her gender, e.g. 36M or 05F. Complete life stories are not included in the appendices, due to the great number (50) of the narratives. However, translations of the excerpts can be found in Appendix 2.

3.4. Findings

The aim of the present study was to examine the metaphorical expressions that learners employed about themselves and about their English teachers. The purpose was to find out what the metaphors used by the writers revealed about their reflections on themselves as learners of English. The analysis provided, both in the file of the learners' metaphors of themselves, and of their teachers, a number of different types of learners and teachers. The categories were easily reduced to six main groups on the basis of similar features, which seemed to suffice for the purposes of this study. Numerous examples are provided in

order to illustrate the interpretations on which the categorization was based. The categories were named in the frame of LEARNER AS X and TEACHER AS X. In this section I will report on the findings of this study, first the categorization of the learners' metaphors about themselves and then about their teachers. I will summarize the findings with the help of two tables that demonstrate the frequency of the metaphors in the categories and the number of the writers who used them.

3.4.1. Categorization of learner metaphors

The participants were students of English in a university, so it is justified to assume that they had been successful learners of English at school. What do the learners' metaphorical constructions of themselves reveal about the amount of work and effort they had exercised in learning English in formal contexts? As a rule, the writers considered themselves as '*good pupils*' in general (interestingly, quite a few writers placed 'good' in quotation marks), and acquiring the English language was easy for the majority of them; nevertheless, each person had put at least some effort to studying English. The basis for the following categorization is the effortlessness and pleasure in learning English the writers convey in their narratives. The metaphorical categories extend from learning without effort, through diligent working, to those who were not interested in learning English at all. The categories are demonstrated in order of the writers' frequency in them, beginning with the most frequent type of language learner to the least frequent type: LEARNER AS 1. PERFECTIONIST, 2. NATURAL TALENT, 3. LOVER, 4. SUFFERER, 5. WORKER, and 6. DRIFTER.

1. PERFECTIONIST

Perfectionist students' strive for perfection seems to be absolute: they have to be best in their class; nothing else is good enough for them. The means to success are their own efforts and dedication, which again can cause bad feelings among their classmates. Self-criticism and pride are the powers that drive them forward. In examples (1) and (2) *pursuit of perfection* and great disappointment because of

the tiniest failure is explicitly expressed. The students raise *the crossbar* higher than the teacher, as the writer in (1) puts it. Perfectionism is like an illness in that it has symptoms and it causes hardships, as in (2). The goal is to be *the very best* at English in the class, as in (3), where mistakes are *the end of the world*. Less harsh towards herself is the writer in (4) who can stand at least some *stains on perfection*. Errors often get the learners *angry with themselves*, as the writer in (5) states.

(1) Täytyy kyllä myöntää, että olen edelleenkin varsinainen perfektionisti. Viisi väärin kolmestakymmenestä luetun ymmärtämistehtävässä oli usein jopa pettymys. Päämääränänihan oli täydellisyys. Onneksi opettajan rimat olivat kuitenkin hieman alhaisemmat kuin omani. (36F)

(2) Kappaleen sanat piti aina lukea tunnille ja kolmen kappaleen välein oli sanakokeet. Niistä muistan aina saaneeni 10 tai 10- ja jo silloin minussa piileskelevät perfektionismin oireet ilmenivät suuren pettymyksen muodossa, kun kerran sain 91½Pt (25F)

(3) Mulle oli melkeen maailman loppu, jos vastasin väärin, tai jos olin unohtanu tehdä kotitehtävät. Listoista sitten muiden tyttöjen kanssa katottiin kuka on enkussa kaikkein paras. (20F)

(4) Virheet tietysti merkitsivät tahroja täydellisyyteen, mutta ei se mitenkään kauheaa ollut joskus riskeeratakin ja yrittää vaikei ihan varma ollutkaan. (26F)

(5) Ja kun minulle sattui virheitä olin niistä niin vihainen itselleni etten tehnyt samaa virhettä toistamiseen. (45F)

Perfectionist learners' *self-criticism* makes it hard to tolerate one's own failures, as in example (5) above and in examples (6) through (8) below. This attitude is frequently portrayed in the narratives. For the writers in (6) and (7) an error is *a hard bite to swallow*. The former demands too much of herself, as well as the latter, for whom grammar mistakes are such a hard bite that she writes 'hard' with big letters. Some students become *afraid of making mistakes* because of *the scornful laughter* of their fellow students, as in (8) and (9). One of them is not so strict to herself as the other who stubbornly tries and studies even more to become better and better.

(6) Lukiossa englanti oli edelleen lempiaineeni ja huomasin vaativani siinä itseltäni parempia tuloksia kuin joissain muissa aineissa. Olen kyllä muutenkin melko itsekriittinen ja vaadin itseltäni paljon, mutta englannissa minulla oli halu osata ja osata hyvin. Minua otti todella päähän, jos en saanut täyttä kymppiä enkun kokeesta. ... Itse asiassa en koskaan osannut selittää, miksi 10- ei riittänyt minulle. Ehkä oli kova pala myöntää, että en aina onnistunut niin hyvin kuin olisin tahtonut. (08F)

(7) Olen aina ollut hyvin itsekriittinen. Kielioppivirheet ovat olleet minulle KOVA pala. Halusin onnistua täydellisesti, mikä on tietenkin mahdotonta, vai? (47F)

(8) Olin hyvin kriittinen kielitaitoni suhteen ja olen vieläkin, joten en pitänyt itseäni kovinkaan "hyvänä" englannissa, vaikka peruskoulun opettajan mittapuun mukaan olinkin hyvä oppilas ... saattoi olla että muut vähän naureskelivat sille, että "se sai noin huonon", kun oli totuttu, että "se vetelee aina kymppijä". Tämän takia minusta tuli ehkä hieman arka virheille. ... Ehkä ongelmani oli liiallinen itsekritiikki. (02F)

(9) Toinen asia, joka tuntui rajoittavan opiskeluani jollain tavoin oli se, että pelkäsin tehdä virheitä tunneilla. Olin kauhusta jäykkänä vastatessani väärin, koska odotin pilkkanaurun kajahtavan ilmoille. Joskus se oli hyvin raskasta, mutta jääräpäisenä ja kunnianhimoisena ihmisenä yritin unohtaa kaiken sellaisen ja keskittyä olemaan aina vain parempi ja parempi. (22F)

Always being the best pupil in class makes some students *proud of themselves*, as in (10) where the teacher made the writer a model example for the others and in (11) where the test grades were the writer's boast. Some even become *arrogant* or *cocky*, as in (12) and (13). Pride goes before a fall, as the saying goes; although these students feel flattered, they arise *bad blood* among their classmates, as in (10), or they have to face the fact, at some stage of their learning, that there is something in the English language they had not *bothered* to learn properly (12). Suddenly it is not self-evident for the writer in (13) to get the highest marks in English; she has to revive her English so that she *has not her haughty nose put out of joint*.

(10) Minusta oli tehty malliesimerkki muille! Tietysti olin imarreltu ja ylpeä itsestäni, mutta asioilla on aina kaksi puolta. Onhan tunnettu tosiasia, että tällainen tapaus, ja jo pelkästään se, että joku on hyvä koulussa herättää usein pahaa verta luokkatovereissa ja jopa ystävissä. (05F)

(11) Muistan kerran äitini valittaneen, miten yksitoikkoisia numeroni olivat: aina kymppiä tai kymppimiikkaa. Sana-koevihkoni oli ylpeyden aiheeni, joka minulla taitaa edelleen olla tallessa. (25F)

(12) Ikävä seuraus jonkin verran ylimielisestä asenteestani tuolloin oli, etten ole ikinä oppinut tulkitsemaan ääntämerkkeitä. Yliopistossa onkin sitten edessäni ollut pieni tenkkapoo, kun pitäisi yhtäkkiä osata foneettiset merkit. Tähän asti olen vain luottanut korvatuntumaani. (15F)

(13) Ennen kirjoituksia huomasin, että taitoni olivat rapistuneet ja laudatur ei enää näyttänytkaan itsestään selvältä. Pienen paniikin jälkeen sain itseni kokoon, kertasin keskeiset asiat (tosin viimeisenä iltana), ja selviydyin kirjoituksista - Luojan kiitos saamatta koppavalle nenälleni. (16F)

The metaphorical expressions of the perfectionist learners describe how they demand total perfection of themselves in language learning. This compulsion comes from the students themselves, not from their teachers. A worse grade than the best (grade 10) is not good enough for them and they cannot stand any failures. Moreover, fear of mistakes causes them to study even more because they have to be perfect. The perfectionists are unpopular among their classmates but that makes no difference. In some instances the writers admit that their superiority made them arrogant. The majority of the writers used metaphorical expressions related to a compulsion of being the best. Likewise, the number of metaphors in all categories was greatest here. That indicates that more than half of university students of English are perfectionists in their self-constructions as language learners.

2. NATURAL TALENT

The naturally talented language learners construct their identities as talented by employing metaphorical expressions that refer to inherited qualities and natural gifts. These individual qualities make learning English easy for them. A sense of effortlessness in acquiring English is pictured by metaphors *comes off naturally* in example (14) and *as if out of the spinal cord* in example (15). This personal quality is regarded as an inborn characteristic, as in (15), and portrayed as such by expressions like *a built-in ear for languages* in examples (16) and (17), and *a head for languages* in example (17).

(14) Siinä missä englanti on aina tuntunu onnistuvan luonnostaan, on muut kielet olu vähän vaikeempia. Ei kuitenkaan niin vaikeita, etteikö kielipäästä olisi ollu jotakin apua. (42F)

(15) Kaiken kaikkiaan englannin opiskelu on aina sujunut minulta melko vähällä vaivalla, ikään kuin selkäytimestä. (49F)

(16) Mulla on aina ollut jonkinlainen sisäänrakennettu "kielikorva", joka sano mulle mikä on oikeen jos olin jostain epävarma. (20F)

(17) Englannin opettajani otti vertailukohteeksi isosiskoni, joka myös oli menestynyt kielissä, ja sanoi meillä olevan kielikorvaa. Kävin ala-asteen (nimi) kyläkoulussa ja luokallani oli vain kahdeksan oppilasta, joten toista "kielipäistä" ei meidän luokalle osunut. (21F)

The writers in this category often emphasize their ability to learn by listening; they seem to think that they were born with a capacity for oral mimicry. There is no need for memorizing words or studying grammar: they just *open their ears* like the writer in example (18), or they *play it by ear* and judge by what *sounds or feels best*, as in (19).

(18) [isosiskolla] oli omituinen tapa lukea läksynsä aina ääneen -melkein koko ala-asteen ajan - joten minun ei tarvinnut kuin asettua mukavaan kuunteluasentoon ja avata korvani. Lauserakenteet ja fraasit jäivät päähäni tällä keinoin todella helposti....Kielioppia en muista koskaan edes sen kummemmin lukeneeni Jotenkin sanat ovat aina -tai ainakin yleensä - loksahaneet oikeaan järjestykseen ilman suurempia miettimisiä. Olisikohan siihen sitten syynä jonkinlainen kielikorva. Tai ehkä vain hyvä tuuri. (43F)

(19) Tottakai se pohja kielioppeineen on koulusta peräisin, mutta silti taidan edelleenkin tehdä kaiken lähinnä mustatuntuu -periaatteella, korvakuulolta. Kielipää ja korvakuulo taitavat olla sukulaisia keskenään, ja kyllähän niillä tietysti aika pitkälle pääseekin, mutta pääseekö yliopistoon saakka? Tuskin. (42F)

Naturally talented language learners often emphasize the fact that not even English grammar, which ordinary students consider needing hard work, requires effort from them. They take it for granted that they learn rules, together with words, *by listening to what sounds right*, as in examples (20) and (22), *spontaneously* in (21), *without effort* in (22). The writer in (23) even claims that she succeeds better without studying the grammar because she has *a good ear for languages*. Still, some students admit, like the writer in (19) above, that there might become a time when they are in trouble because they have not learned the rules of English grammar.

(20) Niin kauan kuin muistan, olen korvannut kieliopin korvakuulolla. Toisin sanoen; rakenne mikä kuulostaa hyvältä on myös kieliopillisesti oikein. Tähän mennessä "korvakuuloni" on vain hyvin harvoin pettänyt minut. Kielioppiin turvaudun ani harvoin eikä minulle ole koskaan tullut mieleenkään lukea kielioppia esimerkiksi kokeisiin. (48F)

(21) Kielioppia ei ollut vaikea omaksua, sillä säännöt tuntuivat sujuvan jo entuudestaan aivan luonnostaan. (19F)

(22) En oikeastaan koskaan muista kärsineeni mitenkään erikoisesti kieliopin opettelemisesta. ...olin oppinut myös päättämään mikä kuulostaisi parhaimmalle. (36F)

(23) Kielioppia en kuitenkaan koskaan ollut halunnut opiskella ja niinpä kieltäydyin siitä lukiossakin, sillä minulla on hyvä "kielikorva", ja vaikka tiedänkin, että jotkut asiat on vain opeteltava ulkoa, sillä

kaikkeahan ei voi kuulla, olin huomannut selviytyväni paljon paremmin ilman lukemista. (05F)

Besides the positive feeling of being talented, some learners are disappointed; they wish for more challenge, especially in junior high. At that age the majority of the students are usually not interested in diligent working at school. There are exceptions, of course, as examples (24) through (26) prove. The learner in (24) does not remember any *learning experiences* or any difficulties; he uses the expression *vocabulary stuck in the head like a nail*, which pictures how simple memorizing vocabulary was: just one blow of a hammer. These writers find the standards for requirement not high enough for the *naturally talented* language learners, as in (25). When instruction is *too relaxed* and *undemanding*, the learners who are well endowed by nature might get bored, as the writer in (26). (By contrast, in the category of workers, some students state that they did experience enough challenge and pressure in language learning.)

(24) En osaa eritellä mitään "oppimiskokemuksia", mutta en muista minkään asian tuottaneen erityisesti vaikeuksia. Sanasto jäi päähän kuin naula ja kielioppikin oli varsin yksinkertaisessa muodossa. (50M)

(25) Englanninopetuksella ei ollut paljoa antaa niille kielellisesti lahjakkaille, jotka olisivat halunneet taitojaan käyttää muuhunkin kuin mallilauseiden kääntämiseen tai kieliopin kertaamiseen. (16F)

(26) Yläasteella opetus oli suoraan sanottuna löysää ja tylsää. O-lisimme siinä iässä olleet jo aivan valmiita tekemään ihan oikeata työtä, mutta sitä meidän ei sallittu tehdä. Opettajamme oli kyllä mukava ja tiesi paljon myös kieleen liittyvästä kulttuurista. Ala-asteella me teimme joskus suhteessa enemmän töitä, kun yläasteella. (32F)

Especially in the first years of English instruction school is *great fun* and learning is *joyful*, like *a game*, as in (27). Pleasant effortlessness in acquiring a foreign language can be seen in secondary school as well, as in examples (28) and (29), where the writers compare learning English with *children's play*.

(27) Ala-asteella koulu oli "kivaa" ja opiskelutahti verkkaista. Kieli oli minulle helppoa, motivaatio suunnaton. Opiskelu oli oppimisen iloa, kuin leikkiä. (47F)

(28) Tietenkin vaikeustaso kasvoi ja sanavarasto senkun karttui, mutta englanti tuntui silti minusta aina aivan lasten leikiltä. (05F)

(29) Yläasteen ajan homma sujui kuin leikki. ... Vaikutti siltä että kielen oppiminen oli minulle helpompaa kuin monille muille. (10M)

The naturally talented learners enjoy their ability to excel without effort, which is due to their inborn qualities. They seem to be aware of this gift. Despite the quality of the teachers, language learning is easy for the students in this category. They do not need to make sacrifices for learning; they just utilize their natural gifts. Metaphorical expressions related to the innate talent of acquiring English were employed by half of the writers. The proportion of male students was considerably bigger (six out of ten) in this category than in the others.

3. LOVER

Metaphorical expressions in the category ‘Learner as a lover’ construct a picture of enthusiastic language learners who do not mind studying hard. On the contrary, they enjoy diligent work with the subject they are in love with; consequently, they succeed in learning, and love even more everything that is related to Britain.¹ The beautiful language *has taken their heart*, and they *have fallen in love* with it, as in examples (30) and (31). Love for English and the British Isles make the learner an *England-freak* or *mad about Britain*, as in (31) and (32). Another expression for loving everything English is found in (33), where the learner claims to be an *anglophile* to the point of *obsession*.

(30) Niinpä siis jo alle kouluikäisenä tutustuin melko hyvin tuohon outoon, kauniiseen kieleen, joka lopulta vei sydämeni....Olin aina rakastanut kaikkea vanhaa ja englantilaista. (05F)

(31) Rakastuin kaikkeen, mikä koskee Brittein saaria ja minusta tuli Englanti-friikki. (02F)

(32) Englannissa olin luokkani paras, muissa aineissa keskitasoa. Miksi näin sitten on? Vaikea kysymys, sanoisin, että niin kauan kuin muistan olen ollut Britannia-hullu, joten luonnollisesti myös maassa puhuttu kieli on kiehtonut. (45F)

¹ In the whole data only two students actually stated that they preferred American English but no-one in this category.

(33) Minusta tuntuu että olin yhdessä vaiheessa oikea "anglofiilikko". Englanti kielenä ja maana oli oikea pakkomielle. (31F)

Frequent use of the concept *favourite subject* occurs in quite a few narratives in several learner categories, which is hardly surprising: the students are successful learners of English and often like it more than other subjects. The corresponding Finnish expression *lempiaine* (something like 'a darling subject') shows more clearly feelings of love towards the English language than the English expression. One example of many is in (34), and the same idea is described by the expression *number one* in (35), where the writer compresses in one sentence the reason for being good at a subject at school. The status of a favourite subject mostly remains through all school years.

(34) Englanti on aina ollut lempiaineitteni joukossa. Ala-asteella kirjoitin ystäväni kaverikirjoihin lempiaineen kohdalle englanti. Enkä mielipiteessäni järkkynyt. (33F)

(35) Entä englanti verrattuna muihin kieliin? No, englanti on ollu aina nro ykkönen kielistä. Se, että kuka on paras esim. englannissa jollain luokalla, johtuu ihan siitä, mihin kullakin on mielenkiintoo. Jos on jostain kiinnostunu, niin tottakai siitä hankkii tietoo ja on vastaanottavaisempi niillä tunneilla. (13F)

Another reason for loving English could be found in the metaphorical expressions of having entered a new, *wonderful and mysterious world*, as in (36), especially in the descriptions of language learning in primary school. Learners are excited to solve *secret codes* of the new language, as in (37). The learner in (38) has been *charmed* by the English language right from the beginning. It still has *magic* for her, in the same way as in (39), where the writer felt great when, after the very first lesson, also she now knew *the magical spells* of the English language.

(36) Kolmannella luokalla sain sitten toden teolla hypätä englannin ihmeelliseen maailmaan. (46F)

(37) Innokkaana, kuten yleensä kaikki lapset, lähdin selvittämään uuden kielen saloja. (16F)

(38) Olen opiskellut englantia 12 vuotta. Heti ensimmäisestä oppitunnista alkaen olen ollut tämän kielen lumossa, eikä sen taika ole vähentynyt vuosien saatossa tippaakaan...Olen perinyt rakkauteni englantia kohtaan isältäni, joka oli englannin opettaja. (45F)

(39) Aakielen opettelu sujui kahdessa ryhmässä, ja ensimmäinen ryhmä tuli ihka ekalta enkun tunnilta mumisten näitä sanoja kuin taikaloitsuja, heti tuli kateellinen olo. Tunnin päästä osasin itsekin taitat - ja se tuntui upealta. (23F)

The category of learner as a lover centers around the concept of love. Sometimes it can be madness, sometimes magic. When you love something you want to spend all your time with it and do not count the efforts in learning English. Great emotions are involved here similarly to the category of a sufferer later. An equal number of writers employed affective metaphorical expressions of loving and of suffering. It is not unusual for the same student to have had both kinds of experiences.

4. SUFFERER

In the category 'Learner as a sufferer' the writers construct their identities as language learners around metaphorical expressions related to being bored, impatient, frustrated or frightened. Particularly in comprehensive secondary school and senior high school some students cease to be motivated and interested and, therefore, they do not work as well and as much as they could. The linguistic form in the expressions is often negation, as in (40), where the writer states that learning was *not fruitful* and *not inspiring*. Lessons are always carried out with the same routine, *bla.bla.bla.*, so English lessons started to become a *necessary evil*. In example (41) a sense of compulsion and dislike of school, again in secondary school, is portrayed by the metaphorical expression a *dry bun*, which has to be eaten before the learner can grasp more delicious things. The writer in (42) explains that a trend of her days was to hate school at that age; therefore the succeeding students were *not looked upon with approval* and the writer sometimes made mistakes in tests on purpose in order not to be distinguished from the others. Aiming at the final exam meant grammar *in deadly dozes*, as in (43), so that the senior high school nearly *suppressed* the zeal for studying languages, as in (44). There was no time for conversation. Lack of oral language learning is an acknowledged fact in Finnish senior high school.

(40) Yläasteen englannin opiskeluni ei ollut juurikaan hedelmällistä tai inspiroivaa. Tunnit olivat mielestäni aina sitä yhtä ja samaa. Läksyjen kysely, ehkäpä sanakokeet, tehtävien tarkistus, uusi kappale, mahdollinen kielioppi ja niin edelleen...bla.bla.bla. Meille tylsän tunnollisille oppilaille englannin tunteista alkoi muodostua vain välttämätön paha entisen ilon sijasta. (07F)

(41) Yläasteella koulunkäynti on hyvin monelle aikamoista pakkopullaa. (25F)

(42) Ajan trendi oli muutenkin inhota koulua eikä liian hyvin pärjääviä katsottu suopeasti: minäkin vastailin aina silloin tällöin tahallani väärin kokeisiin etten vaan erottuisi joukosta. Ongelmana oli se ettei niitä asioita voinut olla osaamatta, joka ainut opettaja höpisi samat asiat kymmeniä kertoja ja ne jäivät kyllä päähän ilman mitään erikoista keskittymistä tai kiinnostusta asiaan. Englanti ei ollut poikkeus: etenimme minimaalisen hitaasti. (52F)

(43) Opettaja tosin vaihtui ja monologi muuttui entistä tylsemmäksi. Opiskelu tähtäsi YO-skaboihin, joka tarkoitti grammaria in deadly dozes. (09F)

(44) Odotin kuitenkin yhä käytännön kielen oppitunteja. Olin pettynyt "keskustelujen" vähyyteen. Kukaan ei puhunut sydämensä kyllyydestä. Pelkäsin lukiosysteemin nujertavan koko kielenopiskeluintoni. (47F)

More suffering was caused by unjust treatment from both teachers' and fellow learners' side. The writers repeatedly complain about *scornful laughter* at advanced pupils, as in (45). Unjust treatment always calls for protests and the fact that some teachers played favourites and had *pets*, as in (46), made the writers angry and lowered their motivation. (The perfectionist learners earlier and the ambitious workers later were able to ignore the laughter with the help of their enormous motivation.) One English teacher made the writer's *hair curl* for some reason in (47), and another produced *moments of horror and pain* to the writer in (48). The affective dimension of learning can be seen in that the students think of their learning experiences in terms of how they feel in class.

(45) Englannin opettajamme oli ammattitaitoinen, asiastaan innostunut ja mukava. Siitä huolimatta vihasin tunteilla olemista sydänjuuriani myöten, koska kaikki jatkuvasti nauroivat minulle. Motivaationi kärsi, pinnasin paljon koulusta, mutta englannin numerossani se ei näkynyt. (15F)

(46) Viittasin jatkuvasti, mutta minulta ei aina kysytty. Meidän ryhmässä oli pari tyttöä joita opettaja lelli ja sehän minua pänni. (37F)

(47) Siinä tyypissä oli vaan jotain sellaista joka sai karvat nousemaan pystyyn eikä mua sitten paljoa huvittanutkaan tehdä englannin eteen ja mä seisahduin tietylle tasolle. (18F)

(48) Kauhunhetkiä englannin opiskelu onnistui nytkin tuottamaan. Joka toinen keskiviikko kipusimme kuuliaisesti lukion puolelle ja studiotunneille. Jo marssi sinänsä oli painajaismainen. Varsinaiset tuskanhetket aiheutuivat kuitenkin, kun olimme studiossa koulun pätevimmän ja puhevikaisimman opettajan johdolla. (23F)

An entailment of the more general ‘Life is a journey’ metaphor is ‘Learning is a journey’, whose scheme includes the metaphor ‘learner as traveller’. As explained previously in section 2.1.3, the frame of a journey conveys a vast number of conceptual metaphors that, however, are not useful for the categorization in this study. Nevertheless, a traveller who suffers from desperately slow pace of learning can be seen as an example of the frustration advanced learners of English feel in a heterogeneous class. Some examples of the frequently used metaphorical expressions of going forward very slowly are in (49), where they study the same lessons *again and again*, and in (50), where they advance *at a pace of a snail*. There can be *stumbling blocks* on the road towards proficiency in English, as in (51). Learning English advances with varying success, at times it is a *quick spurt* forward, as in (52), and at other times *pulling a sledge full of stones* (53).

(49) Mä odotin että lukiossa tahti ois edes vähän muuttunut yläasteella mua ärsytti suunnattomasti kun junnattiin samassa kappaleessa hirmu kauan - mut sama tahti jatkui. Välillä mä en jaksanut tehdä yhtään mitään, kun mua otti niin suunnattomasti päähän se samojen juttujen jankkaus. Silti mä olin suht hyvä. (28F)

(50) Yläaste oli niin englannin kuin muidenkin aineiden kannalta äärimmäisen turhauttavaa aikaa. Etenimme etanavauhtia eikä oppikirjojen kappaleissa usein ollut ainuttakaan uutta sanaa. Tavallisesti puolet ajasta kului siihen kun opettaja yritti saada luokan villikot hiljaisiksi. (48F)

(51) Ainoa kompastuskiveni tuntui olevan ainekirjoitus, ehkä siksi että olen aina kuvitellut hyvin ei-luova ihminen. (22F)

(52) Vuoden aikana kielitaidon paraneminen tuntui kulkevan hieman jaksoittain; välillä nopea pyrähdys eteenpäin, sitten taas jonkin aikaa paikallaan ja sitten taas eteenpäin. (14F)

(53) Koko kouluaikani oli nyt tästä eteenpäin vuoroin innostusta, vuoroin kivireen vetämistä englannin suhteen. (30F)

The metaphorical expressions in the category of ‘Learner as a sufferer’ crystallize around the feelings of being bored or treated wrongly. Learners’ individual needs are not met. Frustration suppresses motivation so the amount of work in learning English is not big. Importantly, the writers do

not suffer from too much homework or from poor marks. Reasons for suffering are sometimes the teachers who reiterate the same rules, or fellow students, or sometimes maybe just the learners themselves: they are aware of their feelings and how they affect their progress. On the basis of their narratives, half of the writers had felt unhappy and bored with English acquisition in some phases of their language learning career. The situation was not permanent, however, for teachers changed and students could find motivation again.

5. WORKER

The metaphorical expressions used by ambitious students portray language learners who take great effort in the acquisition of the English language. The students do not particularly enjoy hard work, neither do they suffer from it; instead, they consider success in English almost their duty or a compulsion. However, they are eager to learn and able to study persistently. A learner as a worker *wants* to be good at English, while the perfectionists in the first category felt that they *had to* be best. *Ambition* and *self-esteem* drive the writer in (54) forward. However, a diligent and conscientious learner is not always popular, as the writers in examples (55) through (58) state. (Writers in other categories generally complain about the same thing.) These ambitious learners suffer from being *labeled* by teachers, as in examples (56) and (57), and *called names* by classmates, as in (58). The learner in (57) considers herself *a bookworm*, which is a good example of how metaphor can compact information. An imaginative reader pictures a colourless worm that lives inside a book, eats only dry books, whose whole world a book is. Similarly in (58), the figurative expression *a swot* reveals how the learner studies so hard that she gets sweaty.

(54) Lukiossa työskentelin pienen paineen alla koko ajan. Opettaja luotti kielitaitooni, samoin luokkatoverini, enkä halunnut tuottaa pettymystä. Itsetuntoni ei olisi kestänyt sitä. ... Oma kunnianhimoni ajoi eteenpäin. (47F)

(55) [Sanojen] oppiminen tuli aikaa myöten yhä helpommaksi, mutten koskaan tuntenut saavuttavani menestystä ilman panostamista. Tilanne yläasteella oli kaksijakoinen: vaikka oli suunnaton halu olla paras, toisaalta liian hyvä oppilas saattoi saada nipon leiman otsaansa. (46F)

(56) Minua häiritsi vielä kovasti hyväksi englanninoppilaaksi leimautuminen joka jälleen aiheutti kireitä tilanteita muiden oppilaiden kanssa. (32F)

(57) Lukiossa sain tarpeekseni opettajan pommituksista ja leimoista joita lukiossa kukin sai. Tuo on lukutoukka, tuo on opettajan lellikki ja tuo on varmasti täysi idiootti... Eikä opettajan tyyli valita minut, jos kukaan ei viitannut, lukemaan aineeni todellakaan parantanut muiden käsitystä minusta (ei silti, että sillä olisi ollut niin välisikään) lukutoukkana. (36F)

(58) Huonoin juttu yläasteen enkun opiskelussa oli se, että mun luokka oli kauheen passiivinen kaikessa ja tietty mä sain hirveen hikarin maineen kun tykkäsinkin jostain aineesta. Silloin oli kaverien mielipiteet vielä hirveen tärkeitä. (28F)

The ‘Learner as a worker’ metaphor entails the concept of *competing* with other students, which also implies hard work and training. In order to remain *on top* of the class in learning, as ambitious students do, the writer in (59) even has to start working a bit because of the extremely competitive atmosphere in the class. Similarly, the writer in (60) feels the *competition* and *pressure* of always getting A-grades; however, she is not going to give up. In the third grade of primary school a learner in (61) accepts the *challenge* from her teacher and comes off *victorious*; the importance of this event for the writer is shown by the big letters in the expression. A student in senior high school in (62) describes the challenge in learning as *iron time*. Iron has to be forced to a shape; it is strong and useful. (In the group of ‘Natural talent’ the learners wished for more challenge; here they experienced enough challenge.)

(59) En ollutkaan enää niitä harvoja, jotka aina loistivat. Harvinaisen kova kilpailumieliala, joka vallitsi luokassamme, sai minut aika ajoin raivoihini ja vaipumaan epätoivoon. Taisin olla aikamoinen kapinallinen. Jouduin tekemään jo hiukan töitäkin pysytelläkseni kärjen tuntumassa. (19F)

(60) Paineet olivat kymppin oppilaalla kuitenkin kovat ja luin englanninkielisiä kirjoja sekä kielioppiakin ihan kunnolla. Kuuntelu oli näet mennyt minulta alakanttiin emmekä minä ja eräs toinen ”hiku” halunneet luopua ajatuksesta saada enkusta varma laudatur. (25F)

(61) Minua jännitti hitusen, mutta sain varmuutta siitä, että opettaja oli uskonut juuri minulle tämän luottamustehtävän. Jälleen sain ottaa käteeni nipun kuvia ja esittää kuluneen kysymyksen: What's this? ...Joka tapauksessa poistuin luokasta Todellisena Selviytyjänä tyytyväisyyden säteillä kasvoillani. (34F)

(62) Ah! Lukioaika oli englanninoppimisen kannalta tosi rautaista aikaa. (39F)

The metaphorical concept 'Learning a language is building a house' can be included in the worker category, since construction work needs planning and demands great effort just like learning does. You need firm foundations for a good result. Frequently used metaphorical expressions in the narratives are *basis* and *ground*, *to collapse* and *to build* as in (63) and (64). The writer in (64) compares language learning with *building a brick house*, bit by bit, never leaving anything undone. She admits that her house is not finished yet and that it *sways dangerously*. The writer in (65) exploits the metaphor fully while describing how she has a completed house that she *is furnishing* at the moment. (In the file of teacher metaphors, metaphorical expressions of building a house can also be found; however, no separate category was made there, since it is the student who does the work, although with the help and advice from the teacher.)

(63) Yläasteen opettajamme (nimi) piti myös tunnuslauseenaan, että jos jonkin aineen perusta on hataralla pohjalla se romahtaa ennen pitkää kokonaan. En tiedä vaikuttiko se niihin oppilaisiin joihin se oli tarkoitettu, mutta minä ainakin rakensin vahvan pohjan kaikille uusillekin kielille joita aloin opiskelemaan. (36F)

(64) Opettaja pyysi meitä ajattelemaan kielenopiskelua kuin tiilitalon rakentamisena; jos ei muuraa tiiviisti vaan jättää aukkoja sinne tänne, niin talo jossain vaiheessa romahtaa. Mielestäni vertauskuva oli hyvä ja olen koettanut pitää sen mielessä. Täytyy kyllä myöntää, että lipsumisia on tullut ja että taloni huojuu vielä pahasti, mutta olen koettanut ja koetan jatkossakin tukevoittaa sitä. (08F)

(65) Miten sitä nyt kuvailisin... Olkoon kielitaitoni valmis omakotitalo, jota tällä hetkellä ollaan sisustamassa: laitetaan verhoja ikkunoihin ja mattoja lattialle. (25F)

In the 'Learner as a worker' category the writers emphasize striving for good results in learning the English language. Their own will and ambition makes them strain and toil, not teachers' requirements. In that respect the self-directed effort in language learning is related to motivation. Unpopularity among classmates does not stop them. Metaphorical language of working hard, cramming, pressures and constructing a building were not employed by so many writers as one would have thought; the number of metaphorical expressions in the texts, though, was as great as in the other categories.

6. DRIFTER

In this last category of metaphorical expressions about learners themselves the amount of effort taken for studying is as small as in the group of ‘Learner as a natural talent’, but for a different reason. The drifters do not care for school or for formal language learning too much. They seem to be passive, either lazy or uninterested. The writer in (66) does not bother *to slave away* in school, whereas the writer in (67) admits that she is *bone lazy* and in (68) that she only used *half brain* in comprehensive school.

(66) En viitsinyt liikaa rehkiä, koska olin päättänyt lähteä vaihto-oppilaaksi, ja sieltähän kielitaidon saisi kuin itsestään. (17F)

(67) Toisaalta, vaikka olinkin patalaiska, tunsin jonkinlaista vastuuta koenumeroistani. Englannin kielen oppiminen itsessään ei ollut minulle suurikaan arvo – tuohon aikaan osasin arvostaa tuskin mitään. (19F)

(68) Ja minkäänlaisista odotuksista englannin kielen suhteen ei kyllä voida minun tapauksessani puhua, sillä kävin näet koko peruskoulun ikään kuin puolella aivokapasiteetistani. (26F)

Some of the students are selective, so other things than studying English at school take their time and interest, as in examples (69) through (71), which are, for some reason, from male students. These students are not lazy but they engage themselves in what they are interested in doing. The writer in example (69) did not pay any *attention* to studying English and because he had not even *peeked* at the issues at hand he was in trouble before an exam. Likewise, the writer in (70) studied what he *pleased*. Also the writer in (71) was selective and paid *less attention* to studying.

(69) Lukion ajalta mielikuvani ovat selkeämpiä. En kiinnittänyt englanttiin mitään erikoisempaa huomiota. Välillä olin jopa pulassa kokeen lähestyessä, koska en ollut vilkaissutkaan käsiteltäviä asioita. Silti numerot pysyivät yhdeksäisen tasolla läpi lukion. (10M)

(70) Aloinkin lukea enemmän mitä huvitti. (03M)

(71) Opiskelu jäi vielä vähemmälle huomiolle. (06M)

The category ‘Learner as a drifter’ was by far the smallest in regard to the number of writers as well as the expressions they used. Drifters managed somehow, though, without much or any work at school. They often learned

English outside school, in doing what they were interested in. The writers did not blame teachers; they just did not have the need to succeed at school. Learning came as a by-product to them.

3.4.2. Categorization of the teacher metaphors

The basis for the following categorization of the learners' metaphorical constructions of their English teachers was the teachers' expert knowledge and efficiency: simply, how 'good' teachers they were in the eyes of the learners. Features of good teaching, as expressed by the learners, were a mixture of charisma and dedication to the subject as well as to the learners' success in the subject, fairness, and, importantly, a sense of humour. The most frequent expression referring to a good teacher was *mukava* (nice), which can be interpreted in so many ways. Students described their teachers less frequently than they wrote about themselves. Consequently, the number of metaphorical expressions about teachers is smaller than the one about learners. Three narratives did not contain any figurative descriptions of teachers. As regards the teachers' ability to make students learn English well, eight relevant groups of metaphors arose from the narratives. They are, in order of frequency of the writers who employed the metaphors in their narratives: TEACHER AS 1. MOTIVATOR, 2. TRIER TO PATIENCE, 3. MANUFACTURER, 4. TARGET OF MISCHIEF, 5. WITCH, and 6. DEMIGOD.

1. MOTIVATOR

The 'Teacher as a motivator' motif appeared numerous times. The Finnish word *kannustava* was frequently used in describing a good and well-liked English teacher. It has a multitude of meanings in connection to teaching: encouraging, inspiring, motivating, challenging, skilled, accepting and even nice. A motivator controls the class, though. The writer in (72) commented on her English teacher who *took the reins* firmly, but gently. Students usually wish that the teacher takes control in the classroom. A stimulating teacher knows how to correct learners' mistakes *without causing a trauma* for the rest of the learner's life, as in (73). Students do not forget unjust treatment. Likewise, a professional teacher is able to

take into account the varying needs of a heterogeneous class in a pleasant way, as in (74). The learners often consider a ‘cool’ teacher also competent, as in (75), where the writer finds she is lucky having a fairly young male teacher who *cracked jokes*; in his lessons learning was *not deadly boring*.

(72) Luokkahenki oli uskomaton, samanlaista ei ole ollut sitten alakouluvuosien... Opettajalla oli lempeästi, mutta varmasti ohjat kässissään. (47F)

(73) Opettaja korjasi ystävällisesti virheeni, joten vastaamisesta ei jäänyt merkittäviä traumoja sisälleni kytemään. (33F)

(74) Kannustavalla opettajalla oli varmasti tosi suuri merkitys oppimistuloksiimme. Hän sai vähän heikommatkin oppilaat mukaan ihan kummasti, ja meille yli-innokkaille hän järjesti lisätehtäviä ja monenlaista muuta mukavaa tekemistä. (49F)

(75) Minulla oli kuitenkin selvästi onnea mukanani, sillä sain koko koulun ehdottomasti mukavimman ja samalla pätevimmän opettajan englanttiin. Hän oli suht koht nuori miesopettaja, jolta irtosi aina vitsejä...Opiskelu ei ollut mikään kuolettava asia niillä tunneilla. (05F)

Personality is an important tool for a teacher, not least to a language teacher. The writers often emphasize the characteristics of motivating teachers by employing rather general adjectives: *kiva*, *reipas*, *lempeä*, *persoonallinen*, *hauska* (nice, brisk, gentle, personal and fun), for example. In the connection of a good teacher these expressions illustrate the features of motivating teaching that contribute to learners’ good results in English and to happy memories of English lessons. In (76) the writer can still remember how *energetic* the *nice auntie* was and how good she smelled; and on top of that, she pronounced English like real English people do! Another *personality* is portrayed with his funny clothes and habits in (77). This teacher was *fair and just* like the one in (78). Furthermore, motivating teachers do not treat students wrongly; they help all learners, also the weaker ones. Such pleasant teachers make the learners interest in English, as in (77) and (78).

(76) Ala-asteen englannin opettajani (nimi) oli muistaakseni todella kiva täti. Hän oli aina niin pirteänoloinen ja energinen, ja tuoksuikin vielä aina niin kivalta (mitä lie parfyymiä käyttänyt). Ja kun se osasi sitä englantiaakin sitten niin todella hyvin, lausuikin mielestäni kuin ihan aidot englantilaiset konsanaan. (26F)

(77) Onneksi opettaja vaihtui ja tilalle tuli varsin persoonallinen miesopettaja, joka oli äärettömän pätevä...Niin ainakin minun lapsen mieleni silloin sanoi. Hänellä oli skottiruudullinen hattu, jossa oli hassu tupsu...Hän soitti basuunaa (joskus myös tunneilla)...ja hänellä

oli usein termospullollinen kahvia villasukassa lämpimässä. Tuosta persoonallisuudesta jäi pelkästään hyviä muistoja, sillä hän onnistui palauttamaan mielenkiintoni englantiin, ja mikä tärkeintä hän oli oikeudenmukainen ja tasapuolinen. (05F)

(78) Opetuskin oli yläasteella paljon rennompaa. Vihkojen repiminen loppui englannin osalta siihen (ainakin vähäksi aikaa). Opettaja oli reilu ja jaksoi auttaa huonompiakin oppilaita, eikä tehnyt enää mieli luistaa tehtävistä ja sanojen luvusta (tai no, ei ainakaan niin paljon). Ei mukavalle ja oikeudenmukaiselle opettajalle voinut olla inhottava. What comes around, goes around. (17F)

As several writers have already emphasized, positive experiences have a great influence on learning. Particularly in language learning, affective aspects are important. The atmosphere depends on the teacher. A motivating, encouraging, joyful climate in the classroom helps the learners enjoy studying English. The writer in (79) vividly describes her images of the English classroom, where *the sun always shone* and *the sky was enormously blue*, and mentions the teacher with her *silvery bracelets jingling*. Metaphoric reading of that memory reveals the pleasant atmosphere in English lessons. The topmost picture of learning English on the third grade in (80) and (81) is an encouraging and *homelike atmosphere*, where learners are not frightened. That is a good start to the many years of English instruction to come.

(79) Jotenkin mulle on jäänyt sellainen mielikuva, että siihen meidän pieneen enkun luokkaan paistoi aina aurinko ja niistä isoista ikkunoista sisään tunkeva taivas oli valtavan sininen. Meillä oli koko ala-asteen aikana kolme opettajaa, naisia kaikki, mutta parhaiten mä muistan ihan sen ekan open. Se pukeutui aina hienosti ja tuoksui hajuvedeltä. Sit sillä oli hopeisia rannerenkaita ranteesta kyynärpäähän asti jotka piti aina sellaista helinää kun se liikkui ympäri luokkahuonetta. (18F)

(80) Kun kolmannella luokalla englannin tunnit sitten alkoivat, niistä tuli ehdottomasti viikon kohokohta koulussa. Suuri vaikutus tähän oli varmasti opettajalla, josta pidin paljon. Ala-asteen englannin-tunneista onkin päällimmäisenä jäänyt mieleen kannustava ja rohkaiseva ilmapiiri: ei pelota, kotoisa. (14F)

(81) Pidin hänestä kovasti. Yhtään erityisen selvää tapausta minä en hänen tunneiltaan muista, mutta sen kylläkin, ettei minua pelottanut tunneilla eikä tehnyt mieli kapinoida vastaan. ... Olen aina ollut niitä oppilaita, joihin kiitos ja tietty joustavuus ovat tehneet paljon paremman vaikutuksen kuin ankaruus ja uhkailut, jotka pelkästään latistavat opiskelumotivaationi. (19F)

Metaphorical expressions in the category of 'Teacher as a motivator' construct around concepts of personality. Warm, caring teachers

attempt to make students feel secure, and bring out the best in them. The majority of students used metaphorical expressions referring to a motivating English teacher, and the number of the metaphorical expressions was also quite big.

2. TRIER TO PATIENCE

In this category teaching is as teacher- and text-centred as in the previous one, but in this case teachers are tedious persons and really dull. The students do not value them as good teachers. Metaphorical expressions of boring teachers are the most frequent teacher images in the data. Reasons for the students to be bored and to dislike their English teachers in this category are various: teachers are terrible old hags, they are tired of teaching or uninterested in the subject, they lack professional experience, they make the learners' hair curl or make them furious in some other way.

The writer in (82) remembers her teacher as an *old-maidish, dryasdust person*. English lessons in example (83), like in very many other examples, followed *the same schedule* day after day. Moreover, the teacher had *routine manners* and *a rutted teaching style*. Of course, if lessons are *agonizingly boring*, as in (84), students are apt to occupy themselves with something more interesting, which can result in the teacher shouting at them, which in turn adds to the *antipathy* towards the teacher. The antipathy in (84) is revealed by metaphorical reading of the teacher's *dry and tense voice, tight knot of hair and cold look*. Nonetheless, the student in (85) is able to adopt a tolerating attitude to her teacher's *monologue*, with a little sarcasm embedded. Frustration can sometimes be caused by the teacher's *disorganization*, as in (86), which makes the learner confused and mixed up.

(82) Opettaja oli tylsä, tätimäinen kuiva kääkkä ja luokan henki oli vähän semmonen ja tämmönen. Näistä ajoista ei ole paljon jäänyt mieleen ja yleiskuva on lähinnä ankean harmaa. (04F)

(83) Opetus oli tylsää. Tunnit menivät saman kaavan mukaan; oppikirjaa, työkirjaa, kuuntelua Eri tehtävä-tyypeistäkin tehtiin aina samat. Opettajallamme oli todella pitkälle kehittyneet maneerit ja urautunut opetustyyli. (10M)

(84) Vieläkin pystyn palauttamaan mieleeni kolmannen luokan englanninopettajani kuivan ja kireän äänen, tiukan nutturan ja kylmän

katseen. ... (Nimi) tunnit olivat tuskastuttavan tylsiä, siellä heräsi kiusaus harrastaa jotakin muuta, vaikkapa kirjelappusten kirjoittelua ja lähettelyä ... Taisinpa joskus joutua lukemaan jonkin lappusen luokan edessäkin, ja sekös oli noloa, ja -mikä pahinta - se lisäsi antipatioitani entisestään. (43F)

(85) Englannin ope oli sellainen vanha, hiukan höperö mutta ihana täti, joka varmasti osasi paljon mutta ei osannut jakaa osaamistaan muille. Hänen monologinsa olivat toisaalta ihan viihdyttäviä ja jotkut pikku detaljit saattoivat jopa saavuttaa tajuntamme. (09F)

(86) Opettaja ei ollut enää yhtä topakka, vaan suoraan sanottuna aikamoinen hössö. ... Opettajamme oli kyllä innoissaan uusista menetelmistä, mutta ei osannut ottaa niitä järjestelmällisesti ja suunnitellusti käyttöön. (25F)

In several instances the writers explicitly state that their teachers were incompetent and good-for-nothing. They were lacking in professional competence. The degree of caring and enthusiasm possessed by the teachers seemed to be lowest possible. Learners simply cannot cope with instructors who behave unprofessionally. A substitute teacher in example (87) was considered incompetent and *an oddity*. An example of what a teacher should not be like is pictured in (88), where the senior high school teacher did not bother to prepare lessons; he *had not lifted a finger* to aid the learners. What is more, he favoured all girls. Another *low record* is portrayed in (89), where the writer states, as one of many, that the teacher's pronunciation of English was poor, which irritated her. Finally, good teachers do not *yell* at students, like the teacher in example (90), who was *easily irritated* and *lost her temper*.

(87) Eka negatiivinen kokemus, joka tulee mieleen liittyy sijaiseen, joka oli meillä yläasteen aikana. Sitä naista pidettiin kummajaisena ja ainakin kaikkien oppilaiden mielestä se oli epäpätevä. Kaikista paras juttu oli, kun se kuiskutti jokaisen korvaan etukäteen minkä numeron ne tulee saamaan todistukseen. (13F)

(88) Lukiossa englannin opettajamme oli huono. Ilmaisuuksien tyrmistyttävän suora, mutta myös valitettavan totuudenmukainen, sillä hän ei todellakaan ottanut mitään vastuuta oppimisestamme. Tunnit olivat todella surkeasti valmisteltuja. ... Hän on kyllä valitettavan hyvä esimerkki siitä, minkälainen opettaja ei saa olla.... Hänellä oli suosikkioppilaita, useimmiten tyttöjä. ... Meillä oli todella hyvä ruotsin opettaja ja verratessamme enkun opettajaa häneen mieshän ei tuntunut pistävän tikkua ristiin meidän hyväksemme. (25F)

(89) En nauttinut englanninopiskelusta lukiossa. Ensinnäkin opettajani oli pohjanoteeraus, varsinkin hänen lausumisensa, mikä on minulle melkein tärkeintä. (45F)

(90) Näin jälkeinpäin ajatellen tuntuu siltä, että suurin osa tunteista kului siihen, kun opettaja huusi luokalle syystä tai toisesta. Erityisesti

kuulakärkikynän napsuttelu oli sellainen asia, joka sai opettajan ärsyntyään ja monesti täysin menettämään malttinsa. (14F)

The language teachers in the category of ‘Teacher as a trier to patience’ make an interesting subject extremely dull for the students while the learning process becomes stale and boring. The writers’ numerous accounts of their frustrating teachers reveal the teachers’ lack of concern and empathy for the students. Confrontation with an unsympathetic teacher can arouse defiance in learners. More than half of the writers have such negative memories of their English teachers; the number of metaphorical expressions is the biggest in this category.

3. MANUFACTURER

In the category of ‘Teacher as a manufacturer’ most metaphorical expressions came from students in senior high school. Cost-effectiveness and time cutting are the central concerns of the teachers there, because they are required to cover a large amount of material within a given period of time, due to the matriculation exam at the end of the senior high school. The curriculum becomes a race-track to be run as fast as possible. The teacher is an authority and English lessons stick strict to business. Students’ desires and creative learning processes are not valued; instead, efficient working is demanded. Examples (91) and (92) depict the *factory-related, mechanical* proceeding no matter what. *Cramming of grammar* seems to be the most important task in (92), and in (93) the teacher *terrorized students with grammar*. Teachers make an effort to be more and more effective, indicating a ‘racing syndrome’; thus, the teacher in (94) is nicknamed after a mark of a well-known moped implying *romping speed*. In spite of the hard work the demanding teachers make the students do, they appreciate good learning results and strict order in the lessons. The writer in (95) describes two language teachers in secondary school: one was *an iron lady* who kept the class *under discipline*, while the other did not succeed in maintaining order and discipline and was therefore ridiculed.

(91) Aikaa säästääkseen (nimi) ihan viisaasti päätteli, että on vähemmän korjaamista, jos vain hyvät oppilaat kirjoittavat taululle. Korjaamista kyllä riitti sittenkin, kaikkien lauseissa. (29F)

(92) Opetus oli sisällöltään tyypillistä "meidän-on-edistytävä-vaikka-oppilaita-on-liikaa". Grammaria pännättiin ilman selitystä poikkeuksille ja sanoja luettiin ulkoa jokaviikkoista sanakoetta varten. (09F)

(93) Lukiossa opettajani oli varsinainen "kielioppi-hirmu", kaikki tunnit kuuluivat kielioppiharjoitusten parissa ja poikkeusten poikkeuksia opeteltaessa. (35F)

(94) Lukioon mentäessä mä en muista kyllä että muuttuiko opetustyyli mitenkään erikoisesti, samanlaista, yhtä opettaja keskeistä se oli kuin ennenkin. Tehokkaampi opettaja meille kylläkin tuli lukion ekalla, sitä sanottiinkin helkamaraisuksi. (18F)

(95) Yläasteella meillä oli kaksi opettajaa ruotsissa ja englannissa. (Nickname) oli rautarouva, joka piti kovaa jöötä ja antoi paljon läksyjä. (Nickname) tunnilla oppi. (Another nickname) yritti pitää kovaa jöötä, muttei oikein onnistunut, ja häneen suhtauduttiinkin yleensä ärtyneen huvittuneen alentuvasti, mistä hän ei oikein tykännyt. Onnekseni kävi niin, että sain nauttia (no eipä se silloin miltään nautinnolta tuntunut) (nickname) opetuksesta sekä ruotsissa että englannissa. (39M)

The metaphorical expressions in the category 'Teacher as a manufacturer' are related to a disciplined production system. Nevertheless, the learners express positive attitude towards efficient language teachers although some sense of frustration could be felt. When the student and the teacher are striving to attain a shared end, in this case good learning results, learners do not suffer (too much) from tiresome labouring. Although teachers are authorities, students do not envision their teachers as dictatorial figures. Roughly one third of the participants had had *the luck to enjoy* (as (95) put it) English instruction by a teacher as a manufacturer.

4. TARGET OF MISCHIEF

In the category of 'Teacher as a target of mischief' the teacher does not impose any classroom discipline or have any authority. Less advanced students in particular disturb lessons by shouting and romping whenever they have an opportunity to do so. In secondary school the students are at puberty, which is a difficult age to control. Weak characters without authority become *dream targets* for unmotivated language learners to *bully*, as in (96). The main fun and aim of attending a lesson might have been to *fool the teacher* into doing something ridiculous, like always taking her handbag along *in fear of mischief*, as in example (97). The result is pandemonium and disorder in the classroom.

Likewise, in (98) the main purpose of English lessons is to make the teacher *run crying* out of the classroom. It was not easy to pity such a *hopeless sissy* and a *crybaby*. Learning English becomes impossible even for those who might have wanted to learn something. When there are troublemakers in class, as there often are in secondary school in particular, it is no wonder that some teachers were *on the verge of nervous breakdown*, as in (99).

(96) Englannin opettajani oli varsinainen ilkeilyjen kohde, oikea murrosikäisten unelma-target. Valitettava tosiasia on, että ei-motivoituneet hallitsevat liian usein luokkaa. Hiljaista tunneilla oli silloin kun takana istui tarkastaja tai väsyneen opettajan kutsuma rehtori. (07F)

(97) Yläasteella alaluokkien harras ilmapiiri vaihtui yleiseen hulinaan ja sekasortoon. Opettajallamme (etunimi) oli hieman harmaata ohimoillaan. Ilkivallan pelossa hän otti joka kerran käsilaukun mukaansa menessään hakemaan jotakin kaapista. Hän kuulemma lähetti itselleen kortteja seuramatkoilta. Tämä riitti meille. Tuntien huvi ja tarkoitus oli naruttaa (etunimi), ja siinä touhussa kaikki muu unohtui. (34F)

(98) Vaikka pidin englannista, en lukenut läksyjä yhdellekään tunnille koko yläasteen aikana, koska opettajamme oli toivoton nynny ja lisäksi itkupilli. Kokeet teimme aina pulpetillamme auki olevasta kirjasta suoraan kopsaten. Tuntien päätarkoituksiksi muodostui opettajan itkien ulos luokasta juoksemaan saaminen! Toisaalta minun kävi sääliksi opettajaamme, toisaalta taas olin kiukkuinen siitä, että hän oli niin saamaton ja epäkelpo opettamaan rakastamaani englantia. (15F)

(99) Yläasteella luokkahengen kanssa oli vähän niin ja näin, mun ryhmässä kun oli muutama pahimmista raggareista, jotka sai open hermorumahduksen partaalle. (13F)

In senior high school a small number of students is able to smile at their English teachers in a benevolent way. These students are presumably mature and intelligent and understand that teachers are only humans. When the atmosphere in the class is good, students can sometimes *smile kindly* at the teacher's naïve stories from her past, as in example (100), whereas in (101) an absolutely perfect pronunciation of British English *was ridiculed* by the learners. The last example shows the sarcasm employed by some male students in their narratives. In example (102) the writer states how the teacher *admired the spotty faces* of the seventh graders and then *the teacher eventually calmed down*, not the teenagers, which is against the common view that puberty is usually over by the eighth and ninth grade. A cast of humour can be perceived here.

(100) Hän oli jo vanhahko, kaikin tavoin vanhanaikainen naisihminen, joka aina kertoili meille Turkin matkoistaan ja niistä kilteistä turkkilaisista opiskelijatyttöystävistään. Luokan henki oli meillä ihan kiva, pidimme keskenämme usein hauskaa englannin tunneilla, joskus jopa opettajan kustannuksella. (26F)

(101) Minulla oli kaksi enkun opea lukiossa, toinen heistä vannoi täydellisen brittienglannin nimeen joten amerikan englanti oli täysin pannassa. Tämä sääntö oli minusta hieman pötkö, mutta minkäs teet. Meillä oli ajoittain todella hauskaa tämän opettajan ääntämisen kanssa se oli niin "täydellistä". (37F)

(102) Opettajan -viisikymppisen naisen- mielestä seiskaluokkalaisten näppylänaamat olivat ihania. Kasilla ja ysillä se rauhoittui. Me varmaan turmelluttin. (44M)

Metaphorical expressions in the category 'Teacher as a target of mischief' create an image of an unfortunate type of teacher who is bullied by students. They are incompetent, inefficient and incapable of teaching English. The number of writers in this category is quite small, and the number of metaphorical expressions is the smallest in all the categories.

5. WITCH

Feared and unfair teachers can be pictured with the metaphorical concept of a witch. They are dreadful monsters and tyrants, in whose lessons learning is diminished or prohibited by fear and anger. Their reputation prevails in stories told among the students, which might even add to the students' frightful attitude. The writer in (103) portrays the whole class shivering in the first lesson of a teacher, who had the ill fame of *a domestic terror*, who uttered *malicious remarks* to less advanced learners. In primary school the learner in (104) sees her big feared teacher as an *almighty authority*, *a monster*, against whom it is hopeless to fight. In (105) students had to learn their homework thoroughly in order to dare to attend the English lesson because of the teacher's *fits of rage* and *fiery temper*. The teacher *hated* the writer's class in example (106) and *shrilled* loathsome words about them to another class who learnt to hate English; some of them still do.

(103) Lukion toisella luokalla englanninopettaja vaihtui kaikkein pelkäämään ja kunnioittamaan (nimi). Ensimmäisellä tunnilla koko ryhmä istui hiljaa ja vapisi farkuissaan. (Nimi) pirttihirmun maine oli sinänsä oikea, että heikoille oppilaille saattoi tulla todella ilkeitä

kommentteja. Minulla ei ollut juurikaan pelättävää, sillä olin luokkani parhaimpia ja kilteimpiä oppilaita. (29F)

(104) Tuo höppänä tätsä oli päättänyt joka tapauksessa laskea arvosanani, joten minä luovutin, sillä kuinka pieni 9-vuotias lapsi voisi taistella sellaista "kaikkivoipaa" auktoriteettia vastaan kuin "suuri" pelätty opettaja. ...syyttää ... tuota hirviötä, joka hetkiseksi tuhosi mielenkiintoni englannin kieleen täydellisellä ymmärtämättömyydellään. (05F).

(105) Seuraava opettajamme ei tuntunut kestävästi vallattomia ja tyhmiä oppilaitaan - niin hän antoi olettaa - ja näytti sen hyvin temperamenttisine kiukunpuuskineen. ...Paljolti opettajamme "tulusuuden" vuoksi englannin opiskelun hauskuus alkoi väistyä taka-alalle. Oli osattava ja opittava asioita lähes täydellisyteen asti uskaltaakseen mennä tunneille. (22F)

(106) (Pojan nimi) lukuunottamatta hän inhosi meidän luokkaamme ja sen sai B-ryhmä tuntea nahoissaan, heille hänellä oli tapana kimittää: "Te olette kuin likainen räkärätti joka roikkuu minun niskassani ja jota en saa ravistettua pois!" Kummallista kyllä joka ainut oppilas B-ryhmässä oppi inhoamaan englantia ja useimmat heistä inhoavat sitä tänäkin päivänä. (52F)

Above in (106), the teacher hated the class. More usually, students hate teachers who are too severe or strict to them. Learners are negatively affected by such malicious teachers. In Finnish schools, students seldom meet a teacher who tears their notebooks if the handwriting is not good enough, as in example (107), where the writer also illustrates a threat of getting *beaten on the knuckles* with the pointer, had the learner forgotten to memorize words. Similarly, the cruel headmaster, *a man of the old school* in example (108) *trusted the pointer* and would have used it if the rules had not forbidden it. The appearance of a teacher, who looked like *a dried raisin* and was nick-named after a mark of dried raisins, made the writer in (109) feel pity for her but for no reason at all: she was the most hated teacher in the school, *the queen of monsters, sadists* and other negative features. The vixen's greatest fun was to give *beastly* (literally *pig-like*) exams for the students to take, to make devilish remarks and to *lower* students' grades. A little further on, not included here, the writer calls the same teacher *an old eagle owl* ('vanha huuhkaja'), which is the other example of naming a teacher after an animal in these data. Animal metaphors (others than those that clearly describe the looks of a person) tend to

be based on the assumption that animals are lower to people and thus ideal for describing and evaluating undesirable human attributes (Low 1988:134).²

(107) Neljännestä kuudenteen meillä oli ihan ammattitaitoinen englanninkielenopettaja. Se oli ollut opettajana englantilaisessa sisäoppilaitoksessa ja sieltä oli tarttunut brittiläinen ääntäminen sekä tiukka opetustyyli ja järjestyksen pito. Vihkot revittiin luokan edessä palasiksi, jos oli kirjoittanut kappaleen huonolla käsialalla tai tehnyt paljon virheitä. Hyvä ettei tullut karttakepistä rystysille, jos oli unohtanut lukea sanat. (17F)

(108) Rehtori oli meillä englannin opettajana koko ala-asteen ajan. SE oli vanhan koulun mies, ilmijulma äijä joka luotti karttakeppiin ja huutamiseen. Olisi se varmaan lyönytkin, vaan kun säännöissä sanoi ettei saanut ja sääntöjä se kunnioitti. (44M)

(109) Hän näytti kuivalta kuin rusina (siitpä lempinimi SUN MADE). Minä suorastaan säälin häntä ja päätin olla kiltti oppilas..., mutta ei hän minun sääliäni kaivannut. Olin nimittäin juuri tutustunut koko koulun kauheimpaan ja vihatuimpaan opettajaan... hirviöiden...sadistien ja kaiken muun negatiivisen kuningattareen. Tuolle kääkälle suurinta hupaa oli sikamaisten kokeiden teettäminen oppilaille, avoin piruilu ja mikä suuri riemu irtosikaan siitä, kun sai LASKEA oppilaiden numeroita! Well, we hated her and she hated us...so big deal! (05F)

The students express feelings of disgust, fear, anger and helplessness towards teachers in the category of 'Teacher as a witch'. Whether the students were able to learn anything is not articulated explicitly in the students' narratives but it can be inferred that little learning took place. Insulting and intimidating weaker learners added to an unfavourable learning atmosphere in this category. Only ten participants had such repulsive recollections but each of them employed several metaphorical expressions.

6. DEMIGOD

In the category 'Teacher as a demigod' features of an ideal teacher are portrayed. These 'world's best teachers' become role models for some English learners. Metaphorical expressions in this category are very few. On most occasions in the data, the teacher's gender was not mentioned, but here some writers explicitly state that these ideal teachers are men. The description of an

² The only other examples of animal metaphors were: mouse-like hair (05F) and the pace of a snail (48M). No noble animals were mentioned. In addition, a whole group of learners was called book-worms.

expert teacher in (110) has several supporters: to be *a demigod* in the eyes of the students, particularly in senior high school, the teacher has to possess charisma and a good sense of humour, be demanding, relaxed and encouraging. There is not a word of teaching skills; they come only after these personal characteristics. The metaphorical expression *a gem of the teaching staff* in (111) conveys the fact that the students value dedicated teachers. It is *a blessing* to have a really good teacher because the learners have not met many *ideal teachers* (112). Proficiency is taken for granted in these examples. Efficiency is appreciated, as in (113): although the teacher was feared, she was known to be fair and human, so all the students wanted to be in her class. She had *a spotless reputation* as an effective and demanding teacher that made her *an absolute example* for the writer.

(110) Enkun ope oli tosi hyvä. Juuri sopivassa suhteessa karismaa, vaativuutta, rentoutta, joustoa, huumorintajua, kannustavuutta jne. Puolijumala. (39M)

(111) Yläasteella tosin opettajaksi siunaantui todellinen opettajakunnan helmi: samalla aikaa tiukka ja vaativa ja kuitenkin rento ja välitön. Ja ennen kaikkea, huumorintajuinen. (43F)

(112) Ala-asteella englannin opiskelu oli helppoa, se oli yks mun lempiaineista. Osaks varmaan vaikutti se, että meidän ope oli todella mukava, kaikki piti sitä oikein ihanne-opettajana. (13F)

(113) Olen vuosien jälkeen saanut kuitenkin kuulla, että kaikki lukiolaiset pyrkivät juuri hänen ryhmäänsä, sillä hänellä on tahraton maine tehokkaana englannin opettajana. Hän oli pelätty, mutta silti reilu ja inhimillinen. ... (Nimi) on ehdoton esikuvani englannin kielen saralla - an English teacher with no comparison! (15F)

In the category ‘Teacher as a demigod’ teachers model as educators and are highly admired by the learners. Although students in primary school often adore all their teachers, examples of excellent English teachers were found only in the descriptions of secondary and senior high school. A minority of nine writers had been instructed by ideal teachers.

3.4.3. Summary of the categorizations

The two sections above have reported on language learners’ metaphorical constructions of themselves and of their English teachers derived from the students’ life-stories, from which only the parts describing school-based

language learning were selected as data. Two files were compiled, one for the learner metaphors and the other for the teacher metaphors; subsequently they were both divided into six categories of metaphorical expressions. The basis for categorization in the file of the learners' constructions of themselves was the amount of effort they had to exercise to learn English at school, while the learners' constructions of their English teachers were categorized according to the teachers' effectiveness in teaching English. In order to summarize the categorizations two tables are presented. Table 2 provides a summary of the learner metaphors and Table 3 a summary of the teacher metaphors; both tables are organized in the order of the writers' frequency in the categories. No exact statistical figures have been provided since they would only have been suggestive. Different readers, even the same reader at different times, would end up with different numbers.

Table 2. Students' metaphorical conceptualisations of themselves as learners of English by frequency.

Metaphor	Definition: The students	Examples of metaphors
1. Perfectionist	... feel compelled to master English, no matter how great effort it takes.	<i>self-critical, scrupulous, painstaking, overconfident, stain on perfection, hard bite, cocky</i>
2. Natural Talent	... learn English without any effort because of their inborn qualities.	<i>head/ear for languages, in her spinal cord, by nature, sounds right, children's game</i>
3. Lover	... have great pleasure in learning English and love working with dear English.	<i>it took my heart, I fell in love, anglophile, English freak, magical charm, mysterious world</i>
4. Sufferer	... find lessons boring and frustrating and become unmotivated.	<i>in deadly dozes, rebel, labelling, scornful laughter, dry bun, unhappy traveller, necessary evil</i>
5. Worker	... are ambitious and work hard to be on top of the class.	<i>ambition, worker, bookworm, swot, challenge, building a house, firm foundation</i>
6. Drifter	... are lazy, passive or selective and learn English as a by-product.	<i>no input, bone lazy, with half brain, not a peek on the books, burn out</i>

According to the learners' own beliefs, inferred from the metaphorical expressions they used in their narratives, there were approximately as many perfectionist learners as naturally talented learners (more than half of the writers), but the amount of the metaphorical expressions

in the first category was significantly larger – in fact the largest in all the learner categories. These two categories indicate that there are two quite opposite types of English learners at university: others feel that they have been diligent at school, while the others have coped easily. The next two categories also include two opposite types of learners, ‘Learner as a lover’ and ‘Learner as a sufferer’. Half of the writers belonged to each category, a couple less than to the previous ones. A lover puts a lot of effort in learning English and everything connected with it, while a sufferer has not strength enough to overcome the bars to learning. Less than half of the writers belonged to the category of ‘Learner as a worker’, although there were as many metaphorical expressions employed as in the previous categories. If the perfectionist and the ambitious worker types of language learners, which are quite close to each other, were joined it could be concluded that all the writers have used metaphorical expressions related to working hard in some phase of their language learning. The last category is the smallest with only eleven writers and quite few metaphorical expressions. ‘Learner as a drifter’ was not motivated in learning English for different reasons.

All the writers had employed metaphorical expressions related to at least one learner category; twenty-one students employed expressions belonging to one or two categories, whereas fourteen students employed metaphorical expressions that belonged to several different categories. This indicates that the students did not necessarily experience their language learning in the same way through school (stages of education were not specified in the classification). Another reason could be that the categories were not defined clearly enough.

Table 3 provides a summary of the metaphors that students had employed while describing their teachers. The categorization of the teacher metaphors occurred according to the learners’ opinions of how effective, or ‘good’ English teachers they were. Again, the most common type of a language teacher comes first and the least frequent last. Similar to the two first learner categories, the number of the writers in the first two teacher categories was equal and the same as in the learner categories (more than half of the writers). Also similarly, the types of teachers were the opposites. Some thirty students had been taught by a motivating English teacher, and the students seemed to

feel happy about it. On the contrary, the learners who had a frustrating teacher felt dissatisfied. The amount of the metaphorical expressions was approximately the same in both categories; the largest number in all the teacher categories was found in the category of ‘Teacher as a trier to patience’. From this it can be inferred that advanced learners of English often become frustrated because of the slow progressing at comprehensive school and grammar-oriented instruction in senior high school.

Table 3. Students’ metaphorical conceptualisations of their English teachers by frequency.

Metaphor	Definition: The teacher	Examples of metaphors
1. Motivator	... creates a positive atmosphere and pays attention to individual abilities.	<i>encouraging, nice, not a dictator, personal, holding reins gently, a fantastic aunt</i>
2. Trier to Patience	... lacks teaching skills and makes students frustrated and bores them entirely.	<i>a tiresome old hag, a wizened old woman, Mizz Spinster, a fusspot, an oddity, a low record</i>
3. Manufacturer	... keeps strictly to the demands of the curriculum and the lesson’s schedule.	<i>an Iron Lady, a fierce moped, lashes on reading, keeps in check, grammar in deadly dozes</i>
4. Target of Mischief	... has no authority, is incapable, has given up.	<i>a dream target, a sissy, a crybaby, a martyr, at the verge of nervous breakdown</i>
5. Witch	... has bursts of anger, frightens students, is too strict.	<i>an old eagle owl, a monster, a vixen, the queen of sadists, a domestic terror, devilish</i>
6. Demigod	... stands as a role model for students, who admire him/her.	<i>an absolute example, a gem among teachers, an idol, a rarity, a really cool bloke, a superb type</i>

The most effective type of a language teacher, although maybe not the most liked one, was the authoritarian manufacturer, who some twenty writers had experiences of. The last three teacher categories only had approximately ten writers each, and the number of metaphorical expressions was clearly smaller than in the other categories, except in the category of ‘Teacher as a witch’ that seemed to have loosened quite a few writers’ imagination. Teachers in the fourth category were laughed at and feared in the fifth, so they were not capable of making the students learn English. The last category contains model teachers; very few students had experiences of such rarities. In the narratives of three writers no metaphorical expression describing

their English teachers could be found, whereas six writers had had teachers belonging to several categories; twelve students wrote about only one type of teacher.

3.5. Discussion

3.5.1. Comparison with the categories in the previous studies

Compared with the previous studies in section 2.4, closest to the present study were Ellis (1998) and Kramsch (in press), where the participants were undergraduate students, the data natural texts and the results metaphors for language learners or learning, as well as Oxford et al. (1998), where, however, the metaphors were about language teachers. The participants in the other previous studies were mostly graduate students, quite a few of them teachers, whereas life-stories or written narratives as data were employed in several studies. A majority of the metaphors in the previous studies described teachers or teaching. Metaphor categories for learners were only found in Marchant (1992) and Ellis (1998), and for language learning in Thornbury (1991), Cortazzi and Jin (1999) and Kramsch (in press). Therefore, the metaphor categories in the present study are not quite compatible with the categories in the previous studies. Here, the categorization of the learner and teacher metaphors was based on the participants' constructions of how much effort they needed in learning English, and how effective their English teachers were. These two questions influenced labeling the categories. In addition to the previous studies, Leppänen and Kalaja's (1997) discourse analysis of language learners gave a few models for the present categorization. At the background are, of course, my own experiences of learning and teaching. In the following, I will give an account on similar categories, first for language learners, and then for teachers.

The frame 'Learner as X' was employed merely by Ellis (1998). He did not produce examples to illustrate the reasons for his classification; nevertheless, similar names for the categories or parts of them were 'Learner as struggler, sufferer, traveler, worker, and builder'. Ellis's other categories, 'Learner as problem-solver, negotiator, container, machine, and investor', were

not found in the present study, where learner categories of a perfectionist, a natural talent, a lover and a drifter were used instead. In Marchant's (1992) simile lists only one correspondence with the present learner categories could be found, that of a worker, and not, for instance, Marchant's categories of an enemy, a slave or a friend. If language learning is taken into account, two similar categories were used: 'Learning is movement or a journey' and 'Learning is a construction'. Kramsch (in press) had established eighteen categories for language learning, from which only two seemed to be similar to the present categorization: 'Learning is acquiring a secret code' and 'Learning is making love'. One reason for the differences in the categorizations could be the viewpoint of the responder, i.e. whether they look at the issue from the viewpoint of a learner, a teacher or perhaps a teacher trainer. Another reason could be cultural differences, and still another the fact that it is the researcher who determines the classification in the end. Therefore, the labels for the categories might be different although the interpretations of the expressions in each category could have similarities.

The same reasons could explain the differences in the teacher categories. Research has discovered that teachers have used a number of metaphors to describe themselves; also the previous studies contained much more and much wider analyses of teacher metaphors than the present study. Correspondences could only be found in Oxford (1998) and Oxford et al. (1998). The same categories were 'Teacher as manufacturer, role model, and witch'. Related to a 'Trier to patience' was 'Teacher as repeater, sleep inducer, and bad baby-sitter' and to a 'Motivator' 'Teacher as challenger, nurturer, lover, and scaffolder'. Thus, it can be noted that several similar teacher categories, though with varying descriptions, were found. This could be caused by the large number of teacher metaphors; teachers are commonly seen as types and they are often evaluated. A clear match for 'Teacher as target of mischief' seemed to be lacking in the previous studies. Among metaphors of teaching, similar to the present teacher categories were only 'Teaching is a journey' and 'Teaching is a construction'.

3.5.2. Validation of the study

In order for the reader to be confident about the interpretations in a qualitative study, Low (1999:48) proposes that the researcher has to report on the chain of conclusions and on the construction of the interpretations very carefully (see also Potter and Wetherell 1987:172-174). The report has to include exhaustive information about the data selected or omitted for the study, and about the techniques of analysis and categorization used, as well as about the extent to which the data support the conclusions proposed. What these requirements mean in practice (Kalaja and Hyrkstedt 2000:377) is that the texts are read and reread, the materials are specified in every detail and a lot of raw examples of the data are included. In this way readers can judge for themselves whether the interpretations are adequately convincing. Because the data for the present study were quite large, the research target had to be limited; otherwise the data were dealt as such.

Evidence for proving that the metaphors are not only verbal devices but have cognitive and social validity for the respondents is, according to Cortazzi and Jin (1999:152), the frequency of the same, or very similar, metaphors in the data and the number of writers who give these metaphors in significant contexts of learning or teaching. In the present study, metaphorical expressions gathered to form the categories occurred frequently enough in several writers' life-stories to provide some assurance of the validity. The context as such was about language learning and teaching due to the preliminary instructions given to the participants. Division into six different groups in both the learner file and the teacher file took place quite easily and all metaphors fitted some category either as such or after interpretation. The participants mostly employed common metaphorical expressions. More personal metaphors like *to put on a pedestal* for a learner and *to get more feathers* for a teacher were seldom used. The students' narratives varied greatly in length and in the use of figurative language. As explained earlier in the summary of the categorizations, all writers used metaphorical expressions about themselves as learners, and all but three about their teachers. However, the number of metaphorical expressions in each narrative varied between very few and very many. An example of an extremely figurative style is (05F),

whose memories of her school years proved to be particularly rich in metaphorical expressions and whose style of writing was very lively. If there were several almost similar examples for a category, the choice was made in favor of the writer, who had not yet been taken a passage from. Katz (1996:61-64) claims that it is self-evident that metaphors make patterns, but they also carry the danger of shaping perceptions rather than clarifying them. This danger was avoided in the present study by the fact that the data were collected long before the decision to use metaphor analysis was made, and that the metaphors emerged over a course of time and became fully developed at the end of the analysis. The writers did not consciously nominate metaphors to characterize their experiences but the expressions were collected from natural running discourse.

Due to circumstances, only one person identified the metaphors in the life-stories and made all the conclusions. Low argues (1999:49) that a unilateral identification of metaphors has both advantages and dangers. The relative ease and speed with which the procedure can be carried out if only one person reads the texts is an advantage, as well as the specific identification criteria that can be set up. It is also possible to become highly responsive to the texts being studied and to draw on the researcher's experience in identification decisions. Nevertheless, the same facts can cause a danger of subjectivity or randomness in identifying expressions, which are not actually marked as metaphorical by the writer. Since not all metaphors were explicitly indicated in the present study, two or several readers could have found more or different metaphors. Another danger that Low (1999:49) points out is over-interpreting expressions, which are only peripherally relatable; this is caused by a heightened sensitivity to the metaphors concerned during the current work. It is left to the reader to decide, whether the metaphors reported in this study were essential and adequate, although it could be rather difficult because the original texts could not be included in full length. Low (1999:50) continues that familiarity with specific words might lead to perceiving them less metaphoric, and conversely, frequent repetition of an expression might increase its salience. Familiarity with the overall text tends to add the metaphors identified. Therefore, the number of readings and the time spent on reflecting on the text themselves become important variables. Finally, Low (1999:50) emphasizes

that the perception of incongruity depends on one's knowledge of the people and the topic area being studied. In the present study, the participants were a kind of familiar group of people to me, and so were the targets and, in addition, the sources of the metaphors were drawn from a common and quite narrow range of expressions.

Truth is important to us but it is based on interpretation. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:159, 165) do not believe that there is absolute, objective truth, because truth is always relative to a conceptual system that is defined by metaphor. Interpretation, in turn, is based on human categorization of properties, which highlight some aspects and hide others. These basic categories are neither fixed nor uniform; rather, they are adjustable to context. Lakoff (1987:294) has developed an experientialist account of truth, according to which a statement is true in a given situation "if our understanding of the statement fits our understanding of the situation closely enough for our purposes". Thus, truth is based on understanding, and metaphor is a principal vehicle of understanding. Lakoff concludes that we commonly take understanding to be an absolute. The truthfulness of life stories has been discussed in connection with data collection in section 3.2.

4. CONCLUSION

Summary of the study. The aim of the present study was to explore English learners' constructions of themselves as learners of English as a foreign language and of their English teachers at school. Thematic life stories of fifty freshmen in the department of English at Jyväskylä University were analysed in order to find the metaphorical expressions they used while describing their school-based experiences of learning English and their teachers. By the means of interpreting the metaphors, the aim was to examine, how much work and effort the students had had to exercise in learning English and how good and effective they thought their teachers had been. This study was an attempt to conduct a qualitative, subjective study of language learners' interpretations of their linguistic experiences inferred from their self constructions in their personal narratives; metaphor analysis was the means to bring the writers' implicit assumptions to awareness and therefore the learners themselves were the only possible source of data.

Metaphor was defined broadly as an umbrella concept for many kinds of linguistic incongruity and anomaly. The metaphorical expressions were mostly explicit and only seldom inferred from the text. The Lakoff and Johnson model (1980) of the ubiquity of metaphor and of their conceptual categories of metaphor did not prove to be useful for the purpose of this study. After all the metaphorical expressions in the narratives were collected, they were carefully reread and organized into two files, one for the learner metaphors and the other for the teacher metaphors. The metaphors within both files were examined further in order to find similarities between them. Gradually, six themes of metaphorical expressions emerged from both files in relation to the research questions. The learner categories were organized on the basis of how effortlessly the writers seemed to learn English, and the teacher categories on the basis of how effective their English teachers had been. This process of classification was totally subjective; nevertheless, all the metaphors appeared to fit one category quite easily, at least after some interpretation, and several examples of each learner or teacher type could be detected.

Learning English was most effortless to the students in the category of 'Learner as natural talent', who did not need to study because they had a

'knack' for languages. Likewise, 'Learner as lover' found learning English easy because they had great pleasure in everything connected with English and England. The writers in the categories of 'Learner as sufferer' and 'Learner as drifter' did not work hard, either, but for quite different reasons from the two previous categories. The sufferers did not suffer from too much work; rather, they had lost their motivation to study because of frustration, caused by the teachers' inability to differentiate teaching or to maintain order in class, while the drifters just did not bother to study much. Finally, the most hard-working English learners were the writers in the categories of 'Learner as worker' and 'Learner as perfectionist', who toiled really hard to be the best in their classes. The number of the ambitious perfectionists was the greatest among these writers, who were university students of English at the moment. Interestingly, if joined in one group, the number of naturally talented and enthusiastic learners, two categories that resemble each other in the effortlessness of learning, was even greater than the combined number of diligent workers and perfectionists.

The most effective English teacher was 'Teacher as demigod', who was an admired model for the learners. Similarly, very effective was the gentle and skilful 'Teacher as motivator', who was able to create an encouraging atmosphere for language learning, whereas 'Teacher as manufacturer' created a feeling of effectiveness by being stern and demanding. The three last categories were not regarded as 'good' teachers by the writers. The teaching style of a 'Teacher as trier to patience' did not stimulate the learners to study English but made them frustrated. A 'Teacher as witch' could hardly make the students learn, no matter how effective s/he appeared to be, because s/he raised fear and anger in the students, which is generally known to obstruct learning. The least effective type of teacher was a 'Teacher as target of mischief', who had no authority and whose lessons the students wasted in doing anything else but studying. The number of writers was greatest among the students who had had a motivating English teacher at school; however, the number of writers with experiences of frustrating teachers was nearly as great. Other categories were described more seldom, and a model teacher was met most seldom. The same teacher did not, of course, teach English to the same student every year at school; some students reported on several teacher changes during their school

time. It can be concluded that learners with experiences of very different kinds of English teachers had ended up studying English at university.

Metaphor analysis has gained ground as a tool for revealing what subjects think about the issue at hand. In the present study, the participants described rather directly their experiences, maybe because they were answering the questions that had been presented to them in the instructions of the task. Literal expressions were quite coherent with metaphorical expressions. Therefore, metaphor interpretation was simple and it did not reveal any subconscious beliefs of the writers, whereas the difficult part of processing the metaphors was identifying them in the first place. The subjects' style of writing and their interest in the matter varied quite a lot and it had an influence on the richness of metaphorical expressions in their narratives. The research questions were chosen from a practical point of view as regards to language teaching. Division of metaphors into different categories took place partly by interpreting the texts as well. On the whole, metaphoric processing of the total fifty life stories would have been impossible for this study, so the main method of interpretation was to process just the metaphorical expressions in the passages that concerned experiences at school.

Implications of the study. An implication for language learning and language teaching at school, invoked by the findings in the present study, could be to emphasize once again that the constructions the students have of themselves as language learners can affect how they go about learning a foreign language. Nevertheless, it seems that teachers have little influence on the image that learners have of themselves. One exception is the category 'Learner as sufferer', where the student's frustration is caused by the teacher's inability to pay attention to different kinds of language learners, or to maintain order in the class. A well-known fact is that students appreciate rightfulness and reasonable discipline. Grammar-centeredness in senior high school can hardly be altered. Similarly, the way learners experience their English teachers had not much influence on their language learning, with the same exception of frustration as above. A teacher as 'Trier to patience' made the learners give up studying for a while, whereas other types of teachers, nice or horrible, did not hinder the students from learning English. Naturally, learning was more pleasant and

presumably more successful under the guidance of a skillful teacher, often described simply as 'nice'. University students of English are presumably a fairly homogeneous group of language learners and therefore their reflections on learning English at school were predictable to some extent. Nevertheless, the results show once again that teachers would do wisely to bear in mind that students are individuals and that they appreciate fair and dedicated teachers. Surprisingly, it appeared that teachers did not have much influence on the students' self constructions as language learners and on their desire to learn English when accounted for by the students. The most important characteristic of a language teacher, however, seems to be his or her personality.

Suggestions for further studies. This study focussed on advanced learners of English. A suggestion for further studies could be to examine whether the less advanced language learners, i.e. those students who did not come to study English at university or who did not enter a university at all, had the same kinds of experiences and understandings of themselves as the students in this study. Another interesting subject would be a comparison of a teacher's construction of a learner with the learner's own self-construction: to what extent they are similar and whether it is relevant. In addition, since the interaction between teacher and student is of great importance in language learning, it would be useful to investigate how the learner perceives the influence of that interaction on his/her learning; metaphors are often used in strong affective contexts. A metaphor analysis might also give new views to studying the role of a teacher's personality and characteristics in shaping learners' attitudes towards language learning. One way to confirm the relevance of the metaphors that the participants employed about themselves would be the use of multiple data sources in the interpretation, such as interviews or open-ended sentences. The number of metaphorical expressions in natural discourse depends quite a lot on the person's style of talking or writing. If the aim of an investigation would be to study, for example, sources of metaphors, it would be in place to ask for them directly, in order to receive more metaphors. Finally, one intriguing question has remained unsolved: a distinction between an idiom and a metaphor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barcelona, A. (ed.) 2000. *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: a cognitive perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bartel, R. 1983. *Metaphors and symbols: forays into language*. National council of teachers of English, Urbana, IL.

Beckmann, S. 2001. *Die Grammatik der Metapher: eine gebrauchstheoretische Untersuchung des metaphorischen Sprechens*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Black, M. 1962. *Models and metaphors: studies in language and philosophy*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Black, M. 1978. How metaphors work: a reply to Donald Davidson, in S. Sacks (ed.), 181-192.

Black, M. 1979. More about metaphor, in A. Ortony (ed.), 19-46.

Boers, F. 2000. Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention. *Applied Linguistics* 21, 553-557.

Boyd, R. 1979. Metaphor and theory of change: what is “metaphor” a metaphor for?, in A. Ortony, 356-408.

Breen, M. P. (ed.) 1998. *Learner contributions to language learning: new directions in research*. Harlow: Longman, Pearson Education.

Bullough, R. V. 1991. Exploring personal teaching metaphors in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 42(1), 43-51.

Cameron, L. 1999. Operationalising ‘metaphor’ for applied linguistic research, in L. Cameron and G. Low (eds.), 3-28.

Cameron, L. and G. Low (eds.) 1999. *Researching and applying metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chilton, P. and M. Ilyin 1993. Metaphor in political discourse: the case of the ‘common European house’. *Discourse and Society* 4, 7-31.

Cohen, L. J. 1979. The semantics of metaphor, in A. Ortony (ed.), 64-77.

Cortazzi, M. and L. Jin 1996. *Metaphors of teaching, learning, and language*. Paper given at the Symposium on Applying Metaphor, University of York.

Cortazzi, M. and L. Jin 1999. Bridges to learning: Metaphors of teaching, learning and language, in L. Cameron and G. Low (eds.), 149-176.

Davidson, D. 1978. What metaphors mean, in S. Sacks (ed.), 29-46.

- de Guerrero, M. C. M. and O. S. Villamil 2000. Exploring ESL teachers' roles through metaphor analysis. *TESOL Quarterly* 2, 341-351.
- Ellis, R. 1998. The metaphorical constructions of second language learners, in M. P. Breen (ed.), 65-85.
- Elovaara, R. 1992. "Olen tyhjä huone". *Tutkielma sanataiteen metaforista ja symboleista*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.
- Fraser, B. 1979. The interpretation of novel metaphors, in A. Ortony (ed.), 172-185.
- Gibbs, R. W. 1994. *The poetics of mind: figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W. 1999. Researching metaphor, in L. Cameron and G. Low (eds.), 29-47.
- Giddens, A. 1991. *Modernity and self-identity: self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press.
- Glucksberg, S. and M. S. McGlone 2001. *Understanding figurative language: from metaphors to idioms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goatly, A. 1997 (1998). *The language of metaphors*. London New York: Routledge.
- Goossens, L. 2000. Patterns of meaning extension, "parallel chaining", subjectification, and modal shifts, in A. Barcelona (ed.), 149-170.
- Green, T. F. 1979. Learning without metaphor, in A. Ortony (ed.), 462-473.
- Hanks, W. 1996. *Language and communicative practices*. Boulder, CO.: Westview Press.
- Hanks, W. 2000. Belief ascription and the social production of belief. Paper presented at the Colloquium on belief ascription. International center for semiotic and cognitive studies, December 15-17, Republic of San Marino, Italy.
- Harvilahti, L., J. Kalliokoski, U. Nikanne and T. Onikki (eds.) 1992. *Metafora: ikkuna kieleen, mieleen ja kulttuuriin*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki: Tampereen Pikapaino Oy.
- Haser, V. 2000. Metaphor in semantic change, in A. Barcelona (ed.), 171-194.
- Heikkinen, A. 1999. *A discourse analysis of success and failure accounts in learning English as a foreign language*. M. A. thesis, Department of English, University of Jyväskylä.

Hellsten, I. 1994. Suomen tie europerheeseen: metaforinen näkökulma journalismin tutkimukseen. *Tiedotustutkimus*, 74-85.

Hellsten, I. 1998. Monistettu Dolly: johdatusta metafora-analyysiin, in A. Kantola, I. Moring and E. Väliaverronen (eds.) *Media-analyysi: tekstistä tulkintaan*. Helsingin Yliopiston Lahden tutkimus- ja koulutuskeskus. Tampere: Tammerpaino, 64-92.

Jackendoff, R. and D. Aaron 1991. Review article, *Language* 2, 320-338.

Johnston, S. 1992. Images: a way of understanding the practical knowledge of student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 8 (2), 123-136.

Kalaja, P. 1995. Student beliefs (or metacognitive knowledge) about SLA reconsidered. *International Journal of Applied linguistics* 5, 191-204.

Kalaja, P. and A. M. F. Barcelos (eds.) (in press). *New approaches to research on beliefs about SLA*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kalaja, P. and I. Hyrkstedt 2000. ”Heikot sortuu elontielle”: asenteista englannin kieleen, in P. Kalaja and L. Nieminen (eds.) *Kielikoulussa – kieli koulussa*. Suomen soveltavan kielitieteen julkaisuja no 58. Jyväskylä: AFinLA, 369-386.

Kalliokoski, J. 1992. Kaaskerin Lundströmin kuvat: Volter Kilven proosan metaforista, in L. Harvilahti et al (eds.), 279-302.

Katz, A. 1996. Teaching style: a way to understand instruction in language classrooms, in K. M. Bailey and D. Nunan (eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: qualitative research in Second Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57-87.

Kearns, M. 1987. *Metaphors of mind in fiction and psychology*. Lexington, KY.: The University Press of Kentucky.

Kittay, E. F. 1987. *Metaphor: its cognitive force and linguistic structure*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Koch, S. and S. Deetz 1981. Metaphor analysis of social reality in organizations. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 9, 1-15.

Kramersch, C. 1993/1995. *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramersch, C. (in press). Metaphor and the subjective construction of belief, in P. Kalaja and A. M. F. Barcelos, (eds.), a copy, 1-19.

Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things: what categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press.

- Lakoff, G. 1990. The invariance hypothesis: is abstract reasoning based on image-schemas? *Cognitive Linguistics*, 1, 39-74.
- Lakoff, G. 1993. The contemporary theory of metaphor, in A. Ortony (ed.), 2nd edition, 202-251.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Turner 1989. *More than cool reason: a field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press.
- Lantolf, J. P. 1996. SLA Theory Building: "Letting all the flowers bloom!" *Language Learning* 4, 713-749.
- Leary, D. 1990. Psyche's muse: The role of metaphor in the history of psychology, in D. Leary (ed.) *Metaphors in the history of psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 10-45.
- Leino, A. and M. Drakenberg 1993. Metaphor: an educational perspective. *Research Bulletin* 84, Helsingin yliopiston kasvatustieteen laitos.
- Leino, P. 1987. Kieli ja maailman hahmottaminen, in T. Hoikkala (ed.) *Kieli, kertomus, kulttuuri*. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy, 26-51.
- Leppänen, S. and P. Kalaja 1997. Vieraan kielen oppijoiden omaelämäkerrat: tarinoita sankarioppijoiden matkan varrelta. *Tempus* 3, 12-15.
- Lindstromberg, S. 1991. Metaphor and ESP: a ghost in the machine. *English for Specific Purposes* 10, 207-225.
- Liskin-Gasparro, J. E. 1998. Linguistic development in an immersion context: how advanced learners of Spanish perceive SLA. *The Modern Language Journal* 2, 159-175.
- Low, G. D. 1988. On teaching metaphor. *Applied Linguistics* 2, 125-147.
- Low, G. D. 1999. Validating metaphor research projects, in L. Cameron and G. Low (eds.), 48-68.
- Mahon, J. E. 1999. Getting your sources right: what Aristotle didn't say, in L. Cameron and G. Low (eds.), 69-80.
- Marchant, G. J. 1992. A teacher is like a ... : using simile lists to explore personal metaphors. *Language and Education* 1, 33-45.
- McAllister, M. and D. McLaughlin 1996. Metaphor in the thinking of teachers. *Education and Society* 1, 75-88.

- McGlone, M. S. 2003. *Metaphor and thought*. Online. [cited on 17.3.2003] Available from Internet at: <http://ww2.lafayette.edu/~mcglonem/metaphor.htm>
- Miller, G. 1979. Images and models, similes and metaphors, in A. Ortony (ed.), 202-253.
- Miall, D. S. (ed.) 1982. *Metaphor: problems and perspectives*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ.: Humanities Press.
- Miall, D. S. 1982. Introduction, in D. S. Miall (ed.), xi-xix.
- Murphy, G. 1996. On metaphoric representation. *Cognition* 60, 173-204.
- Nikanne, U. 1992. Metaforien mukana, in L. Harvilahti et al. (eds.), 60-78.
- Onikki T. 1992. Paljon pystyssä, in L. Harvilahti et al. (eds.), 53-59.
- Ortony, A. (ed.) 1979. *Metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ortony, A. 1979. Metaphor: a multidimensional problem, in A. Ortony (ed.), 1-18.
- Oxford, R. L. 1998. 'The bleached bones of a story': learners' constructions of language teachers, in M. P. Breen (ed.), 86-111.
- Oxford, R. L., S. Tomlinson, A. Barcelos, C. Harrington, R. Z. Lavine, A. Saleh, and A. Longhini (eds.) 1998. Clashing metaphors about classroom teachers: towards a systematic typology for the language teaching field. *System* 26, 3-50.
- Paivio, A. 1979. Psychological processes in the comprehension of metaphor, in A. Ortony (ed.), 150-171.
- Parker, P. 1982. The metaphorical plot, in D. S. Miall (ed.), 133-158.
- Petrie, H. G. 1979. Metaphor and learning, in A. Ortony (ed.), 438-461.
- Potter, J. and M. Wetherell 1987. *Discourse and social psychology: beyond attitudes and behavior*. London: Sage.
- Quinn, N. 1991. The cultural basis of metaphor, in J. Fernandez (ed.) *Beyond metaphor*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Richards, I. A. 1936 (1989). *The philosophy of rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ryan, P.M. 1996. Sociolinguistic goals for foreign language teaching and teachers' metaphorical images of culture. *Foreign Language Annals* 4, 571-586.

Sacks, S. (ed.) 1978 (1979). *On metaphor*. Chicago, IL.: The University of Chicago Press.

Sánchez, R. M. 1999. Imaginative use of the metaphorical concept 'Life is a journey' in Dobyns's *Body traffic*: the creation of the novel imaginative metaphor 'the body is a vehicle'. PALA Occasional Papers n:o 11. Online. [cited on 17.3.2003] Available from Internet at: <http://www.pala.lancs.ac.uk/op/Paper11.doc++%22rosa+morillas+sanchez%22&hl=fi&ie=UTF-8>

Schön, D. A. 1979. Generative metaphor: a perspective on problem-setting in social policy, in A. Ortony (ed.), 254-283.

Searle, J. 1979. Metaphor, in A. Ortony (ed.), 92-123.

Shorter Oxford English dictionary on historical principles 2002 (5th edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Soskice, J. M. 1985 (1987). *Metaphor and religious language*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Steen, G. 1994. *Understanding metaphor in literature*. London: Longman.

Steen, G. 1999. Metaphor and discourse: towards a linguistic checklist for metaphor analysis, in L. Cameron and G. Low (eds.), 81-104.

Sticht, T.G. 1979. Educational uses of metaphor, in A. Ortony (ed.), 474-485.

Stålhammar, M. 1997. *Metaforernas mönster i fackspråk och allmänspråk*. Stockholm: Carlssons.

Thornbury, S. 1991. Metaphors we work by: EFL and its metaphors. *ELT Journal* 3, 193-200.

Torgny, O. 1997. Metaphor – a working concept. Paper for the second European academy of design conference in Stockholm. Online. [cited on 17.3.2003]. Available from Internet at: <http://www.svid.se/ead/ead-Torgny.htm>

Vilkko, A. 1997. *Omaelämäkerta kohtaamispaikkana: naisen elämän kerronta ja luenta*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Tampere: Tammer-Paino Oy.

Virtanen, L. 1982. Henkilökohtainen kerronta, in I-R. Järvinen and Seppo Knuutila (eds.) *Kertomusperinne: kirjoituksia proosaperinteen lajeista ja tutkimuksesta*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Pieksämäki: Sisälähetysseuran kirjapaino Raamattutalo, 171-205.

Way, E.C. 1991. *Knowledge representation and metaphor*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Appendix 1: Instructions for writing the life story

SOVELTAVA KIELITIEDE/LL –94

Kerro tarinasi englannin kielen opiskelijan/oppijana

Olet vasta päässyt opiskelemaan englantilaista filologiaa Jyväskylän yliopistoon. Se on varmaankin aiheuttanut suuria muutoksia elämässäsi. Nyt on hyvä aika pysähtyä ja miettiä elämääsi, menneitä ja tulevia aikoja, kielenopiskelijan/oppijan roolissasi.

Kerro tarinasi englannin kielen opiskelijana/oppijana: mitä olet oppinut kielestä ja miten? Tarinan tulee siis perustua omiin kokemuksiisi ja näkemyksiisi, ja sinä olet tarinan päähenkilö. Tee tarinasta kronologisesti etenevä, ajatuksellisesti yhtenäinen. (Tarkemmat ohjeet seuraavalla sivulla.)

Kuvittele tarinasi lukijaksi jokin hyvä ystäväsi. Kirjoita kuin puhelisit hänelle, rehellisesti ja avoimesti. Anna asioista havainnollisia esimerkkejä. Kirjoita äidinkielelläsi, omalla tyylilläsi, äänelläsi. Lauseiden ei tarvitse olla täydellisiä eikä pilkutuksesta tarvitse olla huolissaan. Voit käyttää englanninkielisiä sanoja tai ilmaisuja, no problem.

Kirjoita noin 5-10 A4-konekirjoitusliuskaa, 2-välillä, vain paperin toiselle puolelle.

Aikataulu: Tarinan 1. versio _____
 Tarinan lopullinen versio valmis _____
 Palautus: Pienryhmien vetäjille _____

APPLIED LINGUISTICS/LL –94

Tell your story as a student of the English language

You have recently been accepted as a student of English philology at Jyväskylä university. It must have caused great changes in your life. Now it is a good time to stop and reflect on your life, on past and future times, in your role as a language learner.

Tell your story as a student/learner of the English language: what have you learned about the language and how? The story will have to be based on your own experiences and impressions and you are the chief person of the story. Make the story chronologically advancing and coherent in the line of thought. (More precise instructions on next page.)

Imagine that your story is read by a good friend of yours. Write as if you were talking to them, honestly and freely. Give illustrative examples of your perceptions. Write in your mother tongue, in your own style and voice. The sentences do not need to be perfect and you do not need to worry about punctuation. You can employ English words and phrases, no problem.

Write about 5-10 pages, A4, with space 2, on one side of the paper only.

Timetable: 1st version of the story _____
 final version of the story _____
 Return: to the instructors of the groups _____

Tarinassasi voit kirjoittaa mm. seuraavista asioista, sikäli kuin katsot ne englannin oppimisesi kannalta tärkeiksi (sinun ei siis tarvitse vastata kaikkiin kysymyksiin):

Kerro englannin kielen opiskelustasi/oppimisestasi peruskoulussa

Oletko koskaan pohtinut, mitä se englannin kieli oikein on? Mistä se koostuu? Kerro tarkemmin. Mitkä ovat ensikokemuksesi (mahdollisesti jo ennen kouluajoja) englannin kielestä? Kerro niistä tarkemmin englannin kielen oppimisen kannalta.

Millaista oli opiskella englantia ala-asteella? Entä yläasteella? Miten sen itse koit? Mitä opit? Millaisena koit englannin kielen opettajasi, luokkatoverit, luokan hengen? Millaisena koit kurssikirjat, työkirjat, kieliopin? Mitä odotit englannin opiskelulta peruskoulussa? Vastasiko opetus odotuksiasi? Kerro yksityiskohtaisesti joistakin niin myönteisistä kuin kielteisistä oppimiskokemuksistasi peruskoulussa. Mikä oli sinulle helppoa, mikä vaikeaa? Miten sinä suhtauduit virheisiin, entä muut? Miten mielestäsi opit parhaiten englantia? Kenen oli vastuu oppimisestasi? Millainen oli mielestäsi saavuttamasi kielitaito peruskoulun päättyessä? Kuvaile tarkasti. Olitko mielestäsi hyvä oppilas. Perustele.

Kerro englannin kielen opiskelustasi/oppimisestasi lukiossa

Millaista oli opiskella englantia lukiossa? Millaisena sen itse koit? Mitä opit? Millaisena koit englannin kielen opettajasi, luokkatoverit, luokan hengen? Millaisena koit kurssikirjat, työkirjat, kieliopin? Mitä odotit englannin opiskelulta lukiossa? Vastasiko opetus odotuksiasi? Kerro yksityiskohtaisesti joistakin niin myönteisistä kuin kielteisistä oppimiskokemuksistasi. Mikä oli sinulle helppoa, mikä vaikeaa? Miten sinä suhtauduit virheisiin, entä muut? Miten mielestäsi opit parhaiten englantia lukiolaisena? Kenen oli vastuu oppimisestasi? Millaista oli englannin kielen opiskelu verrattuna muihin kieliin, entä verrattuna muihin lukuaineisiin? Millainen on mielestäsi saavuttamasi kielitaito lukion päättyessä? Kuvaile tarkasti, mitä mielestäsi osaat. Olit todennäköisesti parhaimpia luokallasi englannissa, miksi? Olitko lukiossa hyvä oppilas? Perustele.

Oletko muuten kouluaikoinasi harrastanut kieliä? Ollut vaihto-oppilaana, piikomassa, kielikursseilla, interrailannut (tai -reilannut)? Kerro näistä tarkemmin kielen oppimisesi kannalta.

Kerro ensikokemuksistasi englannin opiskelusta yliopistossa

Miten päädyit opiskelemaan englantia yliopistossa? Millaista on englannin opiskelu yliopistossa verrattuna peruskoulu- ja lukioaikoihin ja miten koet sen? Kerro kokemuksistasi seikkaperäisesti. Mitä olet oppinut? Miten?

Mitä ymmärrät hyvällä kielitaidolla? Selvitä seikkaperäisesti. Millainen on sinun englannin kielen taitosi nyt? Verrattuna äidinkieleesi, muihin kieliin? Verrattuna syntyperäisiin kielen puhujiin? Millaiseksi koet itsesi englannin käyttäjänä, puhujana, kirjoittajan, lukijana? Miten on suhteesi kieleen, kielen käyttäjiin? Ovatko nämä muuttuneet ajan myötä?

Kerro tulevaisuuden odotuksistasi

Mikä sinusta tulee isona? Kielenopettajako vai jotain muuta? Perustele. Miten englannin kielen opiskelu liittyy siihen? Entä tavoitteesi englannin kielen taidon osalta: syntyperäisen, britin tai amerikkalaisen, kaltaiseksi haluat? Perustele.

Aivan loppuksi: leikitellään ajatuksella, että kaikki toiveesi englannin kielen opinnoissasi toteutuisivat, mitä tekisit?

In your story you can, for example, write about the following issues in so far you consider them important to your language acquisition (you do not have to answer all the questions):

Tell about your studying /learning of the English language at comprehensive school.

Have you ever pondered what the English language really is? What does it consist of? Give a detailed account. What are your first experiences (possibly before school) of the English language? Tell about them more precisely as far as your language learning is concerned.

What was it like to study English at comprehensive elementary school? And at comprehensive secondary school? How did you experience it yourself? What did you learn? How did you find your English teacher, classmates, class spirit? How did you find course books, practice books, grammar? What were your expectations of studying English at comprehensive school? Did the instruction meet with your expectations? Tell in detail about some of the positive as well as negative learning experiences you had at comprehensive school. What was easy for you, what was difficult? What attitude did you take toward your mistakes; how about the others? In what way, in your opinion, did you best learn English? Who was responsible for your learning? What kind of language skill had you achieved when finishing comprehensive school? Describe exactly. Did you think you were a good pupil? Give some reasons for it.

Tell about your studying/learning of the English language in junior high school.

What was it like to study English in junior high? How did you experience it yourself? What did you learn? How did you find your English teacher, classmates, class spirit? How did you find course books, practice books, grammar? What were your expectations of studying English in junior high? Did the instruction meet with your expectations? Tell in detail about some of the positive as well as negative learning experiences you had in junior high school. What was easy for you, what was difficult? What attitude did you take toward your mistakes; how about the others? In what way, in your opinion, did you best learn English? Who was responsible for your learning? What was it like to study English compared with other languages; how about compared with other theoretical subjects? How do you esteem the language knowledge you had achieved at the end of junior high school? Give a detailed account on what you think you know. You were probably one of the best pupils in your class; why? Were you a good pupil in junior high? Give reasons.

During your school years, have you taken an interest in languages in some other ways? Have you been an exchange student, an au pair, on language courses, interrrailing? Tell about that in detail from the viewpoint of language acquisition.

Tell about your first experiences of learning English at university

How did you end up studying English at university? What is it like to study English at university compared with the years at comprehensive or junior high school and how do you feel about it? Give a detailed account on your experiences. What have learned? How?

In your opinion, what is good knowledge of languages? Describe in detail. What is your knowledge of English now? Compared with your mother tongue, other languages? Compared with native speakers? How do you consider yourself as user, speaker, writer, reader of English? How is your attitude toward language, language users? Have these changed during the years?

Tell about your expectations for the future.

What will you become in the future? A language teacher or something else? Give reasons for it. In what way is learning English connected with that? How about your aim in mastering the English language: do you want to become like a native speaker, British or American? Give reasons for it.

Finally: let's play with a thought that all your wishes concerning your English studies would become true; what would you do?

Appendix 2: Sample passages translated into English

- (1) I really have to admit that I still am a true perfectionist. Five wrong out of thirty in a reading understanding test was often even a disappointment. My goal was perfection. Luckily, the teacher's standards were a bit lower than mine. (36F)
- (2) We had to memorize the words of a passage for the lesson and always had a vocabulary quiz after three lessons. I remember I always got 10 or 10- from them and as early as that the symptoms of a perfectionist that were hiding in me appeared in the form of great disappointment when I got 9 ½ once. (25F)
- (3) I almost took it as the end of the world if I answered wrong or if I'd forgotten to do my homework. We girls checked then from the lists who of us was the very best at English. (20F)
- (4) Mistakes sure meant stains on perfection but it wasn't that awful to take a risk occasionally and to try even if I wasn't absolutely certain. (26F)
- (5) And if mistakes happened to me they made me so angry with myself that I didn't make the same mistake again. (45F)
- (6) In senior high school English was still my favourite subject and I noticed that I demanded better results of myself in it than in some other subjects. I really am quite self-critical anyway and demand a lot of myself but in English I desired to have very good knowledge. I was totally pissed off if I didn't get a full ten in an English test. ... In fact, I was never able to explain why a ten minus was not enough for me. Maybe it was a hard bite to admit that I didn't always succeed so well I'd have wanted. (08F)
- (7) I've always been very self-critical. Mistakes in grammar have been a HARD bite for me. I wanted to succeed totally, which is impossible, of course, isn't it? (47F)
- (8) I was very critical of my language knowledge, and I still am, so I didn't consider myself very "good" at English, although, according to the teacher's standards at comprehensive school, I was a good pupil ... the others might have laughed a bit at an incident when "she got as poor a mark as that" because they were used to "her always pulling tens". That's why I may have become a little sensitive to mistakes. ... Maybe my problem was too excessive self-criticism. (02F)
- (9) Another thing that somehow seemed to limit my learning was the fact that I was afraid of making mistakes in the lessons. I was paralysed with terror when I answered wrong because I expected a scornful laughter to explode. Sometimes it was very hard but as a stubborn and ambitious person I tried to ignore all that and to concentrate in becoming even better and better. (22F)
- (10) I had been made a model example for the others! I was flattered and proud of myself, of course, but things always have two sides. It sure is a well-known fact that an incident like that, and simply even if someone is good at school, often provokes bad blood in classmates and even in friends. (05F)
- (11) I recall my mother once complaining about how monotonous my marks were: always tens or ten minuses. My notebook for word quizzes was the cause of pride for me and I think I still have it. (25F)
- (12) My somewhat arrogant attitude at that time had the harmful consequence that I've never learned to interpret phonetic transcription. Therefore, I've had a small problem at university when I suddenly ought to know the phonetic alphabet. So far I've just trusted my ear. (15F)
- (13) Before the matriculation exam I noticed that my skills had become rusty and the highest mark didn't seem to be self-evident any more. After a small panic I managed to pull myself together, revised central points (in the last evening, though) and passed the exam – thank God without getting my haughty nose hit. (16F)
- (14) Where English has always come out well by nature, other languages have been a bit more difficult. Not so difficult, though, that a head for languages wouldn't have helped. (42F)
- (15) All in all, learning English has always gone without much effort, as if out of spinal cord. (49F)
- (16) I've always had an inner "ear for languages" that told me what was right if I was unsure about something. (20F)
- (17) My English teacher compared me with my big sister who had also succeeded in languages and said that we had an ear for languages. I went to primary school in (a name) village school and there were only eight pupils in my class, so it was not probable for another pupil with a head for languages to be there. (21F)
- (18) [big sister] had a peculiar habit to read her lessons aloud – almost during the whole primary school period – so all I had to do was to place myself in a comfortable position for

listening and open my ears. In this way syntactical constructions and phrases stuck in my head really easily. ... I don't remember having ever read grammar much. ... Somehow words have always – or at least generally – snapped into the right order without much thinking. I wonder if it could have been caused by an ear for languages of some kind. Or maybe just good luck. (43F)

(19) Of course the basis with grammar and all comes from school but in spite of that I think I still do everything on the principle of how it feels, by ear. It looks like a head and an ear for languages are related, and you sure get quite a long way with them, but do you get as far as to university? I doubt it. (42F)

(20) As long as I remember I've replaced grammar by ear. In other words, a structure that sounds good is also grammatically correct. So far my "ear" has only very seldom failed me. I resort to grammar very seldom and it hasn't ever even occurred to me, for example, to study grammar for a test. (48F)

(21) Grammar was not hard to learn for the rules seemed to go well quite naturally from before. (19F)

(22) Actually I don't recall to have suffered much because of studying grammar. ...I had also learned to conclude what would sound best. (36F)

(23) I'd never wanted to study grammar, however, so I refused to do so in secondary school, too, for I have a good "ear for languages", and although I know that there are things you just have to learn by heart since you just can't hear everything, I'd noticed that I'd succeed much better without cramming. (05F)

(24) I can't specify any "learning experiences" but I don't remember that anything would have caused

difficulties in particular. Vocabulary stuck in my head like a nail, and also grammar was in quite a simple form. (50M)

(25) English instruction didn't have much to give to the linguistically talented who would have wanted to use their knowledge to something else besides translating model sentences or revising grammar. (16F)

(26) In secondary school teaching was, frankly speaking, undemanding and boring. At that age we would already have been quite prepared to do proper work but we weren't allowed to do so. Our teacher was nice and knew a lot about the culture related to the language. In primary school we sometimes did relatively more work than in secondary school. (32F)

(27) In primary school going to school was "nice" and the pace of studying slow. ...Language was easy for me, motivation enormous. Studying was joy of learning, like a game. (47F)

(28) Of course the standard of demands grew and vocabulary increased more and more but I always felt English was still a children's game. (05F)

(29) Through secondary school everything went like a game. ...It seemed as if learning languages was easier for me than for many others. (10M)

(30) So, already before going to school I got to know pretty well that strange, beautiful language, which eventually took my heart. ... I had always loved everything old and English. (05F)

(31) I fell in love with everything that concerns the British Isles and I became an England-freak. (02F)

(32) I was the best in my class at English, at other subjects on an average level. Why was that? A difficult question, I would say that as long as I can remember I've been mad about Britain, so naturally also the language spoken in the country has fascinated me. (45F)

(33) I think that at some phase I was a real "anglophile". English as a language and the country was a real obsession. (31F)

(34) English has always belonged to my favourite subjects. In primary school I wrote in my pals' friendship books in the place of the favourite subject: English. And I didn't waver in my opinion. (33F)

(35) And English compared with other languages? Well, English has always been number one among languages. Who is the best at English, for example, in a class is due to what they are keen on. If you are interested in something, of course you acquire knowledge about it and are more receptive in those lessons. (13F)

(36) Finally on the third grade I could really jump into the wonderful world of English. (46F)

(37) Eagerly like all children generally, I started out to solve the secrets of the new language. (16F)

- (38) I've been studying English for 12 years. Right from the first lesson I've been charmed by this language and its magic hasn't diminished a bit during the years. ... I've inherited my love for English from my father, who was an English teacher. (45F)
- (39) Learning the A-language was done in two groups, and the first group came from the very first English lesson mumbling these words like magical spells, immediately I felt jealous. In an hour I knew the spells, too – and it felt marvellous. (23F)
- (40) In secondary school my English studying was hardly fruitful or inspiring. In my view, the lessons were always one and the same. Going through the texts, maybe a word quiz, checking homework, a new lesson, potential grammar and so on ... bla. bla. bla. English instruction started to become just a necessary evil instead of the earlier joy for us boringly conscientious pupils. (07F)
- (41) At upper level very many find school quite a dry bun. (25F)
- (42) A trend of the time was to hate school and those who managed too well weren't looked upon with approval: I, too, answered deliberately wrong in tests occasionally so that I wouldn't by any means be distinguished from the others. The problem was that you couldn't help knowing the things, every single teacher repeated the same things tens of times and they did stick to head without any special concentration or interest in the matter. English was no exception: we advanced minimally slow. (52F)
- (43) The teacher was changed, though, and the monologue turned even more boring than before. Studying was aimed at the matriculation races, which meant grammar in deadly dozes. (09F)
- (44) However, I was still waiting for lessons in everyday language. I was disappointed with the scarcity of "conversations". Nobody spoke with their full heart. I was afraid that the senior high school system would suppress all my eagerness for language learning. (47F)
- (45) Our English teacher was skilful, dedicated to the matter and nice. Nevertheless, I hated attending the lessons from the bottom of my heart, because everybody was constantly laughing at me. My motivation suffered, I skipped school a lot, but it didn't show in my English grades. (15F)
- (46) I kept raising my hand but I wasn't always asked. There were a couple of girls in our group who the teacher petted and that made me really angry. (37F)
- (47) There just was something in that type that made my hair curl and I didn't feel like doing almost anything for English and I stopped at a certain level. (18F)
- (48) Learning English succeeded in producing moments of horror even now. Every two Wednesday we obediently climbed to the premises of the senior high school and to the language laboratory. The march itself was like a nightmare. Nevertheless, the real moments of pain were experienced when we were in the language lab under guidance of the school's most qualified and speech-defected teacher. (23F)
- (49) I expected that the pace would have changed at least a bit in senior high school. In secondary school I was extremely annoyed when we read and read the same lesson terribly long – but the pace continued. Occasionally I couldn't manage to do anything at all 'cause I was enormously irritated by the repetition of the same things. Yet, I was pretty good. (28F)
- (50) Secondary school was an extremely frustrating time regards to both English and other subjects, too. We progressed with the pace of a snail and the texts in the textbooks often had no single new word. Usually half of the time was spent on the teacher trying to get the madcaps quiet in the class. (48F)
- (51) My only stumbling stone seemed to be writing essays, maybe because I have always thought I'm a very non-creative person. (22F)
- (52) During a year the improvement of my language proficiency seemed to advance in phases; at times there was a quick spurt forward and then again staying in one place and then forward again. (14F)
- (53) From here on all my time at school was sometimes enthusiasm, sometimes pulling a sledge full of stones as regards to English. (30F)
- (54) In senior high school I worked under a small pressure all the time. The teacher trusted my language skill, so did my class-mates, and I didn't want to cause a disappointment. My self-esteem couldn't have born it. ... My own ambition drove me forward. (47F)
- (55) Learning words became easier and easier as time went on but I felt I never achieved success without input. The situation in secondary school was twofold: even though I had an enormous desire to be the best, but then again a too good pupil might get an egghead's stamp on the forehead. (46F)

- (56) I was very disturbed by being labelled as a good English learner, which again caused tight situations with the other pupils. (32F)
- (57) In senior high school I got fed up with the teacher's bombings and labels that everybody got in senior high school. That one's a bookworm, that one's teacher's pet and that one must be a total idiot. ... And the teacher's style to pick up me to read my essay, if nobody raised their hands, didn't improve a bit other pupils' impression of me (not that it would have mattered anyway) as a bookworm. (36F)
- (58) The worst thing in English learning in secondary school was the fact that my class was awfully passive in everything and I got a reputation of a terrible swot, of course, when I liked a subject. At that time classmates' opinions were still terribly important. (28F)
- (59) I wasn't any more one of the few who always shone [with knowledge]. The extremely hard atmosphere of competition that prevailed in our class got me furious sometimes and made me sink in despair. I think I was quite a rebel. I was even compelled to work a little to be near the top. (19F)
- (60) Pressures of an A-grade pupil were hard, however, and I read English books as well as grammar quite properly. My listening test had namely gone way down, and I and another "swot" didn't want to give up the idea to get the best mark in English. (25F)
- (61) I was a bit excited but I was assured by the fact that the teacher had trusted just me with this confidential task. Again I took a pile of pictures in my hand and asked the worn question: What's this? ... In any case, I left the class as a Real Survivor and my face was radiant with satisfaction. (34F)
- (62) Ah! The time at senior high school was a real iron-like time as regards to learning English. (39F)
- (63) Our secondary school teacher had a motto that if the basis of a subject is on flimsy grounds it'll totally collapse sooner or later. I don't know if it had any influence on the pupils it was aimed at but at least I built a firm foundation to all languages, even the new ones, that I started to learn. (36F)
- (64) The teacher asked us to think of language learning like building a brick house; if you don't brick tightly but leave holes here and there the house will collapse at some point of time. I found the metaphor good and have tried to keep it in mind. I have to admit, though, that there've been slips and that my house still rocks badly but I've tried to make it firmer and will try to do so in the future, too. (08F)
- (65) How should I picture it... Let my language proficiency be like a completed house that is been decorated at the moment: curtains are put in windows and carpets on the floor. (25F)
- (66) I didn't bother to toil too much because I had decided to go as an exchange student and that's where you'd get language proficiency just like that. (17F)
- (67) Then again, although I was bone lazy, I felt some kind of responsibility for my test grades. For me, learning English wasn't a great value as such – at that time I could hardly appreciate anything. (19F)
- (68) And in my case you really couldn't speak of any kinds of expectations as regards to English for I went through the whole comprehensive school as if with half of my brain capacity. (26F)
- (69) From the time at senior high school my images are clearer. I didn't pay any special attention to English. Occasionally I'd be in trouble before an exam, as I hadn't so much as peeked at the issues at hand. Nevertheless, the grades stayed around nine throughout senior high school. (10M)
- (70) I started reading more what I liked to. (03M)
- (71) I paid even less attention to studying. (06M)
- (72) The class spirit was incredible, it hasn't been the same since primary school. ...The teacher held the reins gently but firmly in her hands. (47F)
- (73) The teacher corrected my mistake in a friendly way so answering left no notable traumas to smoulder inside me. (33F)
- (74) The motivating teacher surely had a very big influence on our learning results. She was able to draw even the a bit poorer pupils along quite nicely and for us over-enthusiastic ones she produced extra exercises and many other kinds of interesting tasks. (49F)
- (75) Quite evidently I was lucky, however, for I got the absolutely nicest and at the same time the most competent English teacher of the whole school. He was a rather young male teacher who always told jokes. ...Learning was no deadly business in those lessons. (05F)
- (76) My primary school English teacher (a name) was, as far as I remember, a really nice aunt. She was always so lively and energetic and she even smelled so good (the perfume she wore).

And 'cause even her knowledge of English was so very good; what is more she pronounced English, in my opinion, like real Brits do. (26F)

(77) Luckily the teacher was changed and replaced with a rather personal male teacher who was tremendously competent. ... That's what my childlike mind told me then. He wore a tartan hat with a funny tassel. ... He played the trombone (sometimes in the lessons, too)... and he often had a thermos flask with coffee in a warm woollen sock. That personality left only good memories for he succeeded in restoring my interest in English and what's most important he was just and fair. (05F)

(78) Even teaching in secondary school was much more relaxed. Tearing notebooks stopped there in English lessons (at least for a short time). The teacher was fair and helped the poorer pupils, too, and I didn't want to shirk tasks and word cramming (well, at least not so much). You couldn't be mean to a nice and just teacher. What comes around, goes around. (17F)

(79) The image I have for some reason is that the sun always shone into our small English classroom and the sky that forced its way through the big windows was enormously blue. During the primary school we had three teachers, all of them women, but the very first teacher I remember best. She always dressed fine and smelled of perfume. Then she wore silvery bracelets from wrist to elbow and they always like jingled when she moved around in the class. (18F)

(80) When English lessons finally started on the third grade they definitely became the week's highpoint at school. On that the teacher, who I liked a lot, surely had a great influence. From primary school's English lessons I remember best a motivating and encouraging atmosphere: not frightening, home-like. (14F)

(81) I liked her a lot. I don't recall any especially clear event from her lessons but I do recall that I wasn't frightened in the lessons and didn't want to rebel. ...I've always been one of those pupils who have been much more impressed by thanks and certain flexibility than by strictness and threats that merely suppress my learning motivation. (19F)

(82) The teacher was a boring, auntie-like dry wizen and the spirit of the class was not worth mentioning. From those times I don't remember much and the general view is mostly depressingly grey. (04F)

(83) The teaching was boring. Lessons advanced along the same pattern; textbook, exercise book, listening... Even from the different types of exercises we always did the same ones. Our teacher had really strongly developed persistent habits and a routinized teaching style. (10M)

(84) I can still call to mind my third-grade English teacher's dry and tight voice, tight bun of hair and cold look. ... (A name)'s lessons were painfully boring, there you were tempted to do something else, for example to write and send notes... It might have happened that I sometimes had to read a note like that in front of the class and that was embarrassing, and – the worst thing – it added to my antipathy even more. (43F)

(85) The English teacher was an old, a bit foolish but lovely aunt, who surely had great knowledge but wasn't able to distribute it to others. However, her monologues were quite entertaining, and some small details might even have reached our consciousness. (19F)

(86) The teacher wasn't so brisk any more but, frankly said, rather fussy. ...Our teacher was keen on new methods but she wasn't able to bring them into use in an organized and planned way. (25F)

(87) The first negative experience that comes to mind is connected with a substitute teacher we had in secondary school. The woman was regarded as an oddity and at least all the pupils thought she was incompetent. The very best event was it when she whispered to everybody's ear beforehand what grade he or she was going to get in the report. (13F)

(88) In senior high school our teacher was bad. It's a shockingly direct expression but also, unfortunately, truthful, for he really didn't take any responsibility of our learning. The lessons were really poorly planned. ...He sure is a regrettably good example of what a teacher must not be like. ...He had favourite pupils, mostly girls. ...We had a really good Swedish teacher and when we compared the English teacher with the Swedish teacher we noticed that the man hadn't lifted a finger to help us. (25F)

(89) I didn't enjoy learning English in senior high school. Firstly, my teacher was a record low, especially the way she pronounced English, which for me is almost the most important thing. (45F)

(90) When I think of it now afterwards it seems that the most part of the lessons was spent on the teacher yelling at the class for some reason or another. Especially playing with a ballpoint pen got the teacher provoked and often made her completely lose her temper. (14F)

- (91) To save time (a name) quite right concluded that there would be less to correct if only the good pupils wrote on the board. There were enough things to correct even so, in everybody's sentences. (29F)
- (92) Teaching consisted of the typical "we-have-to-progress-although-there-are-too-many-pupils". Grammar was crammed without explaining the exceptions and words were memorized for the weekly word quiz. (09F)
- (93) My senior high school teacher was a real "grammar terrorist", all the lessons were spent on grammatical exercises and learning the exceptions of exceptions. (35F)
- (94) When going to senior high school I don't remember if teaching style changed in any special way, it was the same, as teacher-centered as before. We got a more effective teacher on the first grade, however, she was called after a make of a moped. (18F)
- (95) In secondary school we had two teachers in Swedish and in English. (A nickname) was an iron lady who kept strict discipline and gave a lot of homework. In her lesson we learned. (Another nickname) tried to keep us under discipline, too, but she didn't quite succeed, and she was generally treated in an irritated, amused and patronizing way, which she didn't like so much. Fortunately it happened so that I could enjoy (well, it didn't feel like a pleasure then) (a nickname)'s teaching both in Swedish and in English. (39M)
- (96) My English teacher was a true target of mischief, a real teenagers' dream-target. It is an unfortunate fact that the unmotivated rule the class too often. It was quiet in the lessons when an inspector or the head master, called by the tired teacher, sat at the back of the class. (07F)
- (97) In secondary school the warm atmosphere of the lower classes was changed into general uproar and disorder. Our teacher (name) had a little grey on her temples. For fear of mischief she took her handbag along every time she went to fetch something from a cupboard. They told she sent cards to herself from package tours. That was enough for us. The fun and purpose of the lessons was to pull her leg and everything else was forgotten in that bustle. (34F)
- (98) Although I liked English, I didn't do my homework for any lesson during the whole secondary school because our teacher was a hopeless wuss and a crybaby as well. We'd always do the exams copying straight from an open book on the desk. It became the goal of each lesson to make the teacher cry and run out of the room! On one hand I took pity on the teacher, on the other hand I was mad for her being so shiftless and unfit to teach English, which I loved dearly. (15F)
- (99) The class spirit in secondary school was only so-so, 'cause in my group there were a few of the worst trouble-makers, who got the teacher on the verge of nervous breakdown. (13F)
- (100) She was a pretty old, in every way old-fashioned woman, who used to tell us about her trips to Turkey and about the nice Turkish female student friends of hers. The class spirit was quite nice, we often had fun in English lessons among ourselves, sometimes even at the teacher's expense. (26F)
- (101) I had two English teachers in senior high school, one of them swore by perfect British English, so American English was totally under a ban. I found this rule a bit stupid but what could you do. Every now and then we had a really good time because of this teacher's pronunciation, it was so "perfect". (37F)
- (102) The teacher – a woman in her fifties – thought the pimple-faces on the seventh grade were lovely. On the eighth and ninth grade she calmed down. Surely it was us who became corrupted. (44M)
- (103) On the second grade in senior high school The English teacher was changed into (a name), who everybody was afraid of and respected. In the first lesson the whole group sat quietly and shivered in their jeans. (A name)'s reputation as a domestic terror was right in that she could give really nasty comments to poor pupils. I didn't have much to be afraid of, since I was one of the best and nicest pupils in my class. (29F)
- (104) That scatty aunt had decided to lower my grade in any case, so I gave up, for how could a little, 9-year-old child fight against such an "all-mighty" authority as a "big" feared teacher. ... the monster, who destroyed my interest in the English language for a moment with her total thoughtlessness. (05F)
- (105) Our next teacher didn't seem to tolerate her wild and stupid pupils – that's what she let us assume – and she showed it with very temperamental bursts of anger. ...Due to our teacher's fiery temperament the fun of learning English started to draw to the background. You had to know and learn the issues almost perfectly in order to dare to come to the lessons. (22F)
- (106) With the exception of (a boy's name) she hated our class and group B was made to suffer the consequences, she used to shrill at them: "You are like a dirty snotty hanky that hangs in

my neck and that I can't get shaken away!" Strange enough, each pupil in group B learned to hate English, and most of them still hate it even today. (52F)

(107) From the fourth to the sixth grade we had a fairly experienced English teacher. She/he had taught in an English boarding school and there adopted the British pronunciation as well as a strict teaching style and maintenance of order. Notebooks were torn to pieces in front of the class, if you had written the text in a bad handwriting or made a lot of mistakes. You almost got hit on the knuckles with a pointer, if you had forgotten to learn the words. (17F)

(108) The headmaster was our English teacher during the whole primary school. He was a man of the old school, a very cruel bloke who trusted the pointer and shouting. Surely he'd also have hit us, but the rules said you mustn't, and he respected the rules. (44M)

(109) She looked like a dried raisin (hence the nickname SUN MADE). I quite pitied her and decided to be a good pupil..., but she didn't need my pitying. I had namely just met the whole school's most horrible and hated teacher... the queen of monsters...sadists and of all the other negative things. That old wizen took greatest pleasure in making the students do beastly exams, in devilish behaviour, and what great joy was caused by being able to LOWER the students' marks! Well, we hated her and she hated us...so big deal! (05F)

(110) The English teacher was really good. Just in the right proportion charisma, strictness, casual style, flexibility, sense of humour, encouragement etc. A demigod. (39M)

(111) In secondary school, however, we were blessed with a true pearl among teachers: at the same time strict and demanding, though relaxed and friendly. And above all, with a sense of humour! (43F)

(112) In primary school learning English was easy, it was one of my favourite subjects. That was partly because our teacher was really nice, everybody thought she was an ideal teacher. (13F)

(113) After years I've heard, however, that all the students in senior high school tried to get in her group, for she had a stainless reputation as an effective English teacher. She was feared, nevertheless fair and human. ...(A name) is an absolute model example of mine in the field of the English language – an English teacher with no comparison! (15F)