

**People's Democratic Republic of Algeria**  
**Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research**  
**Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou**  
**Faculty of Letters and Languages**  
**Department of English**



**Domain:** Foreign Languages

**Branch:** English Language

**Speciality:** Language and Communication

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for  
the Degree of Master in English**

**Title:**

**EFL Learners' Anger Metaphor Production and Influence of the Native  
Language and Culture: Cognitive Linguistic Study**

**Presented by:**

Ms. MANSOURI Thinhinane

**Supervised by:**

Dr. BELKHIR Sadia

**Board of Examiners:**

Chairwoman: Amel BENAÏSSA, MAA, UMMTO.

Supervisor: Sadia BELKHIR, MCA, UMMTO.

Examiner: Nassima AZOUAOU, MAB, UMMTO.

**Academic Year: 2019-2020**

**Dedication**

**To my beloved**

**parents, Sister, and**

**brother**

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere and immense gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Belkhir Sadia for being professional and generous with her time, knowledge, and assistance in each step to complete this dissertation.

I am profoundly indebted to the board examiners who have accepted to read and evaluate my work.

Finally, many thanks go to the participants and all those who helped me to realize this study.

## Abstract

*The present study is concerned with the impact of EFL learners' mother tongue and culture (Kabyle) on the cognitive process involved in the production of English anger metaphors. This research aims at investigating Kabyle language and culture's interference in the production of both ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. Three theories have been used in the present study: The Conceptual Metaphor Theory, the Cross-cultural Cognitive Theory, and Contrastive Analysis. In this research, the latter has focused on three parameters suggested by Barcelona (2001): conventionality, specificity, and elaboration. Adding to this, similarity within universality is another parameter that has been used in (CA). In this piece of work, the study of metaphor production has also relied on four parameters proposed by Kövesces (2010): the immediate cultural context, what we know about major entities participating in the discourse, the physical setting, and the social setting. Language interference is a serious problem that any second or foreign language learner may suffer from. Thus, it is worth to explore Kabyle language and culture's influence in the production of some English anger metaphors. In this work, a questionnaire has been used as a data collection tool. It has been distributed to first and second year master students enrolled in the program "Language and Communication" at the Department of English in Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou. The results obtained have been analysed using two data analysis tools. The first one is Contrastive Analysis. It involved a comparison of two corpora: Kabyle and English anger metaphors. The differences between the two languages may be an important factor that helps checking the influence of the native language and culture in the production of anger metaphors Lado (1957: Preface). The second one is The Corpus of Contemporary American English. It requires the use of Metaphor Identification Procedure to facilitate and better analyse the data. As a result, the analysis of the EFL students' metaphor productions has revealed that Kabyle language and culture interfere most in learners' productions of ANGER IS FIRE metaphor. In addition, it has been discovered that a significant number of students' metaphor productions including ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER has shown creativity. Adding to this, it has been observed that the cultural context influences students' production of creative metaphors.*

**Key words:** Kabyle learners of English, interference, anger metaphors' production, Contrastive Analysis, creativity.

## **List of Abbreviations**

**CA:** Contrastive Analysis

**CCT:** Cross-cultural Cognitive Theory

**CMT:** Conceptual Metaphor Theory

**COCA:** Corpus of Contemporary American English

**EFL:** English as a Foreign Language

**H:** Hypothesis

**L1:** Native Language

**L2:** Second Language

**MIP:** Metaphor Identification Procedure

**Q:** Question

**UMM:** University of Mouloud Mammeri

## **List of Tables**

➤ Table 01: Conceptual and Linguistic Metaphors .....	12
➤ Table 02: English Metaphors .....	25
➤ Table 03: Kabyle Metaphors.....	-27
➤ Table 04: ANGER IS FIRE metaphor in English.....	30

## **Appendices**

Appendix A

Appendix B

## Table of Contents

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgements.....	II
Abstract.....	III
List of Abbreviations.....	IV
List of Tables.....	V
Appendices.....	IV
Table of Contents.....	VII

### General Introduction

• Statement of the Problem.....	1
• Aims and Significance of the Study.....	2
• Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	2
• Research tools and Methodology.....	3
• Structure of the Dissertation.....	4

### Chapter I: Review of the Literature

Introduction.....	5
I.1. Metaphor: overview.....	5
I.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory.....	7
I.3. Cross-cultural Cognitive Theory.....	8
I.4. Anger and Cross-cultural Variation in Metaphor.....	9
I.5. Conceptual Metaphor VS Linguistic Metaphor.....	10

I.6. Linguistic Difference in the Expressions of the same Conceptual Metaphors.....	12
I.7. Metaphor Production.....	13
I.8. Creative Thought in Metaphor Production.....	14
I.9. Language Interference.....	15
Conclusion.....	18

## **Chapter II: Research Design**

Introduction.....	19
II.1. Context of the Research.....	19
II.1.1. Participants.....	19
II.2. Exploratory Study.....	19
II.3. Procedures of Data Collection.....	20
II.3.1. Questionnaire.....	20
II.4. Procedures of Data Analysis.....	20
II.4.1. Contrastive Analysis.....	20
II.4.2. Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA).....	21
II.4.3. Parameters of Analysis of Metaphor Production.....	22
II.4.3.1. Creativity.....	22
Conclusion.....	23

## **Chapter III: Presentation of the Findings**

Introduction.....	24
III.1. Contrastive Analysis.....	24
III.1.1. Common and Uncommon Metaphors in English and Kabyle	

Languages.....	27
III.1.2. Similarities in Universality.....	28
III.1.2.1. Difference in Conventionality.....	29
III.1.2.2. Difference in Specificity.....	31
III.1.2.3. Difference in Elaboration.....	31
III.2. Presentation of Students’ Productions of ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONATINER Metaphor.....	32
III.2.1. Presentation of ANGER IS FIRE Metaphor production.....	33
III.2.2. Presentation of ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER Metaphor .....	36
Conclusion.....	38

## **Chapter IV: Discussion of the Findings**

Introduction.....	39
IV. Discussion of Students’ metaphor Productions.....	39
IV.1. Influence of Kabyle in Learners’ Metaphor Production.....	40
IV.2. Creativity in Students’ Metaphor Productions .....	44
IV.2.1. Discussion of the Influence of the Cultural Context in the Production of Creative Metaphors.....	44
IV.2.2. Discussion of the Influence of Knowledge about Major Entities in the Discourse on the Production of Creative Metaphors.....	45
IV.2.3. Discussion of the Influence of the Physical Setting on the Production of Creative Metaphors.....	46
IV.2.4. Discussion of the Influence of the Social Setting on the Production of Creative Metaphors.....	48
Conclusion.....	49

**General Conclusion ..... 50**

**Bibliography..... 53**



# **General Introduction**

## Statement of the Problem

Cognitive linguistics is a field of study that emerged in the 1970's. It is concerned with the relationship between language and the mind. Cognitive linguists consider meaning as the primary focus in their research. Each scholar working in this field has developed one's approach to language description and linguistic theory focusing on a given phenomenon. By the beginning of 1980's, cognitive linguistics brought new perspectives to the study of metaphors including definitions, ideas, and concepts. In the publication of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), metaphor has been considered not only as a literary device but also part of everyday conversations. It is a means of expressing ideas, emotions, and opinions. Furthermore, it shapes people's understanding, perception, and way of thinking.

Metaphor production is a challenging area of research. It involves that second or foreign language learners need to be aware not only of the target language but also its culture. It means that they are required to develop linguistic competence as well as cultural competence. In fact, English language fluency reflects a correct pronunciation, grammatical rules, culture, and how to say things appropriately. Much research has been conducted on what Danesi (1992) called "metaphoric competence". It is noticed that students make use of the target language words and structures as vehicles of their mother tongue's concepts. In this case, it can be said that second or foreign language learners may suffer from the problem of language interference in metaphor production. It may occur due to the differences that exist between the native language (L1) and the target language at the level of pronunciation, syntax, grammar, phonology, and so on.

Several studies have been conducted on native language influence in metaphor production. Littlemore's et al. (2013) study entitled "An Investigation into Metaphor Use at Different Levels of Second Language Writing" is concerned with the use of metaphors by German speaking-learners of English. They examined 25 essays (five at each level A2, B1, B2, C1, C2) for the use of metaphors and observed that there is more evidence of the influence of German at B2 level than at other levels. Belkhir's study (2014) "*Metaphor and intercultural communication*" was another investigation of cultural influence in the production of animal metaphors in English and Kabyle. It is concerned with the study of cultural impact on the use of 'dog'/aqjun' in English and Kabyle to explore the way dog behaviour is used to present human behaviour. She found that the undesirable dog behaviours are figuratively used to represent undesirable

human behaviour. In her article (2016) entitled “Anger metaphors in American English and Kabyle, the effect of cultures”, she also discovered that the American and Kabyle’s conceptual metaphors for anger are approximately universal. However, they are characterized by cross-cultural specificity. Although shedding light on specific aspects of language interference, these studies did not address one important aspect of language interference, namely the influence of EFL learners’ kabyle language and culture on the production of anger metaphors at the English Department of Mouloud Mammeri university of Tizi-Ouzou.

### **Aims and Significance of the Study**

The main aim of this study is to explore EFL learners’ Kabyle language and culture influence on the production of anger metaphors. In addition to the general aim, other objectives can be defined to deepen the research. The first objective deals with EFL learners’ native language and culture interference in the production of both ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. The second objective is concerned with creativity in students’ productions of anger metaphors. The last objective is dealt with the influence of the cultural context in learners’ anger metaphor productions. Language transfer is a phenomenon that has been studied by many researchers in the world. Therefore, it is worth to investigate it in our educational area to test our learners’ competences in language production and have concrete results about their level. In addition, it is a study that can help learners to be aware of language interference problem and how to avoid it.

### **Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The present dissertation provides an exploratory study that delves in the research field to discover and bring new insights to the subject matter. Thus, an attempt to answer the following questions:

**Q1:** Do Kabyle language and culture interfere in EFL learners’ productions of both ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors after the process of interpretation and understanding?

**Q2:** Is there any creativity in their productions of both ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOTFLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors?

**Q3:** Will cultural context influence students’ productions of ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOTFLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors?

In this research, three hypotheses are suggested to answer the above mentioned questions:

**H1:** Kabyle language and culture interfere in EFL learners' productions of both ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors.

**H2:** EFL students' productions of both ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors are characterized by creativity.

**H3:** Cultural context influences students' productions of ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOTFLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors.

### **Research Tools and Methodology**

The present study is of exploratory nature. As was previously stated, it aims at investigating EFL learners' native language and culture (Kabyle) influence in the production of anger metaphors. The data for this research are gathered through a questionnaire. It is distributed to 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year master students of the Department of English at Mouloud Mammeri university of Tizi-Ouzou in order to collect relevant and as much as possible data to do the research. The data will be analysed using two data analyses instruments: contrastive analysis (CA) and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). In this research, contrastive analysis is used for the purpose of drawing similarities differences between two corpora; the first is extracted from Belkhir's study (2016), the second one is drawn from Lakoff and Kövecses' article (1987). Since differences are the source of difficulty in language learning Lado (1957: Preface), it is possible to analyse the learners' answers to check whether there is any influence of kabyle language and culture in students' written productions of anger metaphors. In COCA, the metaphors are identified by using Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) to examine the learners' productions of possible language transfer. Differences between two corpora; the first is extracted from Belkhir's study (2016), the second one is drawn from Lakoff and Kövecses' article (1987). Since differences are the source of difficulty in language learning, it is possible to analyse the learners' answers to check whether there is any influence of kabyle language and culture in students' written productions of anger metaphors. In COCA, the metaphors are identified by using Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) to examine the learners' productions of possible language transfer.

## Structure of the Dissertation

The structure of the dissertation follows the traditional-simple model. It includes a General Introduction, Four chapters, and a General Conclusion. The introduction provides the reader with an overview about the subject matter and some background to understand clearly what is going to be investigated. It deals with the statement of the problem, aims and significance of the research, research questions and hypotheses, research techniques and methodology, and the structure of the dissertation. The first chapter is named “Review of the Literature”. It reviews important concepts and scholars’ definitions that are directly related to the topic under study. It also presents the theoretical framework including the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), Cross-cultural Cognitive Theory (CCT), and Contrastive Analysis (CA). In this study, the latter deals with the following parameters: conventionality, specificity, elaboration cited in Barcelona’s work (2001) on “*Some Anger Metaphors in Spanish and English, A Contrastive Review*” and similarity in universality. Adding to this, the study of metaphor production also requires the use of four parameters suggested by Kövesces (2010): the immediate cultural context, what we know about the major entities participating in the discourse, the physical setting, and the social setting. The second chapter is “Research Design”; it gives specific and detailed information about the data collection tools which consist of a questionnaire and data analysis procedures including Contrastive Analysis (CA) and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). The third chapter is concerned with the presentation of the results obtained from the questionnaire. The last chapter is “Discussion of the Findings”. It interprets and discusses the results in relation to the theoretical framework in order to give answers to the research questions and explain how the dissertation may contribute to the previous works related to the topic of investigation. Finally, “the General Conclusion” summarizes what has been tackled and elaborated in the previous chapters, gathers the research issues dealt with in the dissertation body, and suggests new perspectives for further research.

# **Chapter I: Review of the Literature**

## **Introduction**

The present chapter provides a theoretical background about previous studies on language interference in metaphor production. First of all, it presents an overview that includes metaphor definitions. Then, it introduces the theoretical framework namely the Conceptual Metaphor Theory and the Cross-cultural Cognitive Theory. After that, it tackles the relationship between anger metaphor and the cross cultural variation issue. This review deals also with the types of metaphors and the cross-linguistic differences in the expressions of the same conceptual metaphor. Finally, it reviews works on metaphor production, creative thought in metaphor production, language interference, and contrastive analysis.

### **I.1. Metaphor: Overview**

Many scholars have provided different definitions of metaphor according to their research focus. In ancient times, the Greek philosopher Aristotle stated that “*metaphor consists in giving the 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 the ground of analogy*” (Aristotle 1457:4). Aristotle explains that metaphors can be constructed through the application of a name to a thing. The former cannot be connected to the latter. However, they may share a certain number of similarities. The fact of attributing an appellation to an entity may approximately reveal a creative thought that seems to be unfamiliar, strange, and difficult to assimilate (Lakoff and Johnson: 1987). In addition, he added that “*the greatest thing by far is to be a master of metaphor. It is the one thing that cannot be learned from others*” (ibid). From a rhetoric perspective, Aristotle defines metaphors as being a stylistic device that characterizes the poet’s work. They are specific to professionals in the domain of literature. According to traditional views, metaphors show the real picture in humans’ minds before encountering it in the external environment. Therefore, they are considered as being an ornamental tool that is used for aesthetic purposes.

Although Aristotle accounts for metaphor as a basic figure of speech that involves a good mastery of it, he neglects the fact that they are part of everyday conversations. Black (1962, 1993) rejects the comparative view of metaphor and introduces the interactive view. According to him, metaphors may operate at a deeper level than word meaning. He focuses on the novelty created by metaphors and the cognitive content carried by this

figure of speech. The emergence of Cognitive Linguistics has brought new insights to the study of metaphor. It has changed the poetic view toward metaphor and came with the idea of integrating metaphors within natural language.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) were the first supporters of metaphor and the ones who claim that they are not only used by poets, but also by ordinary people in spontaneous and effortless ways. According to them, metaphor serves as a basic mental operation, as a way of perceiving, structuring, and explaining the world. It can be said to be a means of interpreting and understanding peoples' life experiences. Weber (1995) also argues that it may be considered as being a cognitive element of speech that encourages transmission and comprehension of messages between speakers. In fact, he suggests that metaphors may not only be considered as a stylistic device, but also a language unit that facilitates short and colourful description of our perceptual world's phenomena that are difficult to deliver and transmit. Metaphors have a crucial role in the communication process. Indeed, they help to have a clear picture of one's environment and stimulate thought. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:5) state, "*Most of our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature.*" Concepts refer to humans' capacity to interpret the external world. They shape one's understanding of matters of life, govern different functions and behaviours, and raise awareness about reality. It is said to be metaphorical and structure the way of thinking, performing actions, and perceiving the world. "LOVE IS A JOURNEY" metaphor provided by Lakoff and Johnson may explain the metaphoricity of concepts. The concept JOURNEY represents experiences, adventures, obstacles, duration, and so on. By contrast, LOVE is a feeling toward a person. In fact, the latter can be understood in terms of the former that is JOURNEY, in the sense that love can be viewed as a life-long emotion that is shared and may face many sacrifices and difficulties. LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor paves the way to comprehend what love is. Thus, Lakoff and Johnson (1980:6) say that "*the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.*" They clarify that "*it should be understood that metaphor means metaphorical concept*" (ibid: 7). It is also said that a conceptual metaphor is composed of two conceptual domains in which one is understood in terms of the other. A conceptual domain may refer to a coherent organization of experience (Kövecses 2010:4). Conceptual Metaphor Theory names the first domain as source domain, and the second is the target domain. The former is concrete, and the second is abstract. For example, LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor consists of two domains:

JOURNEY is the source domain (abstract), and LOVE is the target domain (concrete).

According to Knowles and Moon (2006:3), “*we choose metaphors in order to communicate what we think or how we feel about something; to explain what a particular thing is like; to convey a meaning in a more interesting or creative way; or to do all these.*” In the communicative process, the transmission of the idea can be the subject matter of the speaker. Therefore, he tends to include metaphors within the discussion to reveal what he thinks in a persuasive and attractive manner. Knowles and Moon’s statement seems interesting that it shows the role of metaphor in stimulating people’s creativity and imagination toward certain abstract notions.

## **I.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory**

It started with the works of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. In 1980, they published a book entitled, “*Metaphors We Live By*”; the latter explains the theory and presents concepts related to metaphor. It has been a reaction to the traditional view in which metaphors used to be considered as

ornamental devices that are mainly limited to literature and poetry. Cognitive linguists have been sceptical of the Greek beliefs of using them for an aesthetic purpose. By contrast, they are also used in daily conversations by ordinary people. In addition, the supporters of the theory are convinced that metaphors have to do with thought, and human’s conceptual system is meant to be metaphorical. According to Conceptual Metaphor Theory, a conceptual metaphor is composed of two domains in which one is understood in terms of the other. Its main focus is world’s experiences. According to Gibbs et al. (2004), the conceptual connectivity is not haphazard, but appears rather to be constrained by our bodily experience in the world. It is argued that conceptual metaphors’ aspects are interesting that “*they help ground our cognition in our body and therefore represent a tool for investigating the representational structure of our embodied mind*” (Lachaud, 2012:9). Johnson (1997) argues that the regular co- occurrence of subjective and sensory-motor life experiences may create new connections in our representational system. Such conceptual connections generated from our experience, as embodied beings in the physical world, can help structure the way we think.

In other words, human experience in life may refer to a set of physical body movements, conceptions, perceptions of the world, and way of thinking. These may

contribute in meaning construction and comprehension. Grady (1997, 2005) suggests that conceptual metaphors can be named as primary metaphors based on universal bodily experiences. They are embodied because they are derived from everyday life activities. For instance, [FEAR is COLD SENSATION], [ARGUMENT IS WAR]. Moreover, such conceptual metaphors are meant to be universal i.e., they are used in all human cultures because they share the same experiences in their real world.

Despite the fact that CMT has changed the traditional view of metaphor and brought new insights, scholars' studies on metaphor have received many criticisms from other researchers of different research fields. The critics are concerned with the universal approach to metaphor, forms and concepts, and the absence of culture in the study of metaphor i.e., it neglects cross-cultural variation in metaphor.

### **I.3. Cross-cultural Cognitive Theory**

Kövecses (2005) has introduced the Cross-cultural Cognitive Theory to improve CMT from its weaknesses. It is a more updated version of it. It deals mainly with cross-cultural variation in metaphor and the issue of universality and variation. Although the first version of the theory has received some drawbacks, Kövecses has not denied the existence of universal metaphors. He argues that *“if metaphor is based on the way the human body and brain function and we as human beings are alike at the level of this functioning, then most of metaphors people use must also be fairly similar, that is, universal ”* (Kövecses 2005:34). In his published book entitled *“Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation”* (2005), he was convinced that metaphors vary from one culture to another. He has noticed that *“when we look at metaphors in the world’s languages, we have the distinct impression that there is a large number of non-universal metaphors as well, and that they may be just as numerous as the universal ones, if not more”* (ibid). He explains that primary metaphors may be put together in given varieties and cultures to construct complex metaphors. For example, LIFE IS A JOURNEY and LOVE IS A JOURNEY, in which they act as “conceptual correspondences” or “mappings” between the “source” domain of JOURNEY and the “target” domains of LIFE and LOVE. The idea is that the primary metaphors are expected to be universal, by contrast; the complex ones that are constructed from them are much less likely to be so (ibid: 4).

Kövecses (2005) affirms that universal primary metaphors are also produced by primary experiences, in the sense that they occur unconsciously and automatically. He (2005:3) claims that variation in metaphor may take many forms. For example, love can be conceptualized as JOURNEY, UNITY, HUNTING in English, Hungarian, and Chinese. However, in certain Chinese dialects, it can be conceptualized as FLYING A KITE (Yang 2002). It can be said that the abstract domain can be understood in a cross-culturally variety of ways. Also, anger is interpreted as being a fluid or gas in many cultures. By contrast, it is understood as OBJECT IN THE HEART in Zulu (Taylor & Mbense 1998). According to CCT, all the components of metaphor may be involved in variation. The abovementioned examples demonstrate the variation of the source domain across cultures.

#### **I.4. Anger and Cross-cultural Variation in Metaphor**

Many studies have been conducted on conceptual metaphors that are concerned with emotions. The results show that several unrelated languages share the same figure of speech. Researchers from the cognitive linguistic field have discovered that conceptual metaphors for anger concept seem to be similar in some languages. This kind of metaphor was first studied by Lakoff and Johnson, and Kövecses (1980) in English (Lakoff & Kövecses 1987; Lakoff 1987; Kövecses 1986). The previous works were followed by others in several related and unrelated languages, such as Chinese (Yu 1995, 1998; King 1989), Japanese (Matsuki 1995), Hungarian (Bokor 1997), Wolof (Munro 1991), Zulu (Taylor and Mbense 1998), Polish (Micholajczuk 1998), and Kabyle (Belkhir 2016). Kövecses (2005:40) has cited a number of metaphorical entailments that may raise from the PRESSURIZED CONTAINER metaphor. For instance, INTENSE ANGER PRODUCES STEAM and WHEN ANGER BECOMES TOO INTENSE, THE PERSON EXPLODES. As a result, it is noticed that most of the entailments exist in the Hungarian, Japanese, and Chinese languages.

Lakoff and Kövecses' article (1987) "The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English" has included anger expressions in American English and identified a set of anger metaphors. For example, ANGER IS HEAT, ANGER IS INSANITY, ANGER IS AN OPPONENT, ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL, ANGER IS A BURDEN, and so on. The cultural model of anger is

characterized by having five stages. The first is offending event causing anger. The second is the existence of anger. The third is attempt at controlling it. The fourth is losing control over it. The fifth is the act of retribution. In addition, it has two major aspects: Intensity and control. The former reflects the second stage, and the latter refers to the third and the fourth stage (ibid). Belkhir (2016) contrasted anger metaphors in American English and Kabyle. She has found that anger metaphors are extensively used by both American and Kabyle speakers with unequal frequency rates. Statistics show that American conceptual metaphors are at a certain degree similar to those of Kabyle. However, they indicate cross-cultural specificity where intensity is related to fire and container metaphor in Kabyle; whereas, in American English, intensity relates to container metaphor. In addition, FIRE was the metaphorical source domain that was most frequently used to conceptualize anger in Kabyle. This may demonstrate the importance and the crucial role of fire in Kabyle people's everyday lives. By contrast, the metaphorical source domain that was most frequently used in the conceptualization of anger in American English was CONTAINER (Belkhir 2016: 19-27).

## **I.5. Conceptual Metaphor VS Linguistic Metaphor**

Proponents of CMT have made a distinction between conceptual metaphors and linguistic metaphors. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), conceptual metaphors are overarching cross-domain mappings that influence our thinking, whereas linguistic metaphors are the linguistic realizations of those conceptual metaphors. For example, the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:5) may produce such linguistic metaphors as: *“he can't defend his claims”* or *“they shot down the argument”*. Here, one can say that the former is part of the conceptual system and characterizes thought; by contrast, the latter reflects language. In addition, the linguistic expressions are the concrete manifestation of conceptual metaphors. Falck (2012:110) suggests that *“even though metaphors are grounded in embodied experience, our language still shapes how these experiences are used.”* Thanks to words one succeeds in illustrating pre-existing experiences. Indeed, a wide range of linguistic units may reflect a meaning that is grounded in people's concrete environment.

Metaphorical linguistic expressions consist of words or other linguistic expressions that are derived from language or terminology of the more concrete conceptual domain.

Thus, Kövecses (2010:4) states that all the expressions that are related to life and being partly from the domain of JOURNEY are linguistic metaphor expressions; whereas LIFE IS A JOURNEY is the corresponding conceptual metaphor that they make manifest. In his work (ibid: 3), he provides the following examples:

LIFE IS A JOURNEY

He's without  
direction in life.

I'm where I want  
to be in life.

She'll go places  
in life.

He's never let anyone  
get in his way. She's  
gone through a lot in  
life.

Cognitive linguists have chosen a method to categorize metaphors. Conceptual metaphors are written in small capital letters while the linguistic expressions are not. As it is explained, "*The use of small capital letters indicates that the particular wording does not occur in language as such, but it underlies conceptually all the metaphorical expressions listed underneath it.*" (ibid: 4).

Table 1 below introduces examples of conceptual metaphors and linguistic expressions by Lakoff and Johnson (1980:4-47) in "*Metaphors We Live By*".

<b>Conceptual metaphors</b>	<b>Linguistic metaphors</b>
ARGUMENT IS WAR	-You disagree? Ok, shoot! -If you use that strategy, he'll wipe out. -He attacked every weak point in
LOVE IS A JOURNEY	-Where are we? -It's been a long, bumpy road. -Our marriage is on the rocks.
THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS	-The theory needs more support. -We need to construct a strong argument forthat. -Is that the foundation of your theory?

**Table 1:** Conceptual metaphors and linguistic metaphors

## **I.6. Linguistic Difference in the Expressions of the same**

### **Conceptual Metaphor**

It is argued that many languages may possess the same conceptual metaphors. However, the latter can display a variety of metaphorical linguistic expressions that are emphasized on the conceptual metaphor. As Barcelona (2001:137) points out, we are dealing with the same metaphor “*even though the elaborations, the specifications, and corresponding linguistic expressions of the metaphor are not exactly the same, or equally conventionalized, in both of them.*” One may seem to be more conventional than the other. For instance, ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE (Kövecses 2005:153) is a conceptual metaphor for anger. The English linguistic expression is “*it was a stormy meeting.*” Barcelona (2001) argues that the corresponding metaphorical expressions are more

conventionalized in Spanish than in English, especially where the natural force is metaphorically viewed as a strong wind. In addition, the metaphorical expressions from different languages can differ from each other in the degree of its specificity. CHANGE OF STATE IS MOTION INTO A CONTAINER (kövecses 2005:153) is a combined metaphor in English. It can be used both at a generic and at a specific level. “*His behaviour sent me into a fury*” refers to the former, and “*he flew into a rage*” and “*the news threw him into a terrible state of anxiety*” are related to the latter. In contrast, it is viewed that this level of specificity does not exist for this combined metaphor in the Spanish language (Barcelona 2001: 129). Indeed, “flying” and “throwing” are specific verbs that are not used in Spanish. A common conceptual metaphor can be elaborated in different varieties. Elaboration refers to “*differences between both languages owing to the existence of a version of the metaphor in one language and its absence, or limited use, in other*” (ibid: 137). It means the productivity of a given number of mappings that can give rise to a certain number of linguistic expressions in languages. According to Barcelona (2001), Spanish has much less elaborated list of conventionalized expressions than English.

## **I.7. Metaphor Production**

For many years, metaphors have been the main researchers’ interest in the field of cognitive linguistics (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). It can be described as a revolution against previous traditional studies. Boers (2004: 217) portray metaphor as “*a channelling device to comprehend, store, and reproduce figurative language input.*” It has been noticed that many investigations have been done more on the receptive skill rather than on how to produce metaphors. It is argued that L2 learners often need to understand metaphors more than to produce them (Low 2008; Littlemore & Low 2006a). It is also said that the capacity to produce metaphors in L2 is seen to be “*of less immediate necessity*” (Littlemore 2010: 296). Kecskés and Papp (2000) explicitly prevent learners from using metaphors because it may be a communicative risk in the sense that learners may face problems in terms of metaphor productions, interpretations, and understandings during the communicative process.

MacArthur’s (2010: 156) work is mainly concerned with learners’ productive metaphors. According to her, encouraging metaphor production may be beneficial for students. She notes that these benefits are:

Insights how the first L1 and second language L2 system interact how, the privilege of access to two linguistic and conceptual systems may favour, rather than necessarily hinder, the bilingual's metaphoric production, and to what extent the resulting metaphors are felicitous in the context of intercultural communication .

According to Littlemore et.al (2012, 2014) metaphor production can be an indicator of learners' proficiency in L2. In fact, MacArthur and Littlemore (2011) found that the density of metaphorically used words is up to ten per cent in cued conversations between non- native speakers. There are several studies that have been conducted on the quality of metaphor products. In the works of Williams-Whitney, Mio & Whitney (1992), it was demonstrated that individual differences such as writing experience affect the value of produced metaphors. The latter also can be affected by reasoning and imagery ability (Katz 1989), gender (Hussey & Katz 2006), and working memory capacity (Chiappe & Chiappe 2007). Utsumi's et al. (2012) paper on "*The effects of discourse goals on the process of metaphor production*" at Electro-Communication University shows that explanatory metaphors were more apt and conventional than literary metaphors. The latter seems to be more familiar and elaborate than the former. It can be said that two different discourses' intentions may lead to a variation in metaphor production. Teaching and learning metaphors are crucial because they may improve the learners' communicative skill and encourage creativity. Mouraz's article (2013) on "The use of metaphors in the process of teaching and learning in higher education" at the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences confirms that analogical reasoning and metaphors are vehicles for learning and may contribute in enhancing students' motivation and deepening knowledge in production and acquisition.

### **I.8. Creative Thought in Metaphor Production**

Humans may have the ability to interpret and understand the world thanks to metaphors. They play a crucial role in developing cognitive abilities in the sense that they encourage deep thinking. Moreover, metaphor production may foster creativity and imagination; i.e., it involves an exploration of new contexts and going beyond the familiar ones. Creative metaphors require new and original ideas and concepts. As has been argued, "*Creative metaphors naturally involve originality, novelty, and newness, as well*

*as, being meaningful, as in, having apt relations between the two domains, but they also evoke the positive emotions of pleasure and interest.*” (Birdsell 2018: 77). In addition, they are optimally innovative in the sense that they facilitate “the recognition of the familiar in the novel” (Giora et al. 2015:142). Moreover, original metaphors are the ones that draw the hearers’ or the readers’ attention and interest, and they trigger the mind to think. Birdsell (ibid.) adds that “*they also have the highest hedonic value and as a result should be viewed as being most pleasant and preferred over one that are very familiar and conventional or those that are completely new and original (i.e., those that do not allow for the recoverability of the familiar).*” In education, creativity has received considerable concern since 1950’s. Jackson et.al (2014) searched the academic teachers’ views concerning creativity and found certain features as “*being imaginative, being original, being curious with an enquiring disposition, being resourceful, being able to combine, connect, synthesize, being able to think critically and analytically, being able to represent ideas and communicate them to others.*” Jackson (2014) has suggested that creativity needs a context to maintain creativity. Context may stimulate creativity. For example, “*cultural, technological, teaching environment and it is an interaction of expertise, task motivation, and creativity skills.*” The same idea has been supported by Kövecses (2010). In his work entitled “*Metaphor, Creativity, and Discourse*”, he has stated that “*I will term the creativity that is based on the context of metaphorical conceptualization’ context-induced*”. According to him, unconventional and novel metaphors can be induced from context. He has cited five contextual aspects that give rise to creative metaphors: (1) the immediate linguistic context itself, (2) what we know about the major entities participating in the discourse, (3) physical setting, (4) social setting, and (5) the immediate cultural context.

## **I.9. Language Interference**

Language interference is also called language transfer. It has been the main topic in Applied Linguistics. Transfer in language studies dates back to the ninetieth and twentieth century. Robert Lado and Charles Fries (1957; 1945) were among the scholars who based their works on language acquisition. Odlin (1989: 6-7) claims that “*the languages learned in contact situations may or may not show some kind of language mixing, that is, the merging of characteristics of two or more languages in any verbal communication.*” He also adds, “*if does occur, native language influence is only one of the possible forms it can take.*” The author states that mixing can manifest when the native language interferes in the production of the second one. In addition, he suggests that it may happen in the form of borrowing or

code mixing. There are many existing studies about the importance of native language influence. For example, the influence of Irish on the English spoken in Ireland (Henry 1957), the influence of Quechua on Spanish spoken in Peru and Ecuador ( Muysken 1984), and the influence of Arabic and Turkish on the Dutch spoken by immigrant workers in Holland (Jansen et al. 1981).

Scholars have provided many definitions to the term interference. Weinrich was the first who has used the term. According to him (1968:14), it is the deviation of language norm in usage as the effect of bilingualism toward another language. It can be argued that language interference characterizes a bilingual speaker. The latter tends to use elements of a language in the one he is speaking. Indeed, it may happen unconsciously. Hayi (1985:8) reports the point of view of Valdman (1966) in defining language transfer. He proposes that it is an obstacle because of the speakers' familiarity toward the first language (L1) in the study of language acquisition of second language (L2). In addition, Lott (1983:256) suggests that it refers to the learners' use of the structure of first language in target language. He also cites three factors that cause language interference: The interlingual factor, the over extension of analogy, and transfer of structure.

Language interference can occur at the level of syntax, lexis, semantics, morphology, and phonology. Samington's (2016) article entitled "*First Language Interference in EFL Students' Composition of IAIN Salatiga*" at Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta indicates that EFL students made two types of interference; lexical interference, and syntactical one. Luo's (2014) investigation is concerned with the native language interference in pronunciation of college English learning in China. His findings reveal that Chinese college students suffer from language transfer and he illustrates that they confuse the phoneme [n] with [l], or [f] with [h]. Moreover, Somachai and Usaha (2013) worked on Thai English foreign language students' writing errors in different text types. The results show that there are interferences in both narrative and the descriptive text. It is at the level of tenses, articles, word choice, and so on.

There are other studies that have been conducted on the influence of native language L1 in learners' use of metaphors. Nacey's (2010) research on metaphors used by Norwegian learners of English discovered that L1 influence was evident even at an advanced level. The influence occurs with some novel metaphors that are produced by these learners. It can be said that the problem of language interference concerns not only

intermediate learners, but also the proficient ones in the language. Philip (2010) argues that there may also be an influence of the entrenched linguistic routines that contribute to the production of anomalous metaphors in the Italian English learners' writing. For example, "*deep depression*" metaphor is composed of an adjective "deep" that collocates with the word depression. However, the learners tend to say "*heavy depression*", in this case; the word "heavy"

collocates with the Italian word "depressione". The researcher concludes that metaphor used by the learners does not match the form conventionally. Therefore, it can be assumed that it is not acceptable.

### **I.10. Contrastive Analysis**

CA is an empirical approach that is used to compare and contrast languages in order to extract their similarities and differences. It needs to be linked to such theoretical studies as genetic comparative linguistics, language universals, language typology, foreign language teaching/learning, the study of bilingualism, translation studies, etc. These studies determine the reason of CA's application (Belkhir 2014: 98). CA dates back to historical linguistics where languages are compared to discover the family of languages to which they belong to. Then, it has become related to Applied Linguistics and changed its objectives. From 1940's until early 1960's, there was a growth of competitive research on CA in the field of foreign language teaching and learning. Robert Lado and Charles Fries (1957; 1945) were famous names during that period. CA has been mainly used to discover learners' difficulties in language acquisition. Charles and Lado explain the rationale applied CA as "*the most efficient materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of language to be learned, carefully compared with parallel description of the native language of the learner*" (Fries 1945: 9). In the preface to his well-known book, Lado (1957: Preface) states that "*the plan of the book rests on the assumption that we can predict and describe the patterns which will cause difficulty in learning and those that will not cause difficulty.*"

CA reveals that learners' errors derive from language interference. It is said that CA's main concern is mother tongue influence in second language learning at different levels. The latter can be phonological, morphological, lexical, syntactic, and so on. M. Gass and

Selinker (2001: 76) declare that “*there are other factors that may influence the process of acquisition such as innate principles of language, attitude, motivation, aptitude, age, other languages known, and so forth.*” Many studies have been made on contrastive analysis. Ignatius’ work (2014) “*Expressing Love through metaphors: a corpus-based contrastive analysis of English and Indonesian*” at Nareskan University found that the conceptual metaphors of love in English and Indonesian are likely to be universal. In her article (2016) “*Anger metaphors in American English and Kabyle, the effects of cultures*”, Belkhir found that the American and Kabyle’s conceptual metaphors for anger are approximately universal. However, they are characterized by cross-cultural specificity.

## **Conclusion**

The present chapter has reviewed the main concepts of the research. It has provided an overview about metaphor including some scholars’ definitions. Furthermore, it has presented Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) and Cross-cultural Cognitive Theory (CCT) on which the study is built. Then, it has tackled the relationship between anger metaphor and the cross-cultural variation aspect. Moreover, it has introduced the types of metaphors, and the cross-linguistic difference in the expressions of the same conceptual metaphor. Finally, this review has explored some of previous works that are concerned with metaphor production, language interference, and Contrastive Analysis.

## **Chapter II: Research Design**

## **Introduction**

The present chapter covers the methodological section and the research design of my study. It shows the techniques and the procedures used to answer the research questions asked in the General Introduction. First of all, it introduces the context of the investigation including the subject of the study as well as the participants. Then, it provides an explanation of the exploratory study. This chapter is composed of two sections: the first one is the data collection procedures that include a questionnaire; the second one is concerned with data analysis methods using the contrastive analysis, the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), and parameters of analysis of metaphor production.

### **II.1. Context of the Research**

The present research takes place in the Department of English at Mouloud Mammeri university of Tizi-Ouzou. It seeks to explore the impact of EFL learners' native language and culture (Kabyle) on the cognitive process involved in their production of some anger metaphors. It is a real and contemporary phenomenon that has not been previously studied in our educational setting. As a result, a questionnaire has been administered to first and second year master's students enrolled in the program "Language and Communication".

#### **II.1.1. Participants**

This study includes participants from two levels: eleven first year and nineteen second year master's students enrolled in "Language and Communication" program. It is a sample of thirty persons in which boys and girls are selected randomly. This selection method is used because it can be conducted in short time duration and does not involve any complex process. In this research, students' metaphor production is examined in order to check any influence of the native language.

### **II.2. Exploratory Study**

The study is an exploratory research. It intends to discover new and interesting aspects. In fact, one cannot know the outcomes of the investigation until the end of the research process. This research is concerned with a social phenomenon that needs to be explored in the field. This type of research deals with a problem that needs a deep understanding of it. Wan's (2012) thesis entitled "Using metaphorical conceptualization to

construct and develop ESL students' writing" is an example of an exploratory study. At the end of his research work, he concluded that discussing personal metaphors may help participants improve their writing, and become more sensitised to metaphor, and to thinking critically about it. In addition, the use of metaphorical expressions conveys multiple aspects of students' conceptualizations in writing, and the importance of training in using them. Thus, it can be said that there are many existing exploratory studies that are concerned with metaphors as a whole. Indeed, the present research aims at discovering whether kabyle language and culture influence the production of anger metaphors by English first and second year master's students of the Department of English at the university of Mouloud Mammeri of Tizi-Ouzou.

## **II.3. Procedures of Data Collection**

### **II.3.1. Questionnaire**

A questionnaire is chosen in this study to gather data with respect to the topic under investigation. It is adapted from Musolff's (2016) questionnaire entitled "*NATION-AS-BODY metaphor*" that he used in a research conducted at East Anglia University. The questionnaire is administered to 30 EFL students, and it is anonymous. In addition, the purpose of the present survey is to test the influence of learners' (L1) and culture onto their production of anger metaphors (Container and Fire metaphors). The participants are asked to produce five linguistic metaphorical expressions of both metaphors. Its main advantage is to bring new insights to the research. In addition, it consists of a short activity in the sense that it saves time and effort. Adding to this, it is easy to administer and guarantee objectivity. The present questionnaire has been piloted to ensure its effectiveness. This has been done with five students from the Department of English at Mouloud Mammeri university of Tizi-Ouzou. After the distribution of the questionnaires for evaluation, it has been noticed that the five students took time to write as much as possible answers. However, they have finally succeeded to produce a variety of metaphors. As a result, it can be confirmed that the questionnaire is effective and ready to be distributed.

## **II.4. Procedures of Data Analysis**

### **II.4.1. Contrastive Analysis**

CA is a method used to compare two or more languages in order to extract their

similarities and differences. According to Horn (1980:205) “*one in which the similarities and differences between two (or more) languages at a particular level are explicated in the context of a chosen theoretical framework.*” In practice, CA is mainly concerned with errors of transfer that result in second language teaching and learning. Thus, learners’ weaknesses may be predicted with the identification of the differences between the mother tongue and the target language. In fact, it has an effective role in improving the teaching process including materials. Lado (1957:2) states, “*We assume that the student who comes in contact with a foreign language will find some features of it quite easy and others extremely difficult. Those elements that are similar to his native language will be simple for him and those elements that are different will be difficult.*” The mother tongue’s influence does not have only a negative impact in the sense that the similarities between the two languages facilitate students’ learning while the differences may cause difficulties in learning.

This study deals with native language and culture interference in the production of anger metaphors by first and second year master’s students of the Department of English at Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou. The native language is Kabyle and the target one is English. Two corpora need to be compared (the English and the Kabyle corpus) in order to be able to discover possible similarities and differences in some anger metaphors to predict learners’ language transfers and confirm the hypotheses. The first corpus is extracted from Belkhir’s study (2016) entitled “ANGER metaphor in American English and Kabyle, the effect of culture”. The corpus represents the kabyle metaphors. The second corpus is taken from Kövecses and Lakoff’s article (1987) that is entitled “The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English”. In this study, CA involves the use of the following parameters: conventionality, specificity, elaboration (suggested by Barcelona 2001), and similarity within universality. The present study deals with two conceptual metaphors: ANGER IS FIRE metaphor and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor.

#### **II.4.2. Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)**

The Corpus of Contemporary American English was created and placed online in 2008. It can be considered as the first reliable monitor corpus of English. It is composed of a considerable number of words that can be up-dated each year. Through COCA, one may notice

and study the historical changes in contemporary English. It can be useful in this study since one may check whether the learners' produced anger metaphors exist in English or originate from their first language 'Kabyle' in the form of language transfer. A method is needed to have the ability to identify metaphors in this corpus. A suitable method for the present research is "Metaphor Identification Procedure" developed by a group of scholars. MIP is a procedure that intends to facilitate the identification of metaphorically used words in a discourse. (Pragglejazz Group 2007). It involves the following steps:

- 1- Reading the whole text-discourse to have a general understanding of the meaning.
- 2- Determining the lexical units in text-discourse.
- 3- A- Establishing a meaning in context for each lexical unit.  
(contextual meaning)  
B- Checking whether each lexical unit has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context.  
C- If there is a more basic current-contemporary meaning for each lexical unit in other contexts than the given one, it is important to determine whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning. However, it can be understood in relation with it.
- 4- If yes, it is possible to mark the lexical unit as metaphorical (ibid).

### **II.4.3. Parameters of Analysis of Metaphor Production**

#### **II.4.3.1. Creativity**

The analysis of creativity in metaphor production involves parameters suggested by Kövesces (2010): the immediate linguistic context itself, what we know about the major entities participating in the discourse, physical setting, social setting, and the immediate cultural context. In my study, I have used the following: the immediate cultural context, what we know about the major entities participating in the discourse, the physical setting, and the social setting.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter has explained in details the methodology that is followed to conduct this study. First of all, it has started with presenting the context, the subject under study, and the participants. Then, it has introduced the exploratory study. Moreover, it has presented the data collection procedures, including a questionnaire, and the data analysis procedures.

## **Chapter III: Presentation of the Findings**

## **Introduction**

This chapter provides the results of the present investigation that has been conducted at the Department of English at Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou. The data has been collected through a questionnaire distributed to thirty first and second year master students. Eleven questionnaires were given to the first year students, and nineteen to the second year students. It is a small case study. Thus, the data are not going to be generalized. The results include students' productions of both ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. The analysis of data does not involve any statistical representation because the case study is small. This chapter is divided into two sections: the first one deals with the contrastive analysis of both Kabyle and English metaphors, the second one is concerned with the presentation of students' productions of anger metaphorical expressions.

### **III.1. Contrastive Analysis**

In this research, contrastive analysis of both Kabyle and English metaphors and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) are the main tools that are used to check whether Kabyle language and culture influence the production of English anger metaphors. This section consists in drawing similarities and differences between Kabyle and English anger metaphors to determine any possible language interference in students' answers. The comparison concerns two sorts of metaphors: ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. The English metaphors are drawn from Lakoff and Kövecses' (1987) article, and the Kabyle ones are extracted from Belkhir's (2016) publication. In this study, the comparison and contrast of Kabyle and English metaphors require the use of parameters. The latter are selected from Barcelona's (2001) work: conventionality, specificity, and elaboration. Adding to this, similarity in universality is another parameter that has been suggested for the research purposes. Indeed, these parameters help identify the points of contrast between Kabyle and English metaphors. It is possible to predict language transfer in students' metaphor production through the differences that exist between the two languages. Table 2 below represents ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors of the English language.

ANGER IS FIRE metaphors	ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Those are inflammatory remarks.</li> <li>-She was doing a slow burn.</li> <li>-He was breathing fire.</li> <li>-Your insincere apology just added fuel to the fire.</li> <li>-After the argument, Dave was smoldering for days.</li> <li>-That kindled my ire.</li> <li>-Boy, am I burned up!</li> <li>-He was consumed by his anger.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-You make my blood boil.</li> <li>-Simmer down!</li> <li>-I had reached the boiling point.</li> <li>-Let him stew.</li> </ul>

**Table 2:** English metaphors (see Lakoff & Kövecses 1987)

The abovementioned English metaphors are going to be compared with Kabyle metaphors including ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. The latter are presented in table 3 below:

ANGER IS FIRE metaphors	ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ul yejraḥ ma d tasa yer dixel i tezza. “The heart is injured while the liver roasts.”</li> <li>- Rṛay yecban wa d win ara yernun zzit i tmes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Allay nsen d wul nsen yettfuru. “Their brain and heart steam.”</li> <li>- ...d wurfan yetteyzagen deg wul n unazur. “...and angers that boil in the heart of</li> </ul>

<p>“Such a decision will add oil to fire.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amek ara d-yini wawal yef tirgett yesdegdigen di ssura? “How can words tell about the ember that is burning the body?”</li> <li>- Amedyaz ireq s ucayud n lhejna n tmes i d-yetenkaren deg yiman-is.</li> <li>- “The fire growing inside the poet burns him.”</li> <li>- S tmes iw riy... “My fire burnt me...”</li> <li>- Deg ulawen n lyaci, times, tin ur nxetti. “In the hearts of people, there is fire that does not go out.”</li> <li>- Ulawen n lbatel kwan. “Hearts of injustice ironed.”</li> <li>- Times, yeleheb ujajih-is akken ad yesseknef s tirgin n lyid ulawen yezzan. “The fire blazes to make anger’s embers grill the roasted hearts.”</li> <li>- Tual asen d times yesseryayen tasa deg yiman nsen. “To them, it became the fire that burns the liver inside themselves.”</li> <li>- Bwan wulawen, kenfent taswin, di bab-El-Oued yendeh yimenyi. “The hearts baked, the livers burnt, conflict inflamed in Bab El Oued.”</li> <li>- Times ma nessaked yer zdat anda akken i y-d-iqubel umennuy,</li> </ul>	<p>the artist.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ad yini tiden yettkufuten deg ul-is. “He will tell about what is effervescing in his heart.”</li> </ul>
---	--

<p>ane □ festirgin ḥafi.          “In the battle, aspiring for the future          is useless, because we will walk          barefoot on hot coals.”          -Tamettut tečča times.          “The woman ate fire.”</p>	
---	--

**Table 3:** Kabyle metaphors (see Belkhir 2016)

### **III.1.1. Common and Uncommon Metaphors in English and Kabyle Languages**

English and Kabyle are two languages that are spoken by different societies. Each one has its own linguistic features. Previous works have shown that anger can be conceptualized as FIRE and A HOTFLUID IN A CONTAINER in both languages (see Belkhir 2016; Lakoff and Kövecses 1987). It has been observed that English and Kabyle speakers tend to use approximately the same metaphorical expressions to express their anger as in the following examples:

ANGER IS

FIRE

metaphor

English

metaphors

- Your insincere apology just added fuel to the fire.
- Boy, am I burned up!

Kabyle metaphors

- Rḥay yecban wa d win ara yernun z Zit i tmes. “Such a

decision will add oil to fire.”

- Sometimes  
I  
cry...  
“My fire  
burnt  
me...”

Despite the fact that Kabyle and English have common metaphorical expressions, the two conceptual metaphors ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER display a variety of linguistic expressions in both languages. The following examples are Kabyle linguistic expressions that do not exist in English:

ANGER IS FIRE metaphor

- Tamettut  
tečča  
times.  
“The  
woman  
ate fire.”
- Times, yeleheb ujajiḥ-is akken ad yesseknef s tirgin n lyaḍ  
ulawen yezzan. “The fire blazes to make anger’s embers grill  
the roasted hearts.”

In Kabyle, anger is conceptualized as fire being eaten and hearts being roasted with rage. By contrast, English speakers tend to say in the following:

- He was breathing fire.
- After the argument, Dave was smoldering for days.

### **III.1.2. Similarities in Universality**

Emotions are set of feelings that characterize human nature. They can be described as reactions to some behaviour. People are affected when they are exposed to their external environment. In order to express internal sensations, one may use emotional expressions. The latter are meant to be metaphorical. Metaphors of emotions are said to be embodied in human experiences and reflect the physical world (Grady 1997, 2005). This study is concerned with

two types of conceptual metaphors: ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. It is observed that anger is conceptualized as being FIRE and A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER in both English and Kabyle languages. For example, English speakers may say “*he was breathing fire,*” and “*you make my blood boil.*” Kabyle people also express anger by saying “*tameṭṭut tečča times*” i.e., the woman ate fire, and “*ad yini tiden yetkufuten deg ul-is*”, i.e., he will tell about what is effervescing in his heart. These two sorts of metaphors are based on life experiences. It can be said that anger is interpreted in the same way in both languages since the physical world is universal. Despite the fact that Kabyle and English share the same conceptual metaphors, the latter display a variety of linguistic expressions.

### **III.1.2.1. Difference in Conventionality**

ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER are two conceptual metaphors that exist in both Kabyle and English. However, they display different linguistic expressions related to the same conceptual metaphors. They may vary at the level of conventionality in the sense that one can be more conventional in one language than the other. Conventionality may refer to the extent of marking and unmarking (Barcelona 2001). The following English and Kabyle metaphorical expressions demonstrate difference in conventionality.

	Engli sh	Kaby le
<p>ANGER IS FIRE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- She was doing a slow burn.</li> <li>- Boy, am I burned up!</li> <li>- After the argument, Dave was smoldering for days.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amek ara d-yini wawal yef tirget yesdegdigen di ssura? “How can words tell about the ember that is burning the body?”</li> <li>- Times, ma nessaked yerzdat anda akken i y-d- iqubel umennuy, aneefes tirgin ḥafi. “In the battle, aspiring for the future is useless because we will walk barefoot on hot coals.”</li> <li>- Tameṭṭut tečča times. “The woman ate fire.”</li> <li>- Ul yejraḥ ma d tasa yerdaxel i tezza. “The heart is injured while the liver roasts.”,</li> </ul>

**Table 4:** ANGER IS FIRE metaphor in English and Kabyle (see Belkhir 2016; Lakoff & Kövecses (1987))

ANGER IS FIRE is the conceptual metaphor of both English and Kabyle, as has been revealed in previous research (Belkhir 2016; Lakoff & Kövecses 1987). Fire is the source domain in both languages. Indeed, this emotion can be conceptualized as ember and coals in Kabyle as well. Thus, one may say that the corresponding metaphorical expressions are more conventionalized in English than in Kabyle, in the sense that the English metaphorical expressions sound more familiar and frequently used in daily conversations. In his research, Barcelona (2001) has noticed that the Spanish anger metaphorical expressions are novel and much more colourful than the English “to smolder”. However, Kabyle metaphorical expressions of ANGER IS FIRE seem to be creative and less realized spontaneously in everyday life. For instance, “*In the battle, aspiring for the future is useless, because we will walk barefoot on hot coals.*” i.e. anger is conceptualized as being walking barefoot on hot coals. On the other hand, there are also Kabyle metaphors that tend to be more conventional while they are not in English. For example, “*the woman ate fire*” And “*the heart is injured while the liver roasts*” are two linguistic metaphors that are often used by Kabyle speakers to express their anger.

### **III.1.2.2. Difference in Specificity**

Kabyle metaphoric expressions may be different from the English ones because of specificity aspect. ANGER IS FIRE metaphor can be used at a generic and a specific level. Two examples of Kabyle linguistic metaphors are at a generic level; “*my fire burnt me...*” “*In the hearts of people, there is fire that does not go out.*” In these examples, the verbs “burnt” and “go out” are said to be generic. Kabyle speakers may also say “the heart injured while the liver roasts,” “the hearts backed, the livers burnt, conflicts inflamed in Bab El Oued,” “the hearts of injustice ironed.” It can be observed that “roasting”, “baking”, and “ironing” are specific verbs and much more specific than “burning” and “going out”. As far as English metaphors are concerned, they can be also at a generic and a specific level. Two examples may be provided to demonstrate the generic level of English metaphors; “*Boy, am I burnt up!*” “*She was doing a slow burn.*” To express anger, it is also possible to say in English “*After the argument, Dave was smoldering for days.*” However, the verb “smoldering” seems to be more specific than the verbs “burning” and “doing”.

### **III.1.2.3. Difference in Elaboration**

Degree of elaboration is also a point of contrast between English and Kabyle anger metaphors. ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER are two

conceptual metaphors that are shared by Kabyle and English languages. However, they are more elaborated in one language than in the other. A given mapping or entailment may give rise to a set of linguistic metaphors. Belkhir's (2016) study shows that the source domain FIRE is much more used in Kabyle than in English to conceptualize anger. However, English people use more container as source domain in anger conceptualization. Thus, it can be deduced that ANGER IS FIRE metaphor is more elaborated in Kabyle than in English. By contrast, ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor is more elaborated in English than Kabyle. ANGER IS FIRE gives the following mappings in Kabyle: ANGER IS FIRE CONSUMING A PERSON, ANGER IS FIRE BEING EATEN, ANGER IS FIRE BURNING THE LIVER, ANGER IS THE HEART BEING BAKED OVER FIRE, ANGER IS FIRE IN THE BOD, etc (Belkhir 2016). In fact, these mappings do exist in Kabyle language and characterize Kabyle culture. It can be said that the frequency and the diversity of Kabyle linguistic metaphors including ANGER IS FIRE metaphor make Kabyle metaphors distinguished from the English ones. As it is observed in previous research, ANGER IS A HOT A FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor is frequently used in English than in Kabyle. Thus, it includes the following entailments: WHEN THE INTENSITY OF ANGER INCREASES, THE FLUID RISES; WHEN ANGER BECOMES TOO INTENSE, THE PERSON EXPLODES; WHEN A PERSON EXPLODES, PARTS OF HIM GO UP IN THE AIR; WHEN A PERSON EXPLODES, WHAT WAS INSIDE HIM COMES OUT, etc (Lakoff & Kövecses 1987). It can be noticed that these variety of mappings reflect the English language and culture. Thus, one may say that the diversity of these mappings make non- English people knowledgeable of English metaphors including ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor, and they may discover the new contexts that have been used by English people to conceptualize anger.

### **III.2. Presentation of Students' Productions ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER Metaphors**

This section includes metaphoric expressions produced by students where anger is conceptualized as fire and a hot fluid in a container to check native language influence (Kabyle). The data was gathered through a questionnaire distributed to first and second year master students of the English Department at Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou.

### III.2.1. Presentation of ANGER IS FIRE Metaphor Productions

The following linguistic expressions of ANGER IS FIRE metaphor are classified into groups:

Fire in the body

- 1) If you stoke my flames, you will reap my fury.
- 2) Anger is burning through me.
- 3) My body is on fire right now.
- 4) Fire is lit in me.
- 5) He is so angry that his touch may burn you.
- 6) He unleashed a blaze with rage.
- 7) Fire is growing in me with anger.

Fire in the eyes

- 8) My eyes burst fire.
- 9) He was deceived that fire is seen in his eyes.
- 10) He was so angry that I could see flames in his eyes. Fire in the body.

Fire in the heart

- 11) Your empty words with me set fire in my heart.
- 12) His heart was enflamed.
- 13) His betrayal makes my heart throw flames through my chest.

Fire in the head

- 14) I see fumes coming out of your head.
- 15) Fire could burst out of his head.

Fire in the veins

- 16) I feel fire in my veins.

Fire in the belly

- 17) My belly burns with anger.

Fire in the nerves

- 18) My nerves are becoming ashes with rage.

Fire in the neurons

19) The child mischievous manners provoke fire in his/her mom's neurons.

20) You make my neurons burn.

Fire being eaten with anger

21) I have eaten fire.

22) I ate fire.

Fire being swollen with anger

23) You make me swallow fire.

Anger is being eaten by fire

24) Fire is eating me.

25) Hope fire eats you.

Fire in the mind

26) My mind is a fiery pit.

Anger is being in hell

27) I feel my body inside hell with anger.

Fire in the nose

28) His rage makes fumes come out of his nose.

Fire in the ears

29) Fire started coming out from his ears.

30) His ears were on fire

Being angry is being a dragon on fire

31) I am a dragon spitting fire with anger.

32) She is a dragon breathing fire.

33) I am so angry that I could spit fire.

Fire in the stomach

34) I was so angry, I felt my stomach burning.

35) It is like I have got fireworks in my stomach.

36) I have got a stomach burn with anger.

Fire in the soul

37) My soul is on fire.

38) He has a fiery soul with anger.

Anger triggers fire

39) My anger is a torch that could set fire at any moment. Fire in the speech

40) His words are fire sparks with anger.

41) I was throwing flames instead of words.

42) I was shouting on fire.

43) I speak with fire.

Anger is a bushfire

44) My anger is a bushfire in light.

Fire in the face

45) Fire is on my face with rage.

Being angry is to crash fire

46) His behaviour is intolerant that makes me crash fire.

The contrastive analysis conducted on FIRE metaphors in English and Kabyle and the use of COCA allowed the discovering of some language transfers. Among these are examples (7), (16), (17), (21), (22), (23), (24), (25), and (34). These results will be discussed in the discussion chapter. Contrastive analysis and COCA are two methods that have been adapted to analyse students' answers. The former involves the contrast between Kabyle and English metaphors including ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER, and the latter requires the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) (Pragglejaz Group 2007) to guarantee effective research in it; the purpose is to check the influence of Kabyle language in the production of anger metaphors including ANGER IS FIRE metaphor. As a result, the contrastive analysis and COCA have shown that some participants' written productions of the linguistic expressions seem to exist in Kabyle language and culture only. For example, "I ate fire," "I hope fire eats you," and "fire is

eating me”. Thus, it can be said that the respondents are influenced by their native language. However, the contrast of the two languages’ metaphors has also demonstrated that some of the participants’ productions do belong neither to kabyle nor English. For instance, “I feel my body inside hell with rage” and “my nerves are becoming ashes with rage.”

### **III.2.2. Presentation of ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER Metaphor Production**

The following metaphorical expressions of ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors are organized in groups:

Volcano in the body

- 47) Keep on fanning fire, and you will wake the volcano.
- 48) Damn! I feel the magma that is boiling inside me.
- 49) He is a hot sleeping volcano that woke up from anger.
- 50) I was spitting lava.

Anger in the form of a volcano

- 51) At this moment, my anger is a volcano being at the top of explosion.
- 52) He is trying to control his anger, but it was a boiling volcano.

Rising the degree of anger leads to the explosion of the liquid

- 53) My anger is boiling water that can burst if you disturb me again.

Hot liquid in the nerves

- 54) A huge fiery wave of water penetrates my nervous system.
- 55) My nerves are in hot water.

The nervous system being turned into a liquid from anger

- 56) My nervous system is molten.
- 57) My nerves are turning into a hot spa.
- 58) My nerves were melting out of rage.

Vapour in the head

59) You make Vapour come out from my head.

Vapour in the ears

60) Vapour is coming out of my ears.

Vapour in the nose

61) Vapour is coming out of my nose because of your nonsenses.

Hot liquid in the head

62) My head is boiling inside.

Hot liquid in the stomach

63) My stomach is boiling.

Hot liquid in the body

64) My whole body was boiling with his disrespectful manners.

65) A boiling wave of water is going to blow off from my body with rage.

66) My body water is boiling out of anger.

Blood evaporation

67) I feel my blood evaporating.

Sweat evaporation

68) My sweat is evaporating from anger.

Boiling liquid in the eyes

69) My  
tears  
are  
boiling

Lava in the veins

70) I feel the lava is circling through my veins.

Anger makes the liquid bubbling inside the body

71) I am a bubbling bomb from rage.

72) I am so angry that my blood is bubbling.

Being angry is to be at the top of explosion

73) She was a casserole about to explode.

In this investigation, the participants are also expected to produce metaphors in relation to ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors to check their native language interference. The contrastive analysis conducted on ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors in English and Kabyle and the use of COCA allowed the discovering of few instances of language transfers. Among these are examples (62), (63), and (64). The analysis of date has demonstrated that the majority of the respondents' productions do not belong to English and Kabyle languages. In addition, it is observed that those linguistic metaphors do not exist in COCA. Thus, it can be affirmed that the participants are creative in the sense that they explore new contexts to produce metaphors in more sophisticated and meaningful ways.

## **Conclusion**

The present chapter is concerned with the presentation of the findings. Two research tools have been used to check Kabyle language influence: Contrastive Analysis and The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). The first one involves a comparison between Kabyle and English metaphors. The second one requires the use of Identification Metaphor Procedure (IMP) for effective research in it. The data obtained are going to be discussed in the next chapter.

## **Chapter IV: Discussion of the Findings**

## **Introduction**

The present chapter is concerned with the discussion of the investigation's results in relation to the research questions. The data have been collected through the distribution of a questionnaire to first and second year master students enrolled in "Language and Communication" program at the English Department of Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou. Contrastive Analysis and The Corpus of Contemporary American English are two data analysis tools that have been used to examine the students' metaphor productions in relation to language transfer. In this research, metaphor productions are concerned with the conceptual metaphors: ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER. In this chapter, two sections have been devoted to discuss the results obtained. The first section is concerned with the influence of learners' mother tongue (Kabyle) on metaphor production. The second one deals with creativity in metaphor realization.

## **IV. Discussion of Students' Metaphor Productions**

The present study deals with students' productions of some anger metaphors in order to check the interference of Kabyle language. Two conceptual metaphors have been selected to explore language transfer: ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER. Anger can be conceptualized as FIRE and A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER. The nature of metaphor is to understand one kind of thing in terms of another. (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 6). According to CMT, ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors are composed of a source domain and a target domain. The former refers to FIRE and the latter to A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER.

In order to gather data, a questionnaire based on Musolff's questionnaire (2016), has been administered to first and second year master students of the English Department of Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou. They have been expected to produce metaphors in relation to the two conceptual metaphors: ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER. The students' metaphor productions refer to the linguistic metaphors that can be realized out of the two conceptual metaphors. The former characterize language, and the latter reflect thought (Lakoff & Johnson 1980).

In this study, Contrastive Analysis has been used to analyse the participants' metaphor productions. It involves a comparison between Kabyle metaphors and English ones to discover any weaknesses in language acquisition including language transfer. The former

have been selected from Belkhir's study (2016), and the latter have been drawn from Lakoff and Kövesces' work (1987). It is an efficient material that focuses on a scientific description of the target language and is carefully compared with parallel description of the learners' mother tongue (Fries 1945:9). In addition, the Corpus of Contemporary American English is another tool that has been adopted to evaluate the respondents' answers. Metaphor Identification Procedure has been used along with COCA. The analysis of the results has given rise to metaphors that show the influence of Kabyle and others that demonstrate the participants' creativity in metaphor production. This will be discussed in the coming sections.

#### **IV. 1. Influence of Kabyle in Learners' Metaphor Production**

EFL learners may suffer from many difficulties in language acquisition. Language transfer is a phenomenon that may emerge during the learning process. It can naturally occur because EFL learners have been dealing with a new language. It characterizes a bilingual speaker, and may happen at many levels: syntax, lexis, semantics, morphology, and phonology. Many works have been conducted on language transfer. Luo's (2014) investigation is concerned with native language interference in pronunciation of college English learners in China. His findings affirmed that Chinese college students suffered from language transfer and illustrated their confusion in pronouncing some phonemes: [n] with [l], or [f] with [h]. It is a serious problem that concerns foreign or second language learners. The present investigation deals with Kabyle interference in the production of anger metaphors. Some metaphorical expressions produced by the students have been identified as being instances of language transfer. These occurrences will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

ANGER IS FIRE

(22) I ate fire.

Example (22) above is a metaphorical expression that has been produced by one of the participants. It can be noticed that fire is conceptualized as fire being eaten. By using Metaphor Identification Procedure, COCA has shown the absence of this metaphor in the English language. Indeed, it seems grammatically correct. However, it cannot be meaningful for a native speaker of the English language. Contrastive Analysis of Kabyle and English anger metaphors (see chapter 3) has revealed that this metaphorical expression belongs to Kabyle (L1). Kabyle speakers tend to describe their anger as eating fire, as for

example, “*tameṭṭut tečča times*,” “*the woman ate fire*” (Belkhir 2016). It is a popular metaphor that most Kabyle people make use of to express anger. Barcelona (2001) has named this type of metaphor a *conventional metaphor*. It is a familiar figurative expression that is frequently used in Kabylia. Thus, it can be confirmed that example (22) reveals Kabyle influence on the production of ANGER IS FIRE metaphor.

A further case showing the effect of difference in conventionality upon students’ production of FIRE metaphor is illustrated in example (7) below:

(7) Fire is growing in me with anger.

In example (7), the respondent has expressed and described his/her anger as fire that grows in his/her body. It has been analysed by using COCA and CA. As a result, it has been noticed that the participant has produced a metaphorical expression that seems inexistent in the English language. In fact, it has been observed that this metaphor exists only in Kabyle language (see chapter 3). As has been revealed in Belkhir’s study (2016:239), Kabyle speakers express anger by saying it grows up inside their bodies, as for example, “*Amedyaz ireq s ucayud n lhejna n tmes id-yetenkaren deg yiman-is*,” “*the firegrowing inside the poet burns him*.” In this case, it can be said that the respondent is influenced by his/her native language (Kabyle) in producing this anger metaphor.

(24) *teččayi tmes*.

“Fire is eating me.”

(25) *Times ak-tečč ncalah!*

“Hope fire eats you.”

Examples (24) and (25) above are further metaphors that have been realized by the participants to express anger. In example (24), anger has been conceptualized as fire eating the body. Example (25) is a kind of insult in which the participant has used fire to express and show his/her anger toward a person. These two metaphors have been examined to check its accuracy and determine mother tongue influence. The use of COCA has confirmed that these metaphorical expressions are inexistent in English. In her study, Belkhir (2016:244) has identified an example that confirms that the examples (24) and (25) are further instances of language transfer. It is in the following:

(85) *Ajajih n tmes yečča imdanen...din tendeh, din tegla s wayen; y-d-iṣaḥen s*

*yizzayriyen...*

“Fire’s flames consumed people...there; conflict inflamed and took what we, Algerians, earned...”

As a result, it can be said that Kabyle has an impact on learners’ production of ANGER IS FIRE metaphor.

The abovementioned examples represent the participants’ productions of ANGER IS FIRE metaphor. The analysis has ended with the identification of these metaphors that show language transfer. Kabyle, the native language of the respondents, has been acquired at an early age and fluently used to communicate in the social environment. English is the foreign language that has been learned at school. The mother tongue (Kabyle) is the one that is frequently used outside school. However, English is spoken most of the time at school. In this case, the participants’ native language has influenced the production of anger metaphors because of their familiarity with the language as well as its metaphors. Hayi (1985:8) reports the point of view of Valdman in defining language transfer and proposes that it is an obstacle because of the speakers’ familiarity with the first language in the study of second language acquisition.

Works on CA in the field of language teaching and learning have confirmed that errors of transfer can be the result of the difference between the mother tongue and the target language. When a foreign or a second language learner confronts the target language, he may find some elements easy or difficult. The easy ones can be similar to his native language, and the difficult ones may not (Lado 1957:2). ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER are two conceptual metaphors that exist in both English and Kabyle. They are said to be universal. The concept of universality can be defined in terms of bodily experience (Grady 1997, 2005). Anger can be conceptualized as FIRE and A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER in both languages because of the fact that people share the same experience in life. In this investigation, CA has revealed that English and Kabyle differ at the level of their linguistic metaphorical expressions. Each language has displayed a variety of metaphorical expressions that focused on the same conceptual metaphor. The difference can be at the level of conventionality, specificity, and elaboration (Barcelona 2001). The following example shows the difference in universality between the English and Kabyle linguistic expressions.

(1) *Tameṭṭut*      *tečča*      *times*.  
 Conventional in Kabyle      The  
 woman ate fire.      Belkhir  
 (2016)

(2) *Those are inflammatory remarks.*      Conventional in English Lakkof and Johnson  
 (1980)

The kabyle metaphor in example (1) mentioned above seem to be more conventional in Kabyle than it is in English. In Kabyle sociocultural context, “*I ate fire*” is a popular metaphor that is used frequently. In her study, Belkhir (2016) has contrasted ANGER metaphors in American English and Kabyle. She found that American metaphors are at a certain degree similar to those of Kabyle. However, they indicate cross-cultural specificity where intensity is related to fire and container in Kabyle. Whereas; intensity is concerned with container metaphor in American English. In addition, Fire was the source domain that was most frequently used to conceptualize anger in Kabyle. In contrast, the metaphorical domain that was most frequently used in anger conceptualization was CONTAINER in American English. It can be argued that the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS FIRE is more elaborated in Kabyle than it is in English since FIRE has played a significant role in Kabyle society. It has been an essential tool in Kabyle traditional life. It has been used for making light, cooking, and staying in warm. Thus, it has affected the way of thinking and interpreting the world. Kabyle speakers’ feelings and emotions are understood in terms of fire when denoting anger. The latter is conceptualized by Kabyle speakers as: ANGER IS FIRE BEING EATEN, ANGER IS THE HEART BEING BACKED OVER FIRE, ANGER IS FIRE IN THE BODY, etc (Belkhir 2016: 225). As a result, the influence of Kabyle has been most importantly shown in the learners’ production of ANGER IS FIRE metaphor than in their realization of the ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER. The appendix reveals an amount of fire metaphors that is larger than that of the container. I believe this result from that fact that fire metaphor is much more used in Kabyle (Belkhir 2016), and that it is more elaborated than the CONTAINER.

In the process of second or foreign language learning language transfer can arise. It may unconsciously occur because of the learners’ familiarity with their mother tongue (Hayi 1985), and the difference that may exist between the native language and the target

one. It may not only concern intermediate learners, but also those that are proficient in the language. Language proficiency cannot be measured in relation to the learners' level. In this research, it has been noticed that even master students have been influenced by their mother tongue. Nacey (2010) has discovered in her research on metaphors used by Norwegian learners that L1 influence was evident at an advanced level. The evaluation of data revealed that the respondents have produced a significant number of metaphorical expressions that reflect creativity. The following section is going to discuss creativity in students' metaphor productions.

## **IV.2. Creativity in Students' Metaphor Productions**

The purpose of this research is to explore the impact of the learners' first language and culture (Kabyle) on the cognitive process involved in the production of anger metaphors including ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. The analysis of the participants' metaphor productions has ended with the identification of metaphors that show language transfer and creativity. COCA and CA have confirmed that many of the participants' metaphorical expressions belong neither to Kabyle nor to English. Thus, it can be affirmed that the respondents are creative. They have cognitive abilities to produce metaphorical expressions that reflect originality, novelty, and newness (Birdsell 2018:77). Context may play a crucial role in the participants' metaphorical creativity. It may trigger imagination and inspire them to express anger in such interesting metaphorical expressions. The context can be cultural, technological, teaching environment, an interaction of expertise, task motivation, and creativity skills. In addition, Kövecses (2010) has suggested the factors that may affect the production of creative metaphors: the physical setting, social setting, immediate cultural context, linguistic context itself, and what we know about the major entities participating in the discourse. In this investigation, it has been noticed that some of Kövecses' factors have influenced the production of creative metaphors including ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors.

### **IV.2.1. Discussion of the Influence of the Cultural Context in the Production of Creative Metaphors**

In daily conversations, people tend to produce metaphors within their cultural context. The latter may affect their way of thinking and perceiving the world. In addition,

it may help interpret ones' feelings and emotions. In this investigation, the participants have been asked to produce metaphors in relation to ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER. "*I feel my body inside hell with rage*" is an interesting example that has been chosen to be discussed. In this example, the respondent has conceptualized anger as being hell. It has been noticed that the idea of conceptualizing anger as being hell has come from Kabyle culture. In fact, the knowledge that the conceptualizer (respondent) has about his/her culture has influenced the way of interpreting anger. From a religious point of view, Kabyle people believe that fire „times“ is synonym to hell (Dallet 1982:520). "*ay yemnae Rebbi si tmes,*" "May Allah save us from fire/hell" (see Belkhir 2016: 232) is a saying that characterizes Kabyle folklore. It can be confirmed that the participant has conceptualized anger as being in hell since the latter is considered as fire in Kabyle beliefs. The following metaphors are other examples produced by the participants to show anger:

Fire in the eyes

(8) My eyes burst fire.

(9) He was so deceived that fire is seen in his eyes.

(10) He was so angry that I could see flames in his eyes.

The examples (8, 9, and 10) reveal the participants' capacity to interpret anger as fire in eyes. They are able to feel and see anger due to the cultural influence (Kabyle). It can be noticed that the conceptualization of anger as fire in eyes is well elaborated because of the significant role of fire in Kabyle society. It is used for cooking, making light, and gathering the members of the family to tell stories. As a result, one may say that the cultural and physical context stimulates thought and raises the learners' inspiration to produce creative metaphors.

#### **IV.2.2. The Influence of Knowledge about Major Entities in the Discourse and Metaphor Production**

In discourse, there are major existing entities: the speaker (the conceptualizer), the hearer, and the topic (Kövecses 2010). Knowledge about one entity may influence the production of creative metaphors, as shown in examples (31) (70) (48), and (49) below that have been produced by the participants:

## ANGER IS FIRE

(31) I am a dragon spitting fire with anger.

The metaphorical expression “I am a dragon spitting fire with anger” is related to the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS FIRE. In this example, it has been observed that anger is conceptualized as being a dragon spitting fire with rage. The analysis of data has shown that this metaphor does not exist in Kabyle and English. Thus, it can be noticed that the participant is creative. The respondent’s capacity to interpret anger as a dragon spitting fire is related to his/her background knowledge of fire. In fact, dragon is an imaginative character that appears mainly in films and cartoons. It is known by its fire spitting. Thus, the participants’ knowledge about that character has affected his/her way of interpreting anger.

## ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER

(70) I feel the lava circling through my veins.

(48) Damn! I feel the magma that is boiling inside me.

(49) He was hot sleeping volcano that woke up from anger.

The three abovementioned examples (70), (48), and (49) also reflect metaphor creativity. The participants have been expected to produce metaphors in relation to ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER. These examples reveal the participants’ capacity to conceptualize anger as a volcano in the body. It can be affirmed that the conceptualizers have tried to bring originality, novelty, and newness in metaphor production (Birdsell 2018: 77). In fact, this creativity is the result of their previous knowledge about “volcano”. Volcano is among the natural disasters that have been studied in science at school and visualized in social media. Thus, it can be argued that the participants are well-informed about it in the sense that they have used some terminology related to it: *magma*, *lava*, and *sleeping volcano*. As a result, it can be stated that learners’ previous knowledge fosters creativity and motivates them to think in a critical way.

### **IV.2.3. The Influence of the Physical Setting on the Production of Creative Metaphors**

The physical setting can also influence the production of creative metaphors. It may

refer to events and their consequences, the various aspects of the physical environment, and the perceptual qualities that characterize the setting (Kövesces 2010). In this study, the evaluation of the data has revealed that

some aspects of the physical environment have given rise to metaphorical creativity, as it is demonstrated in examples (44), (54) and (65):

#### ANGER IS FIRE

(18) My nerves are becoming ashes with rage.

(44) My anger is a bushfire in light.

#### ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER

(54) A huge fiery wave penetrates my nervous system.

(65) A boiling wave of water is going to blow off from my body with rage.

These three linguistic metaphors have been produced by the participants. Examples (54) and (65) are the concrete realizations of the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER. In example (54), anger is interpreted as a fiery wave penetrating the nervous system. In example (65), it has been conceptualized as a boiling wave at the top of explosion. A hot or fiery wave is chosen by the conceptualizer to be relevant to the conceptual metaphor. In addition, waves are part of one's physical environment. They can be huge or small depending on the weather. The conceptualizer can be in touch with nature and have experience with the beach waves. They may leave memories in the participants' minds. Thus, it can be said that the waves that the participants encounter in their physical environment trigger imagination to produce such interesting linguistic metaphors. Examples

(18) and (44) are other metaphorical expressions that have been produced by the respondents. In example (18), anger is conceptualized as having the nerves burnt and become ashes. In example (44), anger is interpreted as a bushfire in light. Kabylia has witnessed fire and having the forests burnt. The damages that the fire caused have affected the learners' creation of such original metaphors.

#### **IV.2.4. Discussion of the Influence of the Social Setting on the Production of Creative Metaphors**

Social environment is another factor that influences students' production of creative metaphors. In this research, it has been observed that social aspects have significant impacts on the participants' production of creative anger metaphors. The following metaphors are examples of social influence:

(35) It is like I have got fireworks in my stomach.

(73) She was a casserole about to explode.

In example (35), the participant has conceptualized anger as having fireworks in his stomach. Fireworks are devices used in celebrations. In fact, the conceptualizer has come with the idea of fireworks because of its use in different occasions. They are used to celebrate the birth of the prophet or a marriage. In example (73), the respondent has interpreted anger as being a casserole to explode. A casserole is a tool that is used in the kitchen to cook. Under a high temperature, it can explode. The conceptualizer has referred to an object that is used in his/her daily life to express anger. It can be noticed that the social context has triggered the respondents' thoughts to produce such creative metaphors.

This investigation has brought new insights to the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) since it has demonstrated how students are capable of producing original metaphors with reference to different contexts. Metaphor production may encourage creativity and improve communicative skills. It can be beneficial in motivating the learners to produce metaphors (MacArthur 2010). It has been discovered that analogical reasoning and metaphors are vehicles for learning and may contribute in enhancing students' motivation and to deepen knowledge, production and acquisition (Mauraz et al. 2013). The capacity to produce metaphors may help to develop the linguistic and the communicative competences. In addition, it improves the cognitive abilities. Thus, it can be said that the social setting plays a considerable role in raising students' inspiration and imagination to produce a variety of creative metaphors.

## **Conclusion**

In this chapter, the data gathered from the questionnaire have been discussed in two sections. The first one has discussed the influence of Kabyle language in the production of anger metaphors including ANGER IS FIRE. The second one has dealt with creativity in students' productions of ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. Finally, the following part is the last section of this study. It provides a clear understanding of the main findings and the research questions.

## **General Conclusion**

## General Conclusion

The present work has investigated the impact of EFL learners' native language and culture on the cognitive process involved in some learners' production of metaphors. It attempted to discover the influence of Kabyle language in their production of some anger metaphors. Language transfer is a linguistic phenomenon that occurs mainly in second or foreign language acquisition. This latter is original in the sense that it has not been explored in our educational setting (UMMTO context). It seems interesting that it concerned EFL learners' weaknesses in language learning and demonstrated the nature of errors that can be made by foreign or second language learners.

The investigation has emphasised three major objectives. The first objective was concerned with Kabyle language and culture interference in the production of both ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. The second one dealt with creativity in students' production of ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. The third objective was concerned with the influence of the cultural context on students' production of ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors.

To provide answers to the research questions and to test the hypotheses, a questionnaire was submitted to first and second year master students enrolled in "Language and Communication" program at the English department of Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou. Eleven first year and nineteen second year master students have answered the questionnaire. The data have been analysed with reference to two research tools. The first one is Contrastive Analysis. It required a comparison between two corpora. The latter refers to English and Kabyle anger metaphors. The English metaphors have been selected from Lakoff and Kövecses' work (1987), and the Kabyle ones have been drawn from Belkhir's article (2016). In this research, CA relied on three parameters suggested by Barcelona (2001): conventionality, specificity, and elaboration. Adding to Barcelona's parameters, similarity in universality was another parameter that was used to make the comparison. The contrast between two different languages has helped predict language transfer. The second data analysis tool is The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). Metaphor Identification Procedure has been used to facilitate the selection of metaphors in COCA and check L1 influence

effectively. To test students' creativity in metaphor production, some of Kövecses' parameters (2010) have been adopted: the immediate cultural context, what we know about the major entities participating in the discourse, the physical setting, and the social setting.

The results of this investigation have shown that Kabyle language and culture interfere at a certain degree in the production of ANGER IS FIRE metaphor. As has been revealed in the result chapter, "*I ate fire*" is an example of language transfer. It is a linguistic metaphor in which the participant conceptualized anger as fire being eaten. According to CA, this metaphorical expression is approximately similar to the one that exists in Kabyle language "*tameṭṭut tečča times*" (Belkhir 2016). In addition, they have revealed that the students are creative in producing both ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. In fact, the learners have produced a considerable number of metaphorical expressions that show creativity. It can be stated that they have the capacity to think critically and deeply. Adding to this, the students' metaphors have emerged from their own imagination and different contexts. They have relied on a variety of contexts to come with unfamiliar and unconventional metaphors. For example, "*Damn! I feel the magma that is boiling inside me,*" and "*I feel the lava is circling through my veins*" (see chapter three). Knowledge about volcanoes triggered the participants thought to produce such new and creative metaphorical expressions. "*I feel my body inside hell with rage*" (see chapter three) is another example that was discussed. It showed students' ability to create metaphors through the cultural context. According to Kabyle society's beliefs, fire equals hell. Thus, the learner conceptualized anger as being in hell. As a result, the first hypothesis presented in the introduction chapter is confirmed since there has been influence of L1 in the production of ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. The second and the third hypotheses are also affirmed; the students have been creative in the production of ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphors. In addition, the cultural context has an impact on students' production of anger metaphors.

The present research is a small scale study. It consists of thirty participants from two levels (first and second year master students). Therefore, future research needs to enlarge the number of its respondents. Also, this study is limited to the influence of Kabyle in the production of anger metaphors. Thus, it will be interesting for future researchers to investigate and explore language transfer with other metaphors of emotions.

For example, metaphors of happiness, sorrow, love... etc. In addition, Language interference may occur not only with the native language but also with other languages. For instance, the influence of French language in the production of metaphors may be another interesting study.

It is a hope that this work has highlighted the way Kabyle learner's L1 interferes in the production of anger metaphors and has drawn attention about the seriousness of this language difficulty. It is hoped that this study has well-explored the aspect of creativity in anger metaphor production and brought new insights about it.

## **Bibliography**

Aristotle, . (1457/2002). *On poetics*. S. Benardete and Da. M. (Trans). Indiana: St. Augustine Press.

Barcelona, A. (2001). On the systematic contrastive analysis of conceptual metaphors: Case studies and proposed methodology. In M. Pütz. (Ed.), *Applied Cognitive Linguistics. Language pedagogy* (pp.117-146). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Belkhir, S. (2014). Proverb use between cognition and tradition in English, French, and Kabyle.(Unpublished Phd. Thesis).

Belkhir, S. (2016). Anger metaphors in American English and Kabyle: The effect of culture. *International Journal of Language and Culture*, 3(2), 216-251. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net>.

Birdsell, B. (2018). Creative metaphor production in a first and second language and the role of creativity. (Unpublished Phd Thesis) Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336305913>.

Black, M. (1962). *Models and metaphors: Studies in language and Philosophy*. Ithac, N.Y.: CornellUniversity Press.

Black, M. (1993). More about metaphors. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp.19-41) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boers, F., Demecheleer, M., & Eyckmans, J. (2004a). Cross-cultural variation as a variable in comprehending and remembering figurative idioms. *European Journal of English Studies*, 8(3), 375-388.

Boers, F., Demecheleer, M. & Eyckmans, J. (2004b). Etymological elaboration as a strategy for learning idioms. In P. Baggards & B. Laufer (Eds.), *Vocabulary in a second language: Selection, acquisition, and testing* (pp.53-78). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bokor, Z. (1997). Body-based constructionism in the conceptualization of anger. C.L.E.A.R. series, no.17. Budapest: Department of English, Hamburg University and the Department of American Studies, ELTE.

Chiappe, D., & Chiappe, P. (2007). The role of working memory in metaphor production andcomprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 56, 172-188.

- Dallet, J.M. (1982). *Dictionnaire Kabyle-Français*. Paris: Selaf.
- Danesi, M. (1992). Metaphorical competence in second language acquisition and second language teaching. The neglected dimension. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.), *Language communication and social meaning* (pp.489-500). Washington: Georgetown University round table on languages and Linguistics.
- Fries, Ch. C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Gass, S. M. & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition. An introductory course* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gibbs, R.W., Lenz Costa Lima, P., & Francozo, E. (2004). Metaphor is grounded in embodied experience. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(7), 1189-1210.
- Giora, R., Fein, O., Kotler, N., & Shuval, N. (2015). Know hope metaphor, optimal innovation, and pleasure. In G. Brône, K. Feyaert, & T. Veale (Eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics and humor research* (pp.129-146). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Grady, J. (1997). THEORIES ARE BUILDING revisited. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 8(4), 267-290.
- Grady, J. (2005). Primary metaphors as inputs to conceptual integration. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(10), 1595-1614.
- Hayi, A. D., (1985). *Interferensi Grammatika Bahasa Indonesia dalam Bahasa Jawa*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- Henry, P.L., (1957). *An Anglo-Irish Dialect of North Roscommon. Phonology, accent, syntax*. Dublin: University College Dublin.
- Horn, G.M. (1980). Constraints on transformation: Evidence from contrastive analysis. In J. Fisiak.
- Hussey, K.A., & Katz, A.N. (2006). Metaphor production in online conversation: Gender and friendship status. *Discourse Processes*, 42(1), 75-98.
- Jackson, N. (2014). Developing students' creativity through a higher education. In International symposium on „the cultivation of creativity in university students. Retrieved from <http://www.normanjackson.co.uk/creativity.html>.

- Jackson, M.O., Shaw, M., & Wisdom, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Developing creativity in higher education*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Jansen, B., Lalleman, J., & Muysken, P. (1981). The alternation hypothesis: Acquisition of Dutch word order by Turkish and Moroccan foreign workers. *Language Learning*, 31(2), 315-336.
- Johansson Falck, M., (2012). Metaphor variation across L1 and L2 speakers of English: Do differences at the level of linguistic metaphor matter? Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org>.
- Johnson, C. (1997). Metaphor vs conflation in the acquisition of polysemy. The case of SEE. In M.K. Hiraga, Sinha, C, & Wilcox, S. (Eds.), *Cultural, typological, and psychological issue of Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Katz, A. (1989). On choosing the vehicles of metaphors: Referential concreteness, semantic distances, and individual differences. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 28, 486-499.
- Keckés, I., & Papp, T. (2000). Metaphorical competence in trilingual language production. In J. Cenoz & U. Jessner (Eds.), *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third language* (pp.99-120). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- King, B. (1989). The conceptual structure of emotional experience in Chinese. Doctoral dissertation: Ohio State University.
- Knowles, M. & Moon, K. (2006). *Introducing metaphor*. New-york: Routledge.
- Kövecses, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of anger, pride, and love: A lexical approach to the study of concepts*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (Ed.) (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2010). Metaphor, creativity, and discourse. Retrieved from <https://www.scielo.br>.
- Lachaud, C. (2012). Conceptual metaphors and embodied cognition: EEG coherence reveals brain activity differences between primary and complex conceptual metaphors during comprehension.

Retrieved from <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr>.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied Linguistics for language teachers*. Ann Arbor:University of Michigan Press.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Lakoff, G. (1987a). *Women, fire, and dangerous things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Lakoff, G. (1987b). Image metaphors. *Metaphor and symbolic activity*, 1(4), 219-222.

Lakoff, G. & Kövecses, Z. (1987). The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net>.

Littlemore, J., & Low, G. (2006a). *Figurative thinking and foreign language learning*. Basingstoke:Palgrave Macmillan.

Littlemore, J. (2010). Metaphoric competence in the first and second language: Similarities and differences. In M. Pütz & L. Sicola (Eds.), *Cognitive Processing in second language acquisition: Inside the learner's mind* (pp. 293-316). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Littlemore, J., Krennmayr, T., Turner, J., & Turner, S. (2012). Investigating figurative proficiency at different levels of second language writing. *Research Notes*, 47, 14-23.

Littlemore, J., Krennmayr, T., Turner, J., & Turner, S. (2013). An investigation into metaphor use at different levels of second language writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 35 (2), 177-144.

Lott, D. (1983). Analysing and counteracting interference errors. *ELT Journal*, 37 (3), pp.256-261.

Low, G. (2008). Metaphor and education. In R. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp.212-231). Cambridge, New-York: Cambridge University Press.

Luo, J. (2014). A study of mother tongue interference in pronunciation of college English learning in China. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4 (8).

MacArthur, F. (2010). Metaphorical competence in EFL: Where are we and where should we be going? A view from the language classroom. *AILA Review*, 23(11), 155-173.

- MacArthur, F. & Littlemore, J. (2011). On the repetition of words with the potential for metaphoric extension in conversations between native and non-native speakers of English. *Metaphor and the Social World*, 1(2), 201-239.
- Matsuki, K. (1995). Metaphors of anger in Japanese. In J.R. Taylor & R. Maclaury (Eds.), *Language and the cognitive construal of the world* (pp.137-151). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mauraz, A., Val Pereira, A. & Monteiro, R. (2013). The use of metaphors in the processes of teaching and learning in higher education. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5(1), 99-110. Retrieved from <https://www.fpce.up.pt>.
- Micholajezuk, A. (1998). The metonymic and metaphoric conceptualization of anger in Polish. In A. Athanasiadou & E. Tabakowska (Eds.), *Speaking of emotions: Conceptualization and expression* (pp.153-191). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Munro, P. (1991). ANGER IS HEAT: Some data for a cross-linguistic survey. Manuscript, Department of Linguistics, UCLA.
- Musolff, A. (2016). Cross-cultural variation in deliberate metaphor interpretation. *Metaphor and the Social World*, 6(2), 205-224.
- Muysken, P. (1984). The Spanish that Quechua speakers learn: L2 learning as norm-governed behaviour. In A. Roger (Ed.), *Second languages: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 101-119. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Nacey, S. (2010). Comparing linguistic metaphors in L1 and L2 English. (Unpublished Phd Thesis: University of Oslo).
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Philip, G. (2010). Drugs, traffic, and many other dirty interests: Metaphor and the language learner. In G. Low, L. Cameron, A. Deignan & Z. Todd (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor in the realworld* (63-79). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22 (1), 1-39. Retrieved from <https://www.lancaster.ac.uk>.

Samingon, A. (2016). First language interference in EFL students' composition of IAIN SALATIGA. Retrieved from [eprints.ums.ac.id](http://eprints.ums.ac.id).

Somachai, W. & Usaha, S. (2013). Thai EFL students' writing errors in different text types: The interference of the first language. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 6(1), 67-78. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov>.

Taylor, J. & Mbense, T. (1998). Red dogs and rotten mealies: How Zulus talk about anger. In A. Athanasiadou & E. Tabakowska (Eds.), *Speaking of emotions: Conceptualization and expression* (pp.191-226). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tri Endarto, I. (2014). Expressing love through metaphors: A corpus-based contrastive analysis of English and Indonesian. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net>.

Utsumi, A., Nakamura, K., & Sakamoto, M. (2012). Effects of discourse goals on the process of metaphor production. Retrieved from [citeseerx.ist.psu.edu](http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu).

Wan, W. (2012). Using metaphorical conceptualization to construct and develop ESL students' writing: An exploratory study. (Unpublished Phd Thesis). Retrieved from [etheses.whiterose.ac.uk](http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk).

Weinreich, U. (1968). *Language in contact*. Mouton: The Hague-Paris.

William-Whitney, D., Mio, J., & Whitney P. (1992). Metaphor production in creative writing. *Journal of psycholinguistic research*, 21(6), 497-509.

Yang, G. (2002). Love and its conceptual metaphors in Mandarin: Aspectual classification. Berkeley: University of California. (Unpublished Manuscript).

Yu, N. (1995). Metaphorical expression of anger and happiness in English and Chinese. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 10(2), 59-92.

Yu, N. (1998). *The contemporary theory of metaphor. A perspective from Chinese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

# **Appendices**

## Appendix A

### Questionnaire

#### ANGER IS FIRE

#### ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER

**Task: anger is a strong feeling that one can experience in life. It can be described by means of metaphor. Please make use of both fire and container metaphor in five sentences each.**

**Thank you very much for your collaboration!**

- 1. ANGER IS FIRE metaphor**
- 2. ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor**

#### **N.B**

**Metaphor:** it is defined as “understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 6); e.g. a heart of stone. The mind is an ocean. **ANGER IS FIRE metaphor:** anger can be understood as fire; e.g. he was breathing fire.

**ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor:** anger can be conceptualized as a hot substance inside the body; e.g. you make my blood boil.

## Appendix B

In this section, I present the metaphorical expressions that have been produced by the participants. The underlined linguistic metaphors show the influence of Kabyle language, and the non-underlined ones reflect creativity.

### ANGER IS FIRE metaphor

#### Fire in the body

- 1) If you stoke my flames, you will reap my fury.
- 2) Anger is burning through me.
- 3) My body is on fire right now.
- 4) Fire is lit in me.
- 5) He is so angry that his touch may burn you.
- 6) He unleashed a blaze with rage.
- 7) Fire is growing in me with anger.

#### Fire in the eyes

- 8) My eyes burst fire.
- 9) He was so deceived that fire is seen in his eyes.
- 10) He was so angry that I could see flames in his eyes.

#### Fire in the heart

- 11) Your empty words with me set fire in my heart.
- 12) His heart was enflamed.
- 13) His betrayal makes my heart throw flames through my chest.

#### Fire in the head

- 14) I see fumes coming out of your head.
- 15) Fire could burst out of his head.

#### Fire in the veins

- 16) I feel fire in my veins

Fire in the belly

17) My belly burns with anger.

Fire in the nerves

18) My nerves are becoming ashes with rage.

Fire in the neurons

19) The child mischievous manners provoke fire in his/her mom's neurons.

20) You make my neurons burn.

Fire being eaten with anger

21) I have eaten fire.

22) I ate fire.

Fire being swollen with anger

23) You make me swallow fire.

Anger is being eaten by fire

24) Fire is eating me.

25) Hope fire eats you.

Fire in the mind

26) My mind is a fiery pit.

Anger is being in hell

27) I feel my body inside hell with anger.

Fire in  
the nose

28) His rage makes fumes come out of his nose.

Fire in the ears.

29) Fire started coming from his ears.

30) His ears were on fire.

Being angry is being a dragon on fire

31) I am a dragon spitting fire with anger.

32) She is a dragon breathing fire.

33) I am so angry that I could spit fire.

Fire in  
the  
stomach

34) I was so angry, I felt my stomach burning.

35) It is like I have got fireworks in my stomach.

36) I have got a stomach burn with anger.

Fire in the soul

37) My soul is on fire.

38) He has a fiery soul with anger.

Anger triggers fire

39) My anger is a torch that could set fire at any moment.

Fire in the speech

40) His words are fire sparks with anger.

41) I was throwing flames instead of words.

42) I was shouting on fire.

43) I speak with fire.

Anger is a bushfire

44) My anger is a bushfire in light.

Fire in the face

45) Fire is on my face with rage.

Being angry is to crash fire

46) His behaviour is intolerant that makes me crash fire.

## **ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor**

Volcano in the body

47) Keep on fanning fire, and you will wake the volcano.

48) Damn! I feel the magma that is boiling inside me.

49) He is a hot sleeping volcano that woke up from anger.

50) I was spitting lava.

Anger in the form of a volcano

51) At this moment, my anger is a volcano being at the top of explosion.

52) He is trying to control his anger, but it was a boiling volcano.

Rising the degree of anger leads to the explosion of the liquid

53) My anger is boiling water that can burst if you disturb me again.

Hot liquid in the nerves

54) A huge fiery wave of water penetrates my nervous system.

55) My nerves are in hot water.

The nervous system being turned into a liquid from anger

56) My nervous system is molten.

57) My nerves are turning into a hot spa.

58) My nerves were melting out of rage.

Vapour in the head

59) You make vapour come out from my head.

Vapour in the ears

60) Vapour is coming out of my ears.

Vapour in the nose

61) Vapour is coming out of my nose because of your nonsenses.

Hot liquid in the head

62) My head is boiling inside.

Hot liquid in the stomach

63) My stomach is boiling.

Hot liquid in the body

64) My whole body was boiling with his disrespectful manners.

65) A boiling wave of water is going to blow off from my body with rage.

66) My body water is boiling out of anger.

Blood evaporation

67) I feel my blood evaporating.

Sweat evaporation

68) My sweat is evaporating from anger.

Boiling liquid in the eyes

69) My  
tears  
are  
boiling.

Lava in the veins

70) I feel the lava is circling through my veins.

Anger makes the liquid bubbling inside the body

71) I am a bubbling bomb from rage.

72) I am so angry that my blood is bubbling.

Being angry is to be at the top of explosion

73) She was a casserole about to explode.

