

**CHAPTER V**  
**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

After rendering the findings and long discussion of the findings, the writer comes up with some conclusions and completes his research with some suggestions for the sake of the study.

#### 5.1 Conclusion

Obtaining 71, derived from the average of the subjects' scores of the three abilities, the class is concluded to have good comprehension of English metaphorical expressions. In proportion to the first ability, the subjects, scoring 91, are categorized excellent in differentiating the English metaphorical expressions from the English literal expressions. In line with the second ability, scoring 81, the subjects are good in understanding the intended meaning of the English metaphorical expressions. Corresponding to the third ability, scoring 41, the subjects prove that they have a very poor ability to identify the proper replacement of the English metaphorical expressions for the stated literal expressions.

The average scores of each of the three abilities confirm that the level of difficulties of the three abilities tested to the subjects are naturally graded, from the first ability, to the second ability and finally to the third

ability. This leveling is apposite to the steps of the procedure in the five analytical steps, proposed by Gerard J. Steen.

### **5.1.1 Conclusion of the Subjects' Ability to Differentiate the English Metaphorical Expressions from the English Literal Expressions**

Bordering on the findings and discussion of the first ability research, the writer draws some conclusions as the followings:

1. In conclusion, in line with the first research question, the subjects, averagely scoring 91, reflect that they are excellently able to differentiate the English metaphorical expressions from the English literal expressions.
2. Their success in answering the first-ability-measuring questions confirms two subtasks. First, they thoroughly understand the meaning of the focus expressions, either literal or metaphorical expressions. And second, they are excellently able to identify whether the focus expressions operate metaphorically or literally as intended, based on the context of the sentence. However, as discussed above, few of them still make minor mistakes caused by certain obscurities: incomprehension of the meaning of the focus expressions and unconsciousness or carelessness in identifying the employment of the focus expressions.

3. Differentiating the English metaphorical expressions from the English literal expressions successfully, the subjects corroborate that they have grabbed hold of conscientious analytical tools, as suggested by Steen, for, first, identifying and describing meanings and, then, deciphering whether the linguistic expression is used literally or metaphorically (non-literally) in the discourse.
4. It is evident that the success of the subjects' answering of the first ability research counts on the subjects' adequate vocabulary knowledge or concepts and on the subjects' successful analytical tool for identifying and describing the literal and metaphorical meanings of expressions.
5. It should be emphasized that the subjects' comprehension of metaphoric expressions mainly determines their correct and wrong answers and the level of difficulty of the test' characteristic does not primarily signify the subjects' comprehension of metaphoric expressions. In other word, in the measuring, the subjects' analytical tools for identifying and describing meanings are the major aspects to determine the successful answering, while test type is a minor case.
6. The subjects still make mistakes that are strongly caused by some weaknesses. First, they may not understand the literal and implied meaning of the expression. Second, they are not conscious of or careful with certain expressions whether they are literal or

metaphorical, even though they may have clearly understood the meaning of the word or expression. And third, they are not able to identify the contextual meaning of the word(s) or expression(s) suggested by the text.

7. The findings (see table 4.6) confirm that the level of difficulty of the four parts is graded from part 1 to part 4. Hence, it is true that part 1 is the easiest and part 4 is the most difficult of the first-ability-measuring questions.

### **5.1.2 Conclusion of the Subjects' Ability to Understand the Intended Meaning of the English Metaphorical Expressions**

At the level of the findings of the second ability research, the writer concludes the followings:

1. In reference to the second research questions, the subjects highly understand the intended meaning of the English metaphorical expressions. On the average, the class achieves 81. It is positive that, on the average, the subjects can understand clearly what is meant or intended to express in metaphorical expressions.
2. Rooted on the findings (see table 4.9), the writer concludes that in majority, the twenty-one subjects have successfully passed Steen's five analytical steps. The key to their success in answering the questions is manifested by two things. Firstly, the subjects are able to

understand the intended meanings of the tested metaphorical expressions. It indicates that they recognize the meanings of both literal and metaphorical expressions. Secondly, they are able to search the proper corresponding characteristic(s), interdomain relations or criss-crossed area of sense, of both expressions: the source and target or the object and image.

3. The success of the subjects' conceptualization counts on the subjects' acquisition of adequate vocabulary knowledge or concepts.
4. The subjects do not seem to find obscurity in understanding the literal sense. Nevertheless, there are some tendencies that they are not able to go through the proper understanding of the tested metaphorical expressions (see table 4.10). To recap, the probable obscurities the subjects may come over are the understanding of the intended sense of the tested metaphorical expressions and the locating of the proper interdomain relations of the tested literal expressions and the intended substituting metaphorical expressions.
5. The findings (see table 4.8) stipulate that each question in the second-ability questions is relatively easy to the class. Only question 22 is answered wrongly by less than half of the class, ten subjects.
6. Referring to the fact that the subjects choose the significantly same wrong answers to some questions: 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, 36 and 37 (see table 4.5), the writer concludes that they hold the same wrong

conception. In majority the class is not noticeably able to distinguish clearly between two, or more, choices that are outwardly correct to the question. Consequently, they do not successfully resolve which interdomain relations is the aptest: between the described concept (the target domain) and the comparison concept or analogy (the source domain).

### **5.1.3 Conclusion of the Subjects' Ability to Identify the Proper Replacement of the English Metaphorical Expressions for the Stated Literal Expressions**

Corresponding to the findings of the third ability research, the writer concludes the followings:

1. Averaging 41, the subjects encompass very poor comprehension of identifying the proper replacement of the English metaphorical expressions for the stated literal expressions.
2. Referring to the findings (see table 4.11) that only eight questions are answered correctly by more than half of the class, the writer concludes that the third-ability-measuring questions, questions 41 to 60, are noticeably difficult to the class.
3. The subjects' predominantly unsuccessful answering is marked by their incompleteness of the primary things. Firstly, they do not recognize the sense of either the literal or metaphorical expression,

or of both the literal and metaphorical expressions. Secondly, they do not successfully find the corresponding characteristics between the tested literal expressions and the proper metaphorical expressions, or the interdomain relations between the source and target domains, or the criss-crossed area of sense between the object and image. For the subjects, positioning metaphorical expressions as the proper substitution for the given literal expressions is very obscure. This way of metaphorical thinking is of opposite direction to the second ability. This phase of metaphorical analysis and thinking is a stepping-stone for language learners to step further into readiness to produce metaphoric expressions actively. Thus, the subjects are still far beyond preparedness to construct English metaphorical expressions.

4. It is certain that the subjects do not clearly comprehend what metaphorical expressions are appropriate in meaning to the tested literal expressions. They do not successfully pass the five analytical steps, as suggested by Steen.

## **5.2 Suggestion**

Based on the findings, discussions and conclusions, the writer is adamant to bring up some suggestions for the benefit of the study. The writer divides his suggestions into two categories: firstly, for the practical

teachings of particularly pertinent subjects and secondly, for the allied further research.

### 5.2.1 Suggestions for the Practical Teachings

The writer expects that his suggestions will serve as contributive feedbacks for the concerned English teachers of the undergraduate English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya in their teachings of any pertinent classes such as Vocabulary, Translation, Reading and Literature, in terms of metaphor and its widespread use.

The followings are the suggestions:

1. **Motivating Teachers:** It is imperative that the teachers be **motivating** to their students to apprehend that metaphorical expressions have spread so invasively in human's communications: anywhere, anytime, by anyone in any languages, including English. Attributable to the fact that metaphor is so persistent and, therefore, significant in human's every day communications, it is crucial that the concerned teachers introduce the horizon of metaphor to the students. They should give stronger emphasis on their teachings to lead their students into an acceptance that students learning a language not only enrich their vocabulary with the literal concepts, but also be able to conceptualize the implicit or hidden sense or meaning of what is being stated, mostly in a metaphorical manner,

either orally or in writing. The teachers should **generate** their students to begin with the understanding of a rich concept of vocabulary, literally and metaphorically. Thence, it is teacher's turn to **encourage** their students to enrich their vocabulary by reading English literatures, magazines, newspapers and so on, listening to English songs and radio programs, seeing English-language films, and watching English television programs. According to Richards (1976:77), a learner who is constantly adding to his vocabulary knowledge is better prepared both for receptive and productive language skills. By enriching their vocabulary concepts, language learners may help themselves understand other people's points of view more easily and clearly and they themselves may become more able and intellectual to portray their thoughts and feelings explicitly or implicitly. Corresponding to Richards' statement, Fries (1988:37) emphasizes, "Learning a language practically always means primarily learning the words of that language." Since meanings are expressed either explicitly or implicitly, language learners should have suitable analytical tool for identifying and describing not only the literal meanings but also the hidden meanings.

2. **Sources of Material Development:** Closely associated to the previous suggestion, it is essential that the concerned teachers take

notice of the involvement of metaphorical employment in their English teachings, particularly in Vocabulary, Translation, Reading and Literature classes. The teachers' use of metaphorical expressions should be arising to their students' interest in recognizing metaphor in their English communications. The teachers should substantiate that their involvement of metaphorical employment in their English teachings is perceived plainly by their students, since recognizing metaphorical concepts is sometimes problematic to some readers or hearers, depending on their English knowledge and proficiency. In terms of **material development**, the teachers of the Vocabulary, Translation, Reading and Literature classes are expected to pick some **authentic materials** from English magazines, newspapers, textbooks, songs, TV programs, films, dramas, advertisements, and so on. **Authentic material** is the foundation for some content-based courses such as the teaching and learning of metaphor recognition. Richards (1996:26) states, "For example, newspaper articles can be used as a basis for developing reading skills, expanding vocabulary, or discussing culture." Good materials should provide the students with adequate, apt and thought-provoking exercises and opportunities to lead the students' to the achievement of strong recognition of English metaphorical expressions, as well as literal expressions. It is wise to consider two

important factors in **developing materials**: the effectiveness of the materials in achieving the purposes of the course and the appropriateness of the materials for the students. Appropriateness engrosses students' comfort and familiarity with the materials, curiosity or concern, relevance, and language level of difficulty. The level of difficulty of the materials should be confirmed that it fits the students' capacity of English learning and acquisition and that it satisfies their excitements and more importantly, English learning advancement.

3. **Apropos Syllabuses**: To further his preceding suggestions, the writer expects that in turns the teachers create **syllabuses** of the pertinent subjects such as Vocabulary, Translation, Reading and Literature. **Syllabuses** are designed to organize, at least, two important factors: the **contents of material** and **teaching-learning activities**. In terms of **material content**, the teachers should consider sequencing materials from the simple to the more complex. It is also advisable that the teachers apply recycling process in their metaphor teaching. The principle of material recycling is that students run into previous material in new different ways to augment new skill area using a different activity, or with a new focus. For example, metaphor material learned in a reading activity may be recycled in a translation or vocabulary exercise. This

approach of recycling presumes that each new encounter with the material provides a different challenge and learning atmosphere to the students. Thereby, it maintains the students' interest and motivation to recognize more and more metaphorical expressions. Further, recycling encompasses the effect of integrating material and, therefore, enhances students' ability or skill. In terms of **teaching-learning activities**, the teachers are expected to design what activities are to be conducted within a given time frame. It is suggested that the teachers plan how many sessions they will spend with the students to apply certain materials with certain teaching strategies to emphasize the significance and elation of learning metaphorical expressions progressively and successfully. Then, the teachers should divide each session into several parts of activities. For example, first, the teachers introduce what metaphor is and explain further where, when, how, and by whom metaphor is employed. Second, the class watches a video and listens to the conversation. Third, the class, divided into several groups, discusses the metaphorical expressions used in the conversation. Fourth, each group presents the results of the discussion.

#### 4. **Language Skills Augmentation:**

- a) **Receptive (Passive) Language Skills:** Rooted in the findings that the subjects' first and second abilities are burly, it is

suggested that the teachers augment the students' strong comprehension of metaphorical expressions with further and enhanced learning activities. For example, the students are given translation work quoted from some literary works containing many metaphorical expressions such as poetries, dramas, songs and idiomatic expressions. The students are to convert the focused English metaphorical expressions into English literal expressions. Before doing such a work, the students must be given adequate explanation, examples and simple but effective practices first by the teacher. This teaching is expected to give the students a lot of opportunities and practices to recognize more and more metaphorical expressions and to comprehend the intended meanings of the metaphorical expressions. This class activity helps teachers emphasize their teaching on the augmentation of the students' **passive skills** of metaphor recognition. This teaching may be closely associated with Translation, Vocabulary, Literature and Reading classes.

- b) **Productive (Active) Language Skills:** As a natural subsequence of receptive skills escalation in language learning, it is principled that language learners acquire **productive skills** as well. Founded on the finding that the

subjects' third ability is low on the average, the writer insists to broach his implication. The third ability in the writer's research is a sturdy fundamental for **producing** metaphoric expressions. Therefore, to follow up the subjects' successful first and second abilities, to improve the subjects' unsuccessful third ability and to get them to a more prepared and better condition for acquiring productive skills, the teachers are recommended to give their students, the subjects, a translation work. The text of the translation work can be quoted from, for examples, English magazines and newspapers. The students are instructed to translate the provided text, either from Indonesian into English that employ metaphorical expressions or from literal English into metaphorical English. Before having the students do such translation work, the teacher gives the students adequate explanation, examples and forceful practices first. This teaching is expected to help teachers put emphasis on the enhancement of the students' **active use** of metaphor. From the students' work, the teacher may also analyze the students' ability in using different types of metaphor: dead, cliché, stock, adapted, recent and original (Newmark 1988).

This teaching may engross Translation, Vocabulary and Reading classes.

Above all, on behalf of successful metaphor teaching and learning, teachers should make some considerations. Above all his suggestions, the writer underlines and recaps as the followings. Firstly, the acumen is expected to make the students aware of the vast and vital use of metaphor in human's every day communications. The students are expected to realize that in language, there are many expressions used literally and non-literally, metaphorically. In learning English metaphor, a learner is urged to be able to recognize the implicit meaning. Secondly, the acumen is expected to generate the students' enthusiasm to espouse more and more English vocabulary, employed in literal and metaphorical manners, in explicit or implicit expressions, stated orally or in writing. Thirdly, it is ideal that, learning metaphorical expressions, not only are the students able to recognize metaphorical concepts, but also they are able to express orally or in writing their own feelings and thoughts metaphorically. Hopefully, the teachers will be more successful in creating English students who are motivated to augment and expand more and more English vocabulary, to understand the embedded messages of metaphorical expressions as well as to convey things in metaphorical way, either orally or in writing.

### 5.2.2 Suggestions for Further Research

The writer claims that in this study, there are some limitations that have still not been recovered. In the discussions of the findings, the writer raises some interpretations on the findings to find the subjects' strengths and weaknesses. The interpretations are subjective, not absolute. All the readers of this study may have their own interpretations or conceptions which may be different from the writer's. Since the instrument of the study is a multiple-choice-question test, it does not permit the writer, first, to arrive at the approach of clearer or more exact discussions of the findings of the subjects' strengths and weaknesses and, second, to detect the subjects' productive or active skill.

In view of that, to surmount the limitations, the writer infers that it is ideal to conduct a further research at the level of this study. The writer suggests that in the further study, the researcher focuses on the following two suggestions:

1. Given that the writer's study aims to find the subjects' receptive or passive skill: ability to comprehend (identify) English metaphorical expressions, there is no explication of the subjects' productive or active skill: ability to produce metaphorical expressions, either in writing or orally. Accordingly, the writer surmises that it is considerable to further this study to research the subjects' (or any others' under similar, or different, characteristics) ability to write or

speak metaphorically, as a natural subsequence of learning language as a means of communication.

2. In terms of instrument, it is decisive to use open-ended questions and/or interview. The reasons to use written open-ended questions are that they provide a wider range of written answers to analyze and discuss, and that they allow the subjects to articulate more freely, broadly and individually than what close-ended (multiple-choice) questions do. This type of testing maintains to research the subjects' metaphorical writing skill. The writer is also of the opinion that the use of interview in the further research will be prospectively effective to find a closer look at the subjects' ability and disability to speak metaphorically. Nevertheless, the researcher should draw a clear scope and devise certain limitations concerning the potential broadness of answers the open-ended questions and interview may bring about. Otherwise, the subjects' answers may not cover, or even touch, the intended focus of research and, therefore, may not divulge what the research purports to measure.

Last but not least, the writer expects that, above all, any of the whole parts written in his research will be of any favorable benefit to the readers.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### TEXT BOOK RESOURCES

- Beard, A., (2000). *The Language of Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Blakemore, D., (1992). *Understanding Utterances: an Introduction to Pragmatics*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Borg, W. R. and Gall, M. D., (1989). *Educational Research: an introduction*. New York: Longman.
- Creswell, J. W., (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. London: Sage Publications.
- Cohen, L.; Manion, L.; Morrison, K., (2000). *Research Methods in Education*, New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Comfort, J., (2004). *Effective Presentation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, D.E., (1986). *Metaphor*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Cruse, D.A., (2000). *Meaning in Language: an introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dijk, T.A.V., (1977). *Text and Context*. England: Longman Group Ltd.
- Fraenkel, J. R. and Wallen, N. E., (1993). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. The United States: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Fries, Charles C., (1988). *Teaching and Learning Language as a Foreign Language*. Ann Arbor: The University of Milky Press.
- Gay, L.R., (1985). *Educational Evaluation and Measurement: Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co. A Bell & Howell Company.
- Gibbs, R. W. Jr. and Steen, G.J., (1999). *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics: Selected Papers from the Fifth International Cognitive Linguistics Conference*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Goatly, D.E., (1997). *The Language of Metaphors*. New York: Routledge, London and New York.
- Grundy, P., (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Hatch, E., and Lazaraton, A., (1991). *The Research Manual: Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers
- Harris, D. P., (1969). *Testing English as a Second Language, USA*: Georgetown University, McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Heaton, J. B., (1975). *Writing English Language Tests: Practical Guide for Teachers of English as Second Language*. Singapore: Longman Group Ltd.
- Henning, G., (1987). *A Guide to Language Testing: development, evaluation, research*. Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Kadmon, N., (2001). *Formal Pragmatics*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M., (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The university of Chicago Press.
- Levinson, S.C., (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leezenberg, M., (2001). *Contexts of Metaphor*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Lien, A. J., (1980). *Measurement and Evaluation of Learning*. Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Lycan, W.G., (1999). *Philosophy of Language*. New York: Routledge, the Taylor and Francis Group.
- Lyman, H. B., (1971). *Test Scores And What They Mean*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- McNamara, T., (2000). *Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Moran, R., (1997). *Metaphor*. In C. Wright and R. Hale (eds), *A companion to the philosophy of language*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Nandy, M., (2000). *English Expressions with Idioms, Propositions and Metaphors*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: SAM Publishing Sdn. Bhd.
- Newmark, P., (1988). *A Text Book of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Neuman, W. L., (2003). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Nunan, D., (1992). *Research Method in Language Teaching*. The United States of America: Cambridge University Press.
- Odgen, C. K. and Richards, I. A. (1989). *The Meaning of Meaning*. The United States of America: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Reinhart, T., (1976). *On Understanding Poetic Metaphor*. *Poetics* 5. 383-402.
- Richards, J. C., (1976). *The Role of Vocabulary Teaching*. *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. X, No. 1 and 77.
- Richards, J. C., (1996). *Teachers as Course Developers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Saeed, J. I., (1997). *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Searle, J. R., (1979). *Indirect Speech Acts*. In P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (eds) (1975). *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press.
- Webster, M., (1986). *A Dictionary of the English Language*. Springfield, Massachusetts, U.S.A.: Merriam-Webster Inc., Publishers.
- Wietzbicka, A., (1991). *Cross Cultural Pragmatics*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co.
- Yule, G., (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## INTERNET RESOURCES

1. Casnig, John D., (1997-2006). <http://knowgramming.com/metaphors/index.htm> *A Language of Metaphors*. Kingston, Ontario, Canada: Knowgramming. Com
2. Holcombe, C. J., (2007). <http://www.textetc.com/theory/metaphor.html>. *Theories of metaphors*. Litlangs Ltda.